

Elaine Quigley
Senior Planning Officer
London Borough of Camden
2nd Floor, 5 Pancras Square
C/o Town Hall, Judd Street
London WC1H 9JE

08 February 2018

Dear Ms. Quigley,

**Re – Planning Application Number 2018/0645/P At Barrie House, 29 St Edmunds Terrace,
London NW8 7QH**

I am a resident of Barrie House, the proposed development site and are writing to request that Camden Council refuse planning application # 2018/0645/P submitted by Kaleminster Ltd.

I would like to object to the above mentioned planning application on the following grounds:

1. **Privacy.** The bulk and scale will result in an increased sense of enclosure and loss of light for adjoining residents. The proposed development is over-bearing being 3 and 4 storeys in height, but situated less than 2.5m away from the existing Barrie House. The new flats in the proposed development will overlook directly into my living room and kitchen windows, thus violating our privacy.
2. **Density.** The proposed development exceeds the London Plan housing density. The density limit should not be waived because St Edmund's Terrace is already over-developed with this single street having 74 additional units built, or in construction, in the past few years.

In more detail: The Planning Statement is factually incorrect regarding density. There are 24 units in the existing Barrie House, not the 16 units quoted in Planning Statement section 5.20. Furthermore, Barrie House is in PTAL zone 1B. The map supplied in Appendix A of the Transport Assessment has the marker incorrectly placed in a PTAL zone 2 area. Taking from section 5.20, the land area as 0.2268ha, the 24 existing plus 9 proposed units creates a density of $33/0.2268 = 145.5$ units/ha. This exceeds the maximum of either 95 units/ha (for 'Urban' classification), or 110 units/ha ('Central' classification) for PTAL 1B, as specified in the London Plan.

This high density should not be waived by planners because it should be seen in the context of recent developments in St Edmund's Terrace with 64 (gain of 41) units constructed in the neighbouring Searle Court (formerly Guinness Court), 1 additional unit in Regent's Gate approved, 36 (gain of 26) units built at 40-49 St Edmund's Terrace adjacent to Primrose Hill and the current construction of 9 units (gain of 6) at 4-6 St Edmund's Terrace. During this period, the only nearby bus (route 274) ceased to run a 24 hour service.

3. **Added Parking Stress.** Currently 10 off-street spaces are used by the 24 existing flats (and I believe a further 7 spots are available for current residents to rent). After the proposed development, there will be 10 spaces and 33 flats. This is likely to displace existing residents to on-street spaces. Only the north side of St Edmund's Terrace is in Camden borough and only St Edmund's Terrace itself is available for residents or visitors with CA-J permits, all other streets nearby being restricted to Westminster permit holders. The next closest Camden permit spaces are located on the other side of Primrose Hill Park, which would mean people walking 10 minutes through the park. In non-controlled hours this will still force extra vehicles onto St Edmund's Terrace. The recent developments on St Edmund's Terrace have all included a

parking element, indicating a need for some parking with new developments in a region with this PTAL level.

4. **No Basement Impact Assessment for existing Barrie House.** The ground under the existing Barrie House shows a potential for vertical movement in Figure 18 of the Basement Impact Assessment. However, only damage to properties in Kingsland has been assessed. Furthermore, Figure 18 fails to show the position of most of the foundation pads for Barrie House, even though they are evident in Figures 2 and 17. Barrie House is an 8 storey building supported on these pads, not piles, so ground movements are important and their impact should be assessed.
5. There are also large water pipes passing close to Barrie House from the Barrow Hill Reservoir, which have been leaking water into our grounds for many years. Any new building work / basement may aggravate the situation. I am also not sure if a proper assessment has been made and whether Thames Water has been consulted.
6. **Development is not 'brownfield'.** Garden space will be taken up for the relocation of 10 parking spaces, movement of the driveway and path, provision of a new stairway to new cycle storage, new area for refuse and new short-term cycle parking.
7. **Daylight Assessment.** This appears to have neglected the small windows on the north side of Barrie House that are closest to the new development. The loss of light for current residents of Barrie House would adversely affect the residential amenity of current owners. The 3 bedroom flats will lose their triple aspect outlook completely, which is a feature of the 1960's Flats and one of the most appealing reasons they were purchased, and the 2 bedroom flats will lose light and privacy. The **light impact assessment appears to be incorrect.** There is substantially more impact and loss of light in our opinion than has been calculated here and we would urge for an independent assessor.
8. **Noise from plant.** The Acoustic Report says that noise reduction is likely to be required for air conditioning plant, but there are very few details in the application. The proposed rooftop unit is very close to existing flats in Barrie House.
9. **Noise from new residents and Reflected noise.** The proposed block will impact on the peaceful enjoyment of our homes. The proposed development will add to noise and disturbance (from high density, over-development and the provision of outdoor terraces) and adversely affect the residential amenity of current owners. No account has been taken of the noise reflected back to the existing flats by the construction of a 3-4 storey wall in such close proximity.
10. **Concerns raised in pre-planning advice.** Many concerns raised in the pre-planning advice are still valid. For example, the new development will be too dominant, will create an excessive sense of enclosure and removes the breathing gap between Barrie House and Kingsland.
11. The proposed development in such close quarters to my home will create an unhealthy environment for young children. I have a child of 3 years and I know there are much younger children in the block. Air and noise pollution due to a close building site is a health hazard for these children.
12. This proposed development is at odds with the Government's new homes scheme, which is to work with the local community to enhance an area. This proposed development will not be a sustainable addition to the community. This is a plan to build more luxury homes; at disregard for the wellbeing of the current homeowners by making their homes overlooked, contributing to noise pollution, and over-density in this area.

13. Finally, due diligence has not been followed. There have not been pre consultation meetings or attempts to constructively engage or to consider feedback from the residents in Barrie House.

Therefore, I request that Camden Council refuse this Planning Application. The residents offered and requested Council visits to our homes to verify that these objections are valid.

Should you require any additional information, clarification of any comments made please do not hesitate to contact me via my given details.

Please acknowledge receipt of this letter of objection.

Yours faithfully,



Gaurav Jain

Flat 5, Barrie House,
29 St Edmunds Terrace
London NW8 7QH



Appendix

Photographs from living room and kitchen window overlooking the proposed development space

Living Room Window



Kitchen Window

