				Printed on: 04/04/2019 09:10:03
Application No:	<b>Consultees Name:</b>	Received:	<b>Comment:</b>	Response:
2019/1070/P	Lili Zhang	03/04/2019 17:17:57	OBJ	We are strongly against the change of use for the above planning application, with the following grounds:
				Intrusion of our privacy. The whole 39 College Crescent, as a mini community, all the houses here are supposed to be residential with our nice communal area for a nice living condition and environment. A fixed office use is just about to be OK, because there would be fixed number of people using it and access into our front communal courtyard area. However, a therapy clinic will have so many people with different background, coming into our private living community.  There is only one pedestrian entrance to Coach House – as stated in Section 2.2 of the 2019/1070/P application, there are two access points to our houses. This is Faulty Information! The future patients for this clinic can only access to the Coach House by this single pedestrian path as all the other residents in 39 College Crescent.  The building does not have a lift. As Dr Silvert is not applying to convert the ground floor of the building into D1, he would not be able to treat patients in wheelchairs. Or is he planning to use the ground floor space as a therapy area as well? He needs to clarify this in his application.  This development was designed by a residential developer and not for medical use, this application must be rejected and we suggest that the applicant agent markets the property properly and for a decent period of time to find another suitable office / B1 end user.  Our children will lose their private play area. The front garden of 39 College Crescent has been a nice open area for our children to play with their friends in nice weather, we will not be able to do that if the clinic opens to over 400 patients each week. We would lose our private space, which will be open to public.

				F	inted on:	04/04/2019	09:10:03
Application No:	<b>Consultees Name:</b>	Received:	Comment:	Response:			
2019/1070/P	Zhigang Yuan	03/04/2019 17:25:09	COMMNT	This is an objection to the planning application 2019/1070/P:			
				As a resident and Leaseholder of house 3, 39 College Crescent, I strongly object to the office (known until now as Lily's Kitchen) to D1 (Therapy Clinic) on the following groun Loss of office Space and unsuitability of D1 Use being permitted in this private and encl 39 College Crescent is an unusual development where one office unit is embedded insi of private family homes. For this reason the conversion of this office into a clinic is not for with the residents rights to quiet enjoyment of their homes. Furthermore, : Camden has per the Camden Local Plan, and per the Camden Local Plan Section E2, office space is to other use unless "a). The site or building is no longer suitable for its existing business possibility of retaining, reusing or redeveloping the site or building for similar or alternation 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 office tenants could be found, and there is anecdotal evidence that other tenants could space.  This development was designed to be 6 family homes with a locked single entrance from Office Use (B1 use) is suitable with the employees of the business utilising the premise (typically 9.00am to 5.30pm) from a planning perspective but D1 Clinic use is not a suitable way of the very detrimental on the recreational and amenity space for the communal front of having access up 10.00pm in the evening. Please note that all of these house have extra gardens and the front area is a crucial amenity space for the existing residential unit.	s: sed reside e a reside asible and limited off ould not b use; and b e type an Other e interest College luring wol ble use be ardens wit	ential area ential terrace d in breach fice space de converted for the desire of suitable ed in the  Crescent rking hours ecause it will th patents	
				The applicant mad			

					Printed on:	04/04/2019	09:10:03
Application No:	<b>Consultees Name:</b>	Received:	<b>Comment:</b>	Response:			
2019/1070/P	Zhigang Yuan	03/04/2019 17:22:06	OBJ	This is an objection to the planning application 2019/1070/P:			
				As a resident and Leaseholder of house 3, 39 College Crescent, I strongly object to toffice (known until now as Lily's Kitchen) to D1 (Therapy Clinic) on the following gro Loss of office Space and unsuitability of D1 Use being permitted in this private and el 39 College Crescent is an unusual development where one office unit is embedded in of private family homes. For this reason the conversion of this office into a clinic is now with the residents rights to quiet enjoyment of their homes. Furthermore,: Camden in per the Camden Local Plan, and per the Camden Local Plan Section E2, office space to other use unless "a). The site or building is no longer suitable for its existing busine possibility of retaining, reusing or redeveloping the site or building for similar or alternative 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 woffice tenants could be found, and there is anecdotal evidence that other tenants could space.  This development was designed to be 6 family homes with a locked single entrance of Office Use (B1 use) is suitable with the employees of the business utilising the preminative of the suitable of the second of the communal from the house a very detrimental on the recreational and amenity space for the communal from having access up 10.00pm in the evening. Please note that all of these house have a gardens and the front area is a crucial amenity space for the existing residential unit.	unds: nclosed resident feasible and as limited offer should not be should not be should not be so use; and be ative type and the interest of the common College see during wor uitable use be t gardens with a residence of the common College see during wor uitable use be t gardens with a residence of the common College see during wor uitable use be t gardens with a residence of the common College see during wor uitable use be t gardens with a residence of the college seed the coll	ential area ential terrace d in breach ice space de converted d). that the d size of suitable ed in the Crescent. cking hours ecause it will ch patents	
				The applicant mad			

Printed on: 04/04/2019 09:10:03

Application No:Consultees Name:Received:Comment:Response:2019/1070/PCara Lowy02/04/2019 11:03:41 Dear Mr Benmbarek,

My name is Cara. I am sixteen years old and live in House 4, 39 College Crescent. I am writing to you because I would like to object to the planning application of Dr Silvert to turn the office in 39 College Crescent into a psychiatric clinic. As you might know the office in College Crescent was rented by "Lily's Kitchen" in the past and the five or six office workers were like another family in our little community. They had two dogs who played with our dogs and we took in each others parcels and we all knew each other.

