

Printed on: 15/04/2019 09:10:05

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2019/1070/P	Roger Hephher	09/04/2019 16:32:03	OBJLETTE R	<p>We represent the residents of the six houses at 39 College Crescent, NW3. They object to planning application reference 2019/1070/P.</p> <p>The proposal is to convert part of an office building (The Coach House), which sits in close proximity to these houses into a D1 clinic for people seeking treatment for mental health issues. The clinic would relocate from Wimpole Street, W1, where it currently operates. The Coach House is ringed in red in the aerial photograph below.</p> <p>The proposed change of use is strongly objected to by all the residents, for the same reasons. The principal objection is that the only pedestrian access to The Coach House (blue arrow) takes people into the enclosed courtyard which is the principal amenity space (effectively the 'front garden') of the residents, and the place where their children (currently 8 under 10 years old) play. It should be noted that the application is misleading in referring to there being two entrances, one of which is directly onto the street. The second entrance is in fact a garage door, not a pedestrian access. It is also to be noted that residents have already in the past been troubled by the intercom sounding in their houses when visitors to The Coach House have pressed the wrong button; the current proposal holds out the prospect of this sort of conflict being multiplied many-fold.</p> <p>The juxtaposition of the houses and The Coach House is an uncomfortable one, because there has always been a security risk associated with people entering the courtyard, and always the danger of the street door being left open, enabling children to wander onto the street. However, this has not been a problem in practice, because the premises have been occupied as B1a offices until recently, used by a single company employing a stable workforce of about 10 people, all of whom have been known to the residents, and with few visitors. Similarly, with a small number of familiar employees, inter-visibility between windows (of which there is</p>

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2019/1070/P	Roger Hephner	09/04/2019 16:35:29	OBJ	<p>We represent the residents of the six houses at 39 College Crescent, NW3. They object to planning application reference 2019/1070/P.</p> <p>The proposal is to convert part of an office building (The Coach House), which sits in close proximity to these houses into a D1 clinic for people seeking treatment for mental health issues. The clinic would relocate from Wimpole Street, W1, where it currently operates. The Coach House is ringed in red in the aerial photograph below.</p> <p>The proposed change of use is strongly objected to by all the residents, for the same reasons. The principal objection is that the only pedestrian access to The Coach House (blue arrow) takes people into the enclosed courtyard which is the principal amenity space (effectively the 'front garden') of the residents, and the place where their children (currently 8 under 10 years old) play. It should be noted that the application is misleading in referring to there being two entrances, one of which is directly onto the street. The second entrance is in fact a garage door, not a pedestrian access. It is also to be noted that residents have already in the past been troubled by the intercom sounding in their houses when visitors to The Coach House have pressed the wrong button; the current proposal holds out the prospect of this sort of conflict being multiplied many-fold.</p> <p>The juxtaposition of the houses and The Coach House is an uncomfortable one, because there has always been a security risk associated with people entering the courtyard, and always the danger of the street door being left open, enabling children to wander onto the street. However, this has not been a problem in practice, because the premises have been occupied as B1a offices until recently, used by a single company employing a stable workforce of about 10 people, all of whom have been known to the residents, and with few visitors. Similarly, with a small number of familiar employees, inter-visibility between windows (of which there is</p>

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2019/1070/P	Roger Hephher	09/04/2019 16:32:40	OBJLETTE R	<p>We represent the residents of the six houses at 39 College Crescent, NW3. They object to planning application reference 2019/1070/P.</p> <p>The proposal is to convert part of an office building (The Coach House), which sits in close proximity to these houses into a D1 clinic for people seeking treatment for mental health issues. The clinic would relocate from Wimpole Street, W1, where it currently operates. The Coach House is ringed in red in the aerial photograph below.</p> <p>The proposed change of use is strongly objected to by all the residents, for the same reasons. The principal objection is that the only pedestrian access to The Coach House (blue arrow) takes people into the enclosed courtyard which is the principal amenity space (effectively the 'front garden') of the residents, and the place where their children (currently 8 under 10 years old) play. It should be noted that the application is misleading in referring to there being two entrances, one of which is directly onto the street. The second entrance is in fact a garage door, not a pedestrian access. It is also to be noted that residents have already in the past been troubled by the intercom sounding in their houses when visitors to The Coach House have pressed the wrong button; the current proposal holds out the prospect of this sort of conflict being multiplied many-fold.</p> <p>The juxtaposition of the houses and The Coach House is an uncomfortable one, because there has always been a security risk associated with people entering the courtyard, and always the danger of the street door being left open, enabling children to wander onto the street. However, this has not been a problem in practice, because the premises have been occupied as B1a offices until recently, used by a single company employing a stable workforce of about 10 people, all of whom have been known to the residents, and with few visitors. Similarly, with a small number of familiar employees, inter-visibility between windows (of which there is</p>

