

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

8<sup>th</sup> November 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 am writing again to request that Camden Council refuse planning application # 2018/0645/P. I am very concerned re this planning application which is opposed by vast majority of Residents and neighbours of Barrie House.

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

**1. MANAGEMENT OF THIS APPLICATION**

Since objections were given in March- May 2018, there has been no communication or update from either the Council or the Freeholder on this matter to the local community.

It was noted that the Council would visit the flats and meet with those impacted but this has not been done. Instead the application appears to have been moved forward without proper consultation, despite the rightful concerns of the local community.

We only found out about this through a small cryptic yellow notice being left on the wall by the Council (which looks exactly the same as the previous notice). The notice does not provide any useful detail but instead directs to an on line 70-page document that is too technical for residents to comprehend or to draw key points from. Moreover many elderly residents can not access the details. This is not a fair approach to engage with residents or gauge the impact of this development. The Freeholder has not given any communication on this matter with the leaseholders.

We reiterate in the strongest terms the objection to this application and ask the Council to work towards the benefit of all the stakeholders involved. We are concerned and ask that a meeting be arranged at the Council, with MPs, councillors and residents / neighbours attending so that matters of key importance in this application are properly addressed.

**2. DISPUTED INFORMATION IN THE FREEHOLDERS RESPONSE**

**Consultation with local residents DISPUTED**

It is noted that there has been consultation by the Freeholder. This is not correct. The meeting on the 01/12/17 was a meeting about heating and service charges in the block at which, out of the blue, the managing agent served a planning application to a small group.

**Density- DISPUTED**

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.

#### **Property Law considerations; Daylight and sunlight - DISPUTED**

The proposal has serious property law implications which need to be addressed – have these been looked into? For example, the propose development will mean a loss of existing window for the 3-bed room apartment holders. Also, the conversion from a triple aspect to a double aspect apartment (which was the primary feature to many of buying these flats) causes loss of daylight – this has not been accurately assessed in the report from the Freeholder. Have the apartment owners agreed to this? Could a freeholder unilaterally make changes that impinge on the leaseholders' apartments?

In the new Basement Impact Audit (V2 Campbell Reith), the "potential sensitivity of a 1950's framed structure to ground movements" is mentioned, along with damage to existing flats being estimated in category 1. We do not wish to be exposed to this damage or the risks from construction of a basement underneath and beside the existing multi-storey building.

If constructed, the new building will have too high a massing being 4/5 storeys in bulk and less than 2.5m from our flats. The building reduces the breathing space between existing large buildings and will have a detrimental impact on noise, light and privacy for our flats. ”

#### **Design- DISPUTED**

Comments are noted but nothing has been done

#### **Affordable housing- DISPUTED**

This build is a means on income for affordable housing at the detriment of the current residents. This is not central governments vision for equality.

#### **Parking - DISPUTED**

The Freeholder has ignored the vital issue of parking; especially given the health of many who rely on their own transport. Only one flat has a space sold as part of the property. There are many in the block reliant on their cars who will lose parking; not everyone can use public transport.

Currently 10 off-street spaces are used by the 24 existing flats. 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

**Construction - DISPUTED**

The site is too dense and too close to those that live here to be built without great construction disruption.

**Basement impact assessment - DISPUTED**

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.

There is also a large water pipe passing under Barrie House from the Barrow Hill Reservoir which has been leaking water into our grounds for many years. Any new building work / basement may aggravate the situation. We are also not sure if a proper assessment has been made and whether Thames Water has been consulted.

**Loss of garden- DISPUTED**

**Loss of views - DISPUTED**

3 bedroom flats lose their views from loss of a whole angle of view.

**Noise – DISPUTED**

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.

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 close proximity.

The proposed block will impact on the peaceful enjoyment of our homes.

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,