By changing this office into a clinic our community would be terribly affected because instead of sharing our private space with five or six people that are known to us, we would have ten therapists and all of their patients walking in and out of our private courtyard all day long.

There is not access into the office building from the road, therefore all the patients would have to enter our private courtyard so they could find their way into the clinic. Our courtyard is kept very clean and has pretty planting as well as toys for the children in our residential community. Once patients have completed their meetings or whilst their are waiting for their appointments to come up they will inevitably feel invited to sit down and enjoy the sunshine which will lead to large amounts of people that we don't know mixing with us kids in the courtyard. They will for sure leave behind their empty coffee cups and crisp packets as well. Even if Mr Silvert promised to inform his patients that they can't stay on in our courtyard or leave litter behind, there will be nobody to enforce that. It would be terribly unfair to us children (we are eight kids under ten and two under 18) to lose that little bit of outside space because Mr Silvert wants to operate a clinic inside a residential community.

I personally would also feel very unsafe because our houses have very large windows that face the courtyard and hundreds of people would

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Printed on: 04/04/2019 09:10:03  Response:				
2019/1070/P	Henry Newman	02/04/2019 11:08:24		I write regarding the proposed change of use for 39 College Crescent. As a ward Councillor for Frognal and Fitzjohns, I have heard from local residents who strongly oppose this proposed change of use. I write in support of their objection.				
				Their view is that the site is inappropriate for a therapy clinic, and that there are alternative sites available nearby which could be a more suitable location for a therapy clinic.				
				College Crescent is already a very busy area with limited parking - it's blocked with traffic, both as a route between Finchley Road and Belsize Park, and for local school runs. This change of use could exacerbate that issue.				
				Residents are also specifically concerned by the loss of open space through the courtyard of 39 College Crescent which at the moment is used by several local children as an outdoor play area. Camden's Local Plan's planning policy is to protect both public and private open play spaces for children.				
				Finally although I am supportive of the provision of suitable commercial and therapeutic space locally, a change of use would entail losing office space which according to the Local Plan should only happen if the site is no longer suitable (which doesn't apply) or has been unable to attract business users for a period of time. I am not convinced that in the case of 39 College Crescent that has been met.				
				Please keep me updated on this applicaiton.				
2019/1070/P	Samira Khan	03/04/2019 08:59:41	SUPPRT	Dear Samir,				
				I wish to respond to this before I talk to the press about this, the comments I have read online which I was directed to by a post on facebook are wholly upsetting, and seem to be made by one resident next to this commercial unit, she has said that a therapy clinic is "a safeguarding concern" for children. I am a resident of South Hampstead and I welcome this investment in the mental health of our camden resisdents. This lady is extremely stigamtising of people with mental health conditions and her points on parking are absurd.				
				I hope you will look at this request sensibly and it is of note that all objections on facebook and here seem to be written from her. I am appaluled at her behaviour and trying to stop a therapy clinic which camden has a policy of promoting good mental health for our community, is digusting.				
				most of the objections are around parking, and congestion, I am not sure I see what this has to do with the residents getting more help around mental health which I am passionate about. We have the tavistock next door to this proposal.				
				I hope you will reflect kindly on this application and grant the local community with a sensible decision. Thank you. Samira.				

					Printed on:	04/04/2019	09:10:03
Application No:	<b>Consultees Name:</b>	Received:	<b>Comment:</b>	Response:			
2019/1070/P	Zhigang Yuan	03/04/2019 17:28:48	OBJ	This is an objection to the planning application 2019/1070/P:			
				As a resident and Leaseholder of house 3, 39 College Crescent, I strongly object to the office (known until now as Lily's Kitchen) to D1 (Therapy Clinic) on the following ground Loss of office Space and unsuitability of D1 Use being permitted in this private and er 39 College Crescent is an unusual development where one office unit is embedded in of private family homes. For this reason the conversion of this office into a clinic is not with the residents rights to quiet enjoyment of their homes. Furthermore,: Camden here the Camden Local Plan, and per the Camden Local Plan Section E2, office space to other use unless "a). The site or building is no longer suitable for its existing business possibility of retaining, reusing or redeveloping the site or building for similar or alternabusiness 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 who office tenants could be found, and there is anecdotal evidence that other tenants could space.  This development was designed to be 6 family homes with a locked single entrance for Office Use (B1 use) is suitable with the employees of the business utilising the premise (typically 9.00am to 5.30pm) from a planning perspective but D1 Clinic use is not a subave a very detrimental on the recreational and amenity space for the communal from having access up 10.00pm in the evening. Please note that all of these house have egardens and the front area is a crucial amenity space for the existing residential unit.	unds: nclosed resident feasible and as limited offer should not be should not be should not be so use; and be ative type and the interest of the common College see during wor uitable use be t gardens with a residence of the common College see during wor uitable use be t gardens with a residence of the common College see during wor uitable use be t gardens with a residence of the common College see during wor uitable use be t gardens with a residence of the college seed the coll	ential area ential terrace d in breach ice space de converted d). that the d size of suitable ed in the Crescent. cking hours ecause it will ch patents	
				The applicant mad			