Printed on: 15/04/2019 09:10:05

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2019/1070/P	Roger Hephner	09/04/2019 16:32:27	OBJLETTE R	<p>We represent the residents of the six houses at 39 College Crescent, NW3. They object to planning application reference 2019/1070/P.</p> <p>The proposal is to convert part of an office building (The Coach House), which sits in close proximity to these houses into a D1 clinic for people seeking treatment for mental health issues. The clinic would relocate from Wimpole Street, W1, where it currently operates. The Coach House is ringed in red in the aerial photograph below.</p> <p>The proposed change of use is strongly objected to by all the residents, for the same reasons. The principal objection is that the only pedestrian access to The Coach House (blue arrow) takes people into the enclosed courtyard which is the principal amenity space (effectively the 'front garden') of the residents, and the place where their children (currently 8 under 10 years old) play. It should be noted that the application is misleading in referring to there being two entrances, one of which is directly onto the street. The second entrance is in fact a garage door, not a pedestrian access. It is also to be noted that residents have already in the past been troubled by the intercom sounding in their houses when visitors to The Coach House have pressed the wrong button; the current proposal holds out the prospect of this sort of conflict being multiplied many-fold.</p> <p>The juxtaposition of the houses and The Coach House is an uncomfortable one, because there has always been a security risk associated with people entering the courtyard, and always the danger of the street door being left open, enabling children to wander onto the street. However, this has not been a problem in practice, because the premises have been occupied as B1a offices until recently, used by a single company employing a stable workforce of about 10 people, all of whom have been known to the residents, and with few visitors. Similarly, with a small number of familiar employees, inter-visibility between windows (of which there is</p>

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2019/1070/P	Roger Hephner	10/04/2019 14:22:35	OBJ	<p>We represent the residents of the six houses at 39 College Crescent, NW3. They object to planning application reference 2019/1070/P.</p> <p>The proposal is to convert part of an office building (The Coach House), which sits in close proximity to these houses into a D1 clinic for people seeking treatment for mental health issues. The clinic would relocate from Wimpole Street, W1, where it currently operates. The Coach House is ringed in red in the aerial photograph below.</p> <p>The proposed change of use is strongly objected to by all the residents, for the same reasons. The principal objection is that the only pedestrian access to The Coach House (blue arrow) takes people into the enclosed courtyard which is the principal amenity space (effectively the 'front garden') of the residents, and the place where their children (currently 8 under 10 years old) play. It should be noted that the application is misleading in referring to there being two entrances, one of which is directly onto the street. The second entrance is in fact a garage door, not a pedestrian access. It is also to be noted that residents have already in the past been troubled by the intercom sounding in their houses when visitors to The Coach House have pressed the wrong button; the current proposal holds out the prospect of this sort of conflict being multiplied many-fold.</p> <p>The juxtaposition of the houses and The Coach House is an uncomfortable one, because there has always been a security risk associated with people entering the courtyard, and always the danger of the street door being left open, enabling children to wander onto the street. However, this has not been a problem in practice, because the premises have been occupied as B1a offices until recently, used by a single company employing a stable workforce of about 10 people, all of whom have been known to the residents, and with few visitors. Similarly, with a small number of familiar employees, inter-visibility between windows (of which there is m</p>

