

Comments from local residents to be addressed by the agent – Barrie House

Topic	Comment	Response
Consultation with local residents	Unaware of the referenced Barrie House 'residents consultation'. Unaware of previous communication on this issue prior to the letter dated 05 th Feb from Montagu Evans	The managing agent for the existing block notified lessees on 27/11/17 and 01/12/17 of an upcoming residents meeting to discuss a number of matters including the upcoming planning application. The meeting was held on 6 December 2017 and was attended by eight residents. At the meeting, draft plans of the scheme were presented and meeting minutes were subsequently issued in January 2018.
	Due diligence has not been followed. There have not been pre-consultation meetings or attempts to constructively engage with the local residents of Barrie House or to consider feedback from them	
Density	Planning statement is factually incorrect regarding density. There are 24 units in existing Barrie House not 16 units as quoted in the planning statement (section 5.20). The PTAL rating is 1B not 2 as proposed. Therefore the density calculation is wrong as should be assessed against the correct figures (24 units at PTAL rating of 1B).	The submitted Transport Statement sets out that the Site should have a PTAL of 2, when considering its Total Site Accessibility Index. It is noted that the existing Barrie House and proposed development would result in a total of 33 residential units on site. This equates to 145 units per hectare, which is within the London Plan's appropriate density range. The development has been carefully designed to optimise the density of development and make efficient use of previously development land.
Design	Design doesn't seem to take account of colour of banding structure either of Barrie House or the Kingsland Estate. Should consider re-design of the colour, material and finish that is sympathetic to Kingsland terrace and Barrie House.	Comments noted. The proposed design was development following extensive pre-application engagement with planning and design officers and presented to the Design Review Panel, which was received positively.
Affordable housing	It is wrong for the development to include an extra nine dwellings to the current 24 dwellings that does not consist of any affordable housing and instead a payment in lieu. Should look at the development as a whole and per a proportion being made affordable housing. Of the nine dwellings 6 should be made affordable.	The principle of a payment in lieu of affordable housing for the proposed development is consistent with Camden's development plan policies on affordable housing.
Parking	Essential that local residents of Barrie House have adequate facilities for picking up and dropping off from taxis etc. Residents only access gate at the entrance to Barrie House would preclude such traffic. Will local residents who don't have a parking space lose the right of vehicular access to their own drives.	It is possible for the electronic gate on the vehicular access to include a buzzer system for taxis and other visitors to use. The gates could then be opened electronically, if the request to open is accepted by the resident(s). An existing lifting barrier is already present on Site. The new gates would improve security of the Site.
	Essential that adequate off street vehicular facilities for the residents and visitors of Barrie House should be provided.	

		Camden's planning policy requirements and the on-site logistics.
	The proposal will result in 33 flats and 10 parking spaces. This will displace existing residents to on-street spaces which are only available on the north side of St Edmunds Terrace (remaining streets controlled by Westminster and only available to their residents) Forcing people to walk 10 minutes through Primrose Hill Park to get back to their flat.	The nine proposed residential units will be 'car free' dwellings, with no car parking spaces, in line with LBC planning policy. The relocated parking spaces are to be provided for existing residents who currently benefit from a parking space, sold with the flats. Other leases for the informal and sub-standard parking spaces currently on site is provided on a temporary basis for a period of one year. This would not be offered in the new development.
Construction	Building process would be lengthy, noisy and dangerous and would result in a drastic loss of amenity both for the occupants of Barrie House and the Kingsland Estate.	In developing the Site, the developer will seek to minimise construction impacts relating to both on-site activity and transport arrangements during the construction period. A full Construction Management Plan will be secured by a Section 106 Planning Obligation that will confirm working hours, delivery routes, access arrangements, and cumulative construction impacts. Separate consultation will be undertaken on the details of this prior to works starting on site.
Basement impact assessment	No reference in the BIA to Barrie House itself only properties in Kingsland have been assessed. BIA suggests potential for vertical movement in Fig 18. This fails to show the position of most of the foundation pads for Barrie House, even though they are evident in Figs 2 and 17. Ground movements are important as Barrie House is supported on these pads not piles.	The submitted Basement Impact Assessment has been assessed by the Council's independent consultants. As a result of this review and comments from local residents, a revised Ground Movement Assessment has been submitted to include the existing Barrie House block and single storey extension. The Ground Movement Assessment is based on a construction sequence detailing the underpinning of the existing pads and adjacent excavation which is included in the BIA. The Basement Construction Plan detailing construction methodology and temporary works design which will be prepared by the appointed contractor will adhere to the requirements set out by the BIA.
	Large water pipes passing close to Barrie House from the Barrow Hill Reservoir that have been leaking water into the grounds for many years. Has a proper assessment been made and has Thames Water been consulted?	The water pipes were upgraded as part of extensive works to the reservoir in 2014.
Loss of garden	The proposed parking spaces, movement of the driveway and path and provision of new stair to new cycle storage area and	There would be a loss of 42 sqm of 'green space', equating to 3.7% of the Site area. As noted in the Design and

	new area for refuse would result in the loss of green space not brownfield as suggested.	Access Statement, there are a number of hard and soft landscaping improvements proposed and the permeability of the site would, in fact, increase in area.
Daylight and sunlight	The document has neglected the small windows on the north side of Barrie House that are closest to the new development.	Malcolm Hollis has considered these secondary windows, concluding that they each serve rooms which will retain excellent levels of daylight due to larger windows on the eastern or western elevations being present.
Loss of views	Loss of views from current residents of Barrie House would adversely affect the residential amenity of current owners. Three bed flats would lose triple aspect outlook which is a feature of the 1960's flats	The existing flats on the northern part of the block would maintain a dual aspect, with their main frontages unaffected. The relationship between the southern part of the block and the new extension is unlikely to adversely affect existing amenity through a limitation on outlook, most notably due to the distance between the blocks and the fact that these are also dual aspect dwellings.
Noise	Noise report states that noise reduction is likely for the air conditioning units on the balconies of the new flats but very few details provided.	The proposed plant will be housed in a noise attenuating enclosure, to minimise any impacts of noise on both existing and future residents.
	Proposed development will add noise and disturbance (additional occupiers, 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 3-4 storey wall in such close proximity.	Comment noted. The provision of external amenity space is recommended in planning guidance on new residential schemes. Whilst there will be some noise associated with additional occupiers, it is not considered to contribute to an adverse impact on residential amenity of current owners.
Risk to wildlife	The proposed development poses risks to environment and wildlife in the space. Wildlife here includes foxes, rabbits, squirrels and newts. Biodiversity and wildlife needs to be protected	The proposed development includes the provision of a green roof, which will provide biodiversity benefits on site. In addition to this, the landscaping of the Site is to be improved, which will also increase the opportunity for wildlife and biodiversity benefits.