

Objection to planning application 2017/1118/P

Amy Silverston
37 Laurier Road
London NW5 1SH

I object to the planning application on the following grounds:

1. This is about the car parking arrangements for the proposed residential development. It assumes the building design has been approved, but this is not the case. The design of the proposed building has not been discussed formally by the planning committee. When the original planning application came to committee they rejected it after realising that it will effectively convert public open space into a private residents' garden: the public 'pocket park' has been designed in a way that two padlocks will turn the site into a private gated residential community with lawns, flower beds and tennis courts. This has to be revisited by the planning dept. to ensure the public open space remains available to the public.

The design of the proposed dwellings needs to be examined in detail separately.

2. When justifying their overall design for the site, the developers made a great deal out of how much open space was to be preserved and would not be used for car parking. The current planning application contradicts these pledges. It is disingenuous.
3. This number of cars will be noisy; residents on Regency Lawn, York Rise and Laurier Road will have car doors slamming right behind them into the night.
4. It is likely that the development will generate more cars than parking spaces. Of the original six parking places, several (three?) were for the tennis club, with others designated for non-transferable purposes such as for disabled residents/visitors. There are 21 residential units. It is likely that some will be two-car households. On what basis are non-designated parking spaces to be allocated?

5. Under the original plan, residents were not to be granted CAB parking permits. If they are given parking permits under this revised scheme, because of the perceived unfairness resulting from there not being enough parking spaces for the number of dwellings, they will end up jostling for space on roads that are already full of residents' cars; almost no houses have the option to create off-street parking. As it will be impossible to decide which residents are to be given a parking space, the only fair option is for no residents to be allowed to park there.

Possible solution:

Dartmouth Park is well served by public transport, with residents tending to travel to work by tube, overground or bus, as well as a lot of people cycling. A way to give residents access to a car when they need it would be to have a minimal number of non-transferable parking spaces (for disabled residents and tennis club members) as per the current plan, and to include some car club spaces. The existing car club cars in the area (by the church at the top of Dartmouth Park Road) appear to be well used.

6. Croftdown Road's pavements carry a large volume of pedestrian traffic as a result of there being three secondary schools at one end and a primary school at the other. These pedestrian movements are constant through the day; La Sainte Union starts early (the girls stream past my house from 7:30am). The LaSwap sixth form arrangement, whereby students study at all three secondary schools, means there are students constantly on the move, particularly in to and out of the La Sainte Union's senior students gate opposite the entrance to the bowling club site.
7. Notwithstanding the fact that some of the open space is under tarmac—a previous planning mistake—does the open space designation allow for use of this space for a car park?
8. Allowing this application would contradict Camden policy on reducing car use in the borough:

Camden Local Plan policy T2 Parking and Car Free Development seeks to restrict car parking within both residential and non-residential developments to spaces designated for disabled people and essential operating or servicing needs where necessary throughout the whole borough.

Acceptable access to public transport is based on the assumption that people will walk up to 640 metres (approximately eight minutes) to a bus service and up to 960 metres (12 minutes) to a rail or Tube service.

(Camden Local Plan Evidence Report, Car-free development February 2016)

The MBC site is within these walking times to public transport.

Nowhere in this policy does it state, 'These policies apply across the borough, with the specific exception of the Mansfield Bowling Club site where all other planning policies on protecting sport facilities and registered green space have been abandoned or skirted around so we may as well roll over on this one too.'