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2019/1070/P	Director of College Crescent Limited	12/04/2019 09:18:54	OBJ	<p>We are writing in objection to the above planning application as the owners of House 5 College Crescent. We have a number of concerns with the application and request that these are all fully considered in the Councils determination of the application.</p> <p>Loss of Employment Floorspace</p> <p>The site was redeveloped as part of planning application ref: 2008/5696/P. An integral part of this application was the re-use of No.39 for employment (Class B1) purposes so as to avoid a loss of employment on the site.</p> <p>Fundamentally there has not been a material change in planning policy objectives with regards to this specific consideration since this time. Policies E1 and E2 of the Camden Local Plan (July 2017) seeking to ensure employment uses are not lost and in particular that there is a continuing supply of small and medium sized employment premises. This is evidenced specifically by Policy E1 that sets the Councils objectives for delivering a successful and inclusive economy in Camden stating that the Council will:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. support businesses of all sizes, in particular start-ups, small and medium-sized enterprises;</li> <li>b. maintain a stock of premises that are suitable for a variety of business activities, for firms of differing sizes, and available on a range of terms and conditions for firms with differing resources;'</li> </ul> <p>The supporting text goes onto say that:</p> <p>'Camden has a large proportion of small businesses, with 83% employing less than nine people and a further 14% employing between 10 and 49 employees. However, premises suitable for small businesses as well as medium sized enterprises are currently under pressure from rising land values, limited land availability and 'permitted development' rights which allow the change of use from offices (B1(a)) to housing (C3) without the need for planning permission and therefore without assessment against our planning policies.'</p> <p>I note the applicants Planning Statement selectively made no reference of this important pol</p>

Application No: Consultees Name: Received: Comment:

2019/1070/P College Crescent 11/04/2019 15:51:21 COMMENT

Printed on: 15/04/2019 09:10:05

Response:

COLLEGE CRESCENT LIMITED

date: 09 April 2019  
our reference: JR/RB/ JR GG011019  
subject: College Crescent Limited

Dear Sirs,

[REDACTED] t. We have a number of concerns with the application and request that these are all fully considered in the Councils determination of the application.

#### Loss of Employment Floorspace

The site was redeveloped as part of planning application ref: 2008/5896/P. An integral part of this application was the re-use of No 38 for employment (Class B1) purposes so as to avoid a loss of employment on the site.

Fundamentally there has not been a material change in planning policy objectives with regards to this specific consideration since this time. Policies E1 and E2 of the Camden Local Plan (July 2017) seeking to ensure employment uses are not lost and in particular that there is a continuing supply of small and medium sized employment premises. This is evidenced specifically by Policy E1 that sets the Councils objectives for delivering a successful and inclusive economy in Camden stating that the Council will:

- a. support businesses of all sizes, in particular start-ups, small and medium-sized enterprises;
- b. maintain a stock of premises that are suitable for a variety of business activities, for firms of differing sizes, and available on a range of terms and conditions for firms with differing resources;

The supporting text goes onto say that:

YCamden has a large proportion of small businesses, with 83% employing less than nine people and a further 14% employing between 10 and 49 employees. However, premises suitable for small businesses as well as medium sized enterprises are currently under pressure from rising land values, limited

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2019/1070/P	Roger Hephner	09/04/2019 16:45:21	OBJ	<p>We represent the residents of the six houses at 39 College Crescent, NW3. They object to planning application reference 2019/1070/P.</p> <p>The proposal is to convert part of an office building (The Coach House), which sits in close proximity to these houses into a D1 clinic for people seeking treatment for mental health issues. The clinic would relocate from Wimpole Street, W1, where it currently operates. The Coach House is ringed in red in the aerial photograph below.</p> <p>The proposed change of use is strongly objected to by all the residents, for the same reasons. The principal objection is that the only pedestrian access to The Coach House (blue arrow) takes people into the enclosed courtyard which is the principal amenity space (effectively the 'front garden') of the residents, and the place where their children (currently 8 under 10 years old) play. It should be noted that the application is misleading in referring to there being two entrances, one of which is directly onto the street. The second entrance is in fact a garage door, not a pedestrian access. It is also to be noted that residents have already in the past been troubled by the intercom sounding in their houses when visitors to The Coach House have pressed the wrong button; the current proposal holds out the prospect of this sort of conflict being multiplied many-fold.</p> <p>The juxtaposition of the houses and The Coach House is an uncomfortable one, because there has always been a security risk associated with people entering the courtyard, and always the danger of the street door being left open, enabling children to wander onto the street. However, this has not been a problem in practice, because the premises have been occupied as B1a offices until recently, used by a single company employing a stable workforce of about 10 people, all of whom have been known to the residents, and with few visitors. Similarly, with a small number of familiar employees, inter-visibility between windows (of which there is</p>



