

Dear Mr. Benmbarek,

I'm writing to you re the application 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 live at [REDACTED] in the same courtyard as the coach house which is supposed to host the therapy clinic. I am very concerned to learn of this request since it will have significant negative implications for my family. I am very supportive of any mental health initiatives but I am opposing the idea that our place would be a suitable one for such a clinic.

My issues are the following :

- **Loss of Open Space for Children:** I have 2 young girls aged 3 years and 11 months. My 3 year old regularly plays in the courtyard with the other young children in houses 2, 3 and 6. The courtyard of 39 College Crescent is an open space, garden and playground for the children in the development. Should a clinic be allowed to occupy the Coach House, the result would be very high traffic with the front gate being opened numerous times per day. This would be a clear risk to the children's' safety so I would no longer feel comfortable to let our daughter play in the courtyard any longer. This would be clearly detrimental to her social development and our enjoyment of our home.
- **On top of the above point, there is Incorrect Information on the planning Application:** the planning application says in section 2.2 that there are two access points with one of these directly from College Crescent. This is untrue. **The only way to access the coach house is via the communal areas of 39 College Crescent.** The only other entrance is a garage door, leading to a lower ground car park. The car park provides indirect access to the courtyard through a stair.
- **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 a B1 office, there will be significantly different daily movements 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. This could mean up to c1500+ members of the general public coming in and out of the residential gate 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.

- **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.
- **Disturbance via Central intercom** – For now there is a central intercom which is linked to all the houses including the coach house. Occasionally when someone rang for Lily’s kitchen in the past but received no answer (or got confused about the address), they would default to press ‘1’ on the keypad which meant that our doorbell would ring. This was an occasional irritation (often a big one as it woke my children during their afternoon sleep) but happened quite rarely since there were very few visitors to the old office. If the office is converted to the clinic there would be patients ringing the bell all day long and I fear that this would become a far more frequent event that we are bothered by our bell being rung throughout the day as a result.
- **Noise Pollution** - In point 19 of the application the applicant states that the Opening Hours of the clinic would be of no relevance to the residential units next door. This is incorrect as the BlueTree Clinic would operate until 22:00 at night which would cause noise issues to all the residents. We have an 11 month old daughter whose sleep is frequently disturbed when the front gate is opened (All our rooms are in the front of the building). This is unavoidable from time to time late at night in a residential development with 6 houses but if the office becomes a clinic, this won’t just be the occasional disruption but rather a recurring event, day in day out. This is before considering that certain patients might also make noise once they are within the development.
- **Patients would freely have access to our private car park and would be able to look into our homes at all times with nobody to restrict their movements once inside the development.**



