

Dear Mr. Benbarek, It has come to my attention that Dr Mark Silvert has applied to change the use of the first floor of 39 College Crescent, NW3 5LB from office use (B1a) to a therapy clinic (Class D1) under planning application 2019/1070/P.

I am a mother of two young girls, [REDACTED] My husband, Deniz, and the girls and I live in #6, 39 College Crescent. My girls play in the front garden/courtyard every day after school in good weather and on the weekends. The courtyard is our front garden and that of our neighbours.

I attach photos of my children and the neighbour children playing in the garden this morning, March 31, 2019.

I was very distressed to hear about the change of use application for the Coach House in 39 College Crescent from B1 office to D1 therapy clinic.

As a resident and a Leaseholder of #6, 39 College Crescent, I object to this change of use on the following grounds:

1) Loss of Scarce Office Space: Camden has limited office space per the Camden Local Plan, and per the Camden Local Plan Section E2, office space should not be converted to other use unless "a). the site or building is no longer suitable for its existing business use; and b). that the possibility of retaining, reusing or redeveloping the site or building for similar or alternative type and size of business use has been fully explored over an appropriate period of time."

Neither of these tests have been met. The space has only been vacant for a short while. Other suitable office tenants could be found, and there is anecdotal evidence that other tenants could be interested in the space.

2) Incorrect Information on Application: the planning application says in section 2.2 that there are two access points, "one directly" from College Crescent. This is not the case. There are only two street entrances to the 39 College Crescent residential development. One is the only pedestrian entrance gate, which leads to the communal courtyard where the private homes are located and children use as a play area. The other is the garage door, opening to the vehicle ramp leading to a lower ground car park. The car park provides indirect access to the court yard and direct access to the residential houses. There is no direct street entrance into the Coach House building. There is no way for patients to access the Coach House directly without going through communal areas.

3) Negative Impact of Amenity of Neighbours and Misrepresentation of facts to Council and Residents: The Camden Local Plan states in Section 6 A1 that Camden will "seek to ensure that the amenity of communities, occupiers and neighbours is protected".

With a change of use to patient / general public-focused D1 therapy business rather than an office, there will be significantly different daily movements/visitors to the site than was under the B1 office. Section 6.4.1 of the planning application says: "As already noted, the characteristics of the proposed use are very similar to that of an office occupier, both in terms of the level of employment and also the number of daily movements / visitors to the site. It is not considered that the proposal will have any impact upon neighbouring occupiers in this regard. "

This is not correct. There were few to nil external or general public visitors to the previous occupant Lily's Kitchen. The only visitors and daily movements were from the employees of the business, 5-10 people, who were known to the residents and were the same individuals each day. In contrast, there are 10 therapists at the Blue Tree Clinic. If each of them has eight 1hr appointments per day 5 days a week, that is 400 (8*10*5) members of the general public coming in and out of the residential gate weekly or over 1,600 per month, in addition to the staff of the clinic itself. This would cause serious disruption to the residents' right to quiet enjoyment of our homes. Even half of that figure is a still 20-fold increase in traffic from the previous B1 office use.

4) Health and Safety Risk to Young Children and Residents: *There is a safeguarding issue for the young children who play together in the garden/courtyard and use it as a playground. The residents of College Crescent count eight small children under age 11 and two older children between 11 and 18. The introduction of a high traffic clinic would result in the pedestrian gate being open hundreds more times per week. Children could end up in the street, and members of the public will more easily access the interior of the garden/courtyard. Because the proposed use is a D1 therapy clinic, individuals with mental health issues will be more able to access the garden/courtyard than if it stays a B1 office. These individuals should of course get the mental health treatment they need but not at the risk of harm to children or local residents. In addition, introducing patients with various psychological and psychiatric disorders into a residential development without proper separation of access is inappropriate and poses a serious children's safeguarding concern.*

5) Overlooking/Loss of Privacy/Protecting Amenity Policy A1. *There are six windows of the Coach House that look directly into the windows of our house #6. Two windows are on the ground floor and four are on the first floor. I have attached a photo from my side patio showing the 6 windows that look into our house. Under the current B1 office use, only the employees of the tenant (most recently Lily's Kitchen) could look out the windows into our property. These employees were few in number and known to me. They were not members of the general public. With a change of use to D1, members of the public, as patients of the clinic, can frequent the clinic, hundreds of times per week, with the accompanying loss of privacy to us through the six windows where they can look directly into our property.*

Under Camden's Local Plan Policy A1, the council will "seek to ensure that amenity of...occupiers...is protected." And that "the factors we will consider include: e. Visual privacy/outlook". I kindly ask of you to consider the vast increase in members of the public being able to look directly into our private residence, where two young girls run around (often in pyjamas etc) should this change of use from B1 office to D1 therapy clinic be allowed.

6) Further Risks to Area, Residents and Environment: *College Crescent is already a very busy road without parking facilities. It is frequented by parents and children of UCS school, South Hampstead School, visitors to the flower stall and guests staying at Palmers Lodge Hostel, 40 College Crescent. The introduction of an additional institution which has heavy foot traffic on College Crescent will add to further congestion, foot traffic and illegal parking.*

7) Loss of Open Space for Children Should Change of Use be Permitted. *Camden's Local Plan Policy A2 states that Camden will protect all public and private open spaces and that open spaces support the development of children and young people. The courtyard of 39 College College is an open space, garden and playground for 10 children in the development. Should a D1 clinic be allowed to occupy the Coach House in 39 College Crescent, the high traffic and opening and closing of the front gate would prove too great a risk to the children's safety and security and they would likely not be allowed to play in the garden anymore. This would be a great detriment to their social development and enjoyment of their homes as well as their parents.*

Thank you for your time and consideration.

Sincerely,

Jennifer Akgul