Application No: 2019/1070/P  
Consultees Name: College Crescent Limited  
Received: 11/04/2019 14:29:59  
Comment: OBJECTION

Response: COLLEGE CRESCENT LIMITED

Printed on: 15/04/2019 09:10:05

date: 09 April 2019  
our reference: JR/RB/ JR GG011019  
subject: College Crescent Limited

Dear Sirs,

We are writing in objection to the above planning application as the [REDACTED] We have a number of concerns with the application and request that these are all fully considered in the Councils determination of the application.

#### Loss of Employment Floorspace

The site was redeveloped as part of planning application ref: 2008/5896/P. An integral part of this application was the re-use of No 38 for employment (Class B1) purposes so as to avoid a loss of employment on the site.

Fundamentally there has not been a material change in planning policy objectives with regards to this specific consideration since this time. Policies E1 and E2 of the Camden Local Plan (July 2017) seeking to ensure employment uses are not lost and in particular that there is a continuing supply of small and medium sized employment premises. This is evidenced specifically by Policy E1 that sets the Councils objectives for delivering a successful and inclusive economy in Camden stating that the Council will:

- a. support businesses of all sizes, in particular start-ups, small and medium-sized enterprises;
- b. maintain a stock of premises that are suitable for a variety of business activities, for firms of differing sizes, and available on a range of terms and conditions for firms with differing resources;

The supporting text goes onto say that:

YCamden has a large proportion of small businesses, with 83% employing less than nine people and a further 14% employing between 10 and 49 employees. However, premises suitable for small businesses as well as medium sized enterprises are currently under pressure from rising land values, limited

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2019/1070/P	Roger Hephner	10/04/2019 14:23:51	OBJ	<p>We represent the residents of the six houses at 39 College Crescent, NW3. They object to planning application reference 2019/1070/P.</p> <p>The proposal is to convert part of an office building (The Coach House), which sits in close proximity to these houses into a D1 clinic for people seeking treatment for mental health issues. The clinic would relocate from Wimpole Street, W1, where it currently operates. The Coach House is ringed in red in the aerial photograph below.</p> <p>The proposed change of use is strongly objected to by all the residents, for the same reasons. The principal objection is that the only pedestrian access to The Coach House (blue arrow) takes people into the enclosed courtyard which is the principal amenity space (effectively the 'front garden') of the residents, and the place where their children (currently 8 under 10 years old) play. It should be noted that the application is misleading in referring to there being two entrances, one of which is directly onto the street. The second entrance is in fact a garage door, not a pedestrian access. It is also to be noted that residents have already in the past been troubled by the intercom sounding in their houses when visitors to The Coach House have pressed the wrong button; the current proposal holds out the prospect of this sort of conflict being multiplied many-fold.</p> <p>The juxtaposition of the houses and The Coach House is an uncomfortable one, because there has always been a security risk associated with people entering the courtyard, and always the danger of the street door being left open, enabling children to wander onto the street. However, this has not been a problem in practice, because the premises have been occupied as B1a offices until recently, used by a single company employing a stable workforce of about 10 people, all of whom have been known to the residents, and with few visitors. Similarly, with a small number of familiar employees, inter-visibility between windows (of which there is m</p>

Application No: 2019/1070/P  
Consultees Name: College Crescent Limited  
Received: 11/04/2019 14:38:29  
Comment: OBJECTION  
Response: COLLEGE CRESCENT LIMITED

Printed on: 15/04/2019 09:10:05



date: 09 April 2019  
our reference: JR/RB/ JR GG011019  
subject: College Crescent Limited

Dear Sirs,

[Redacted] We have a number of concerns with the application and request that these are all fully considered in the Councils determination of the application.

Loss of Employment Floorspace

The site was redeveloped as part of planning application ref: 2008/5896/P. An integral part of this application was the re-use of No 38 for employment (Class B1) purposes so as to avoid a loss of employment on the site.

