

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2020/0928/P	Kirill Meck	18/03/2020 21:28:31	OBJ	<p>1.Blank featureless wall on south side elevation</p> <p>The main major objection is the completely featureless wall as shown on the south side elevation drawings that will be facing Kings Gardens block. It lacks ANY features and is MUCH WORSE than even the current wall that multiple Kings Gardens flats are now facing.</p> <p>The current wall has a few windows, bays and indents to break up the view. The new wall is just a BLANK 6 storey brick wall. All main windows in my flat will be facing that blank wall and our enjoyment of our property will be significantly affected.</p> <p>Camden Local Plan Policy A1 requires that quality of life of neighbours to be protected including OUTLOOK. Clearly this has not been properly addressed with the redevelopment. This affects multiple residents of Kings Gardens (12+ Kings Gardens flats are facing that wall).</p> <p>The same also applies to the Heritage Statement which fails to mention that the views in the conservation heritage area will be negatively affected by the proposal on the south side facing Kings Gardens.</p> <p>Something must be done about this view. The issue must be addressed by either a) additional modelling e.g. inserting break lines of "white" brick, false windows recesses etc. b) addition of windows in similar locations as on current wall / elevation or c) a combination of both</p> <p>2.Fence on south side</p> <p>There is no indication on whether there will continue to be a fence on the south side of the property adjoining Kings Gardens (there is a fence there currently). This needs to be clarified as there is nothing is shown on elevations or boundary treatment drawings.</p> <p>3.Protection of trees</p> <p>Planning Statement mentions Tree Survey but no Tree Survey is attached / available. There is no indication anywhere in the submitted documentation on how the redevelopment will protect the trees on the surrounding properties. There are multiple trees within 10 metres of the boundary (south side) in the Kings Gardens property.</p> <p>4.Daylight & Sunlight Report does not provide enough detail on which flats are affected</p> <p>The Daylight & Sunlight Report Appendix 2 lists rooms R1-R9 on the Kings Gardens property. However there is no indication of which flats these rooms apply to. Therefore I and other residents of Kings Gardens cannot assess with any degree of certainty to which flats these readings apply to and what will be the exact impact on the lighting levels in each of their rooms.</p> <p>Furthermore the report mentions that the layout of some King Gardens flats including flat 38 has been sourced from Rightmove. There is no single flat 38 in Kings Gardens. There are flats 38A and 38B. I therefore question the accuracy of the data in the report and whether the plans used for this report are current and valid.</p> <p>5.Dust levels</p> <p>Construction Management Plan avoids providing definitive answers to most questions stating answers will be</p>

Application No: Consultees Name: Received:

Comment: Response:

provided once the principal contractor has been appointed. However this does not currently provide us any with visibility and impact particularly in regards to dust levels. There is also no assurance that the effects on our daily lives will be minimised throughout the lengthy 1.5 - 2 year demolition and construction period. The particular concern is our continued access to ventilation via windows directly facing the demolition / construction site.

Statement of community involvement mentions use of dust suppression sprays an enclosing the site with protective sheet but this is not mentioned in Construction Management Plan.

6.Site boundary

The site boundary seems different shown on existing floor plans versus the proposed site and floor plans and site survey. Which site boundary is correct and has this been agreed with the management of adjoining Kings Gardens?

7.Employment of staff

Section 19 of the redacted application form mentions that the proposed development does not require employment of any staff, however the Proposed Ground Floor Plans clearly show Reception and Staff Office areas. The Student Management Plan also mentions that "An Accommodation Manager will be in the building during the core hours of Monday to Friday 9.00am to 5.30pm with with 24 hour supervision provided by support staff." The application form statement about no staff hence seems to be erroneous and misleading.
