

Application No: 2018/2859/P
Consultees Name: [REDACTED]
Received: 24/07/2018 17:17:40
Comment: COMMENT

Printed on: 25/07/2018 09:10:07

Response:
Ref: Planning application 6 Streatley Place

The proposed development is unsuitable.

1. the provision of 4 flats is over development of the site.
2. type of building methods are unsuitable. Preformed, lightweight structure should be used.
3. the disruption to the neighbouring area is, in term of noise, access, traffic flow, the maximum possible.
4. the building in an important conservation area would stick out like a sore thumb and has no architectural merit.

A key issue is the access to the site. Planning consent must consider the process of building

1. pile driving (which the architect, at a meeting on 4th June 2018 for residents) disclosed would take over 18 months) will be intolerably noisy.
 2. since the building is to be right up to the boundary wall, the proposal is to put up hoarding, reducing Streatley Place at its narrowest points, by half. This is a much-used path, giving access to the school and nursery. The fire exit for Heathside School is perilously near to the top of the steps, and halving the passageway would render it virtually impossible.
 3. 100 skips worth of earth to be trundled down Streatly Place, past school and nursery to the bottom of New End, will block passageway down StreatleyPlace. A skip at the bottom of New End, that has to be removed at its peak several times a week, will block the traffic through to New End Square and the one way system via Back Lane to Heath Street.
- Residents of Streatley Place and Mansfield Place rely on unloading facilities at the bottom of New End particularly the many OAPs with limited mobility.

Blocking Back Lane

The use of the lay-by at the top of Back Lane as a building site will prevent traffic flow. The road is often blocked by delivery vans parked in the lay-by. The dustcarts, serving Flask Walk and Back Lane will certainly be unable to get through.

There are inaccuracies in the application.

Application No: Consultees Name: Received:

Comment:

Response:

1. Daylight: the proposal says there is no significant change from the previously approved scheme -but that scheme did have an adverse impact, and this is a new application and should be considered on its own merits/demerits.

2. the application (Section 6) says there is no change to pedestrians and vehicle access. This is untrue.

Section 13) flood risk, there are errors in the hydrology report (see below). (

Section 18) note there is no public gain from this development.

Errors in the Hydrology report.

p11. point 2. There is a water well at no 7 Mansfield Place, which is prevented from flooding by means of an electric pump. The River Fleet ran under no 1 and 2 Mansfield Place, and through to New End School.

We had a problem with water running down the path of Mansfield Place (not a burst water pipe but a tributary of the River Fleet). Ove Arup Ltd were called in to solve the problem, and we had a special path laid.

Please note, the properties affected by the planned development have not been given notice of the application. Notices have been put up on the lampposts giving less than a weeks notice no provision has been made for those who are not IT literate, including the disabled, to be informed and given the opportunity to comment. The notices were posted after the school closed for the holidays, reducing the opportunity for the parents to object. It does not need saying, or should not, that the noise and disturbance will have a disruptive affect on the educational opportunities of the pupils.

The developers are economical with the truth they claim to have surveyed the businesses in Back Lane. In fact they surveyed businesses in Heath St. No businesses in Back Lane were approached.

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2018/2859/P		24/07/2018 18:35:23	COMMENT	<p>I am writing to object to the planned proposal to remove the only layby at the top of Back Lane. This will effectively stop the ability for us to conduct business.</p> <p>We note that Martin Evans Architects state that they attempted to contact businesses in the area. We have been operating in Back Lane for over 30 years but were not contacted. We note the comments from business in Heath Street in the Construction Management Plan, but have not been able to identify any business in Back Lane who was approached.</p> <p>In addition to the usual logistical activities involved in running an organization, our initiative Knit for Peace receives and distributes clothing and blankets for people in need. We currently receive numerous deliveries of donated items (from 20,000 volunteers around the country). With deliveries occurring throughout the day, this involves a number of carriers and individuals.</p> <p>Also, on a regular basis we load and dispatch vanloads of these items. We therefore depend upon being able to stop and unload/load somewhere in Back Lane. The existing restrictions on access to and from our building already makes this difficult, but the proposal will make it unmanageable.</p> <p>We are concerned that if as suggested, the layby is used as an 'offsite compound' it will inevitably reduce the width of the lane even further, thereby increasing queues (which already form in late afternoons and mornings), and will make access for larger vehicles impossible.</p> <p>Removal of the parking space will be detrimental to our business.</p> <p>If this were to proceed it will impact upon our ability to deliver to the vulnerable and needy. Given the extended period of time that works are expected to take, the damage caused to our activities could be irretrievable.</p> <p>Can you please advise what consideration has been given to the effect of your proposals on businesses in Back Lane?</p>

Printed on: 25/07/2018 09:10:07

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2018/2859/P		24/07/2018 15:54:49	INT	<p>Dear Camden, my property [REDACTED] the proposed development. In 2002, with a view to buying the property and converting it to a garden for my use, I was granted conditional permission for such. The condition was that no independent dwelling was to be built and the several large trees would be kept intact. I pointed out this fact when new owners applied to build a 3 bedroom holiday hotel and take down every tree. It was ignored, permission granted. Then it was sold to new developers who successfully expanded the project to 4 one bed flats. Now another developer has bought it and wants to expand it again to now six flats. What's next a tower block?</p> <p>I would also like to point out that the Tree Survey fails to mention that T1, on my property, is under a Tree Protection Order. I suspect that the excavation for the new basement will impact the roots. I also notice that the ground water survey says that the water table is some 6 meters below the new basement level. However, I excavated a basement at 7 Lakis Close in 2002 and struck water 2 meters below that level. we needed 24 hour pumps and then to seal the basement. I suspect these developers need to do a bit more research before they start excavating. I don't want my property flooded as my basement already lies at a lower elevation to the one they propose and it is less than 2 meters from their excavations.</p> <p>Lastly, like the previous developers, they propose to use 1/2 of Back Lane as a permanent skip site. Despite what they claim, this will be incredibly disruptive to the neighborhood, both commercial and residential. It also virtually makes my drive way inaccessible. They cleverly show a geometric diagram that demonstrates how a vehicle could exit my driveway. This is because the front half of the layby is vacant. But it ignores the impossibility of entering the driveway on this one way street with the other half of the layby permanently occupied by a skip.</p> <p>So, if you are going to approve yet a further exoansion of this development, at least make them do it without these big disruptions to the neighborhood. It will be costly to them to remove and supply material without a permanent skip site but they should bear that cost and make less profit for the sake of the neighborhood. I am still shocked that when I (a local resident) proposed turning it into a garden, Camden approved under conditons that no independent dwelling be erected. Yet, when professional property developers come in, they get approval for pretty much whatever they want. Perhaps an investigation is warranted?</p>