Fundamentally there has not been a material change in planning policy objectives with regards to this specific consideration since this time. Policies E1 and E2 of the Camden Local Plan (July 2017) seeking to ensure employment uses are not lost and in particular that there is a continuing supply of small and medium sized employment premises. This is evidenced specifically by Policy E1 that sets the Councils objectives for delivering a successful and inclusive economy in Camden stating that the Council will:

- a. support businesses of all sizes, in particular start-ups, small and medium-sized enterprises;
- b. maintain a stock of premises that are suitable for a variety of business activities, for firms of differing sizes, and available on a range of terms and conditions for firms with differing resources;

The supporting text goes onto say that:

YCamden has a large proportion of small businesses, with 83% employing less than nine people and a further 14% employing between 10 and 49 employees. However, premises suitable for small businesses as well as medium sized enterprises are currently under pressure from rising land values, limited

**Application No:** 2019/1070/P  
**Consultees Name:** College Crescent Limited  
**Received:** 11/04/2019 14:35:01  
**Comment:** OBJETTER

**Response:** COLLEGE CRESCENT LIMITED

Printed on: 15/04/2019 09:10:05

date: 09 April 2019  
our reference: JR/RB/ JR GG011019  
subject: College Crescent Limited

Dear Sirs,

We have a number of concerns with the application and request that these are all fully considered in the Councils determination of the application.

#### Loss of Employment Floorspace

The site was redeveloped as part of planning application ref: 2008/5896/P. An integral part of this application was the re-use of No 38 for employment (Class B1) purposes so as to avoid a loss of employment on the site.

Fundamentally there has not been a material change in planning policy objectives with regards to this specific consideration since this time. Policies E1 and E2 of the Camden Local Plan (July 2017) seeking to ensure employment uses are not lost and in particular that there is a continuing supply of small and medium sized employment premises. This is evidenced specifically by Policy E1 that sets the Councils objectives for delivering a successful and inclusive economy in Camden stating that the Council will:

- a. support businesses of all sizes, in particular start-ups, small and medium-sized enterprises;
- b. maintain a stock of premises that are suitable for a variety of business activities, for firms of differing sizes, and available on a range of terms and conditions for firms with differing resources;

The supporting text goes onto say that:

YCamden has a large proportion of small businesses, with 83% employing less than nine people and a further 14% employing between 10 and 49 employees. However, premises suitable for small businesses as well as medium sized enterprises are currently under pressure from rising land values, limited

Printed on: 15/04/2019 09:10:05

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2019/1070/P	Roger Hephner	10/04/2019 16:19:54	OBJ	<p>We represent the residents of the six houses at 39 College Crescent, NW3. They object to planning application reference 2019/1070/P.</p> <p>The proposal is to convert part of an office building (The Coach House), which sits in close proximity to these houses into a D1 clinic for people seeking treatment for mental health issues. The clinic would relocate from Wimpole Street, W1, where it currently operates. The Coach House is ringed in red in the aerial photograph below.</p> <p>The proposed change of use is strongly objected to by all the residents, for the same reasons. The principal objection is that the only pedestrian access to The Coach House (blue arrow) takes people into the enclosed courtyard which is the principal amenity space (effectively the 'front garden') of the residents, and the place where their children (currently 8 under 10 years old) play. It should be noted that the application is misleading in referring to there being two entrances, one of which is directly onto the street. The second entrance is in fact a garage door, not a pedestrian access. It is also to be noted that residents have already in the past been troubled by the intercom sounding in their houses when visitors to The Coach House have pressed the wrong button; the current proposal holds out the prospect of this sort of conflict being multiplied many-fold.</p> <p>The juxtaposition of the houses and The Coach House is an uncomfortable one, because there has always been a security risk associated with people entering the courtyard, and always the danger of the street door being left open, enabling children to wander onto the street. However, this has not been a problem in practice, because the premises have been occupied as B1a offices until recently, used by a single company employing a stable workforce of about 10 people, all of whom have been known to the residents, and with few visitors. Similarly, with a small number of familiar employees, inter-visibility between windows (of which there is m</p>