

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2020/3737/P	Charles Round	11/10/2020 23:22:13	OBJ	<p>I Charles Round of 99 Camden Mews want to ensure that my objection is counted, in the past during this process it has not been (consultation 2). My partner Sophie Adams has submitted a letter on behalf of us both and my views of this proposed development are represented in her letter to you. We have also employed the services of Paul Watson to produce a comprehensive report regarding the impact that the proposed development will have on our property 99 Camden Mews.</p> <p>I want to make clear that i am NOT opposed to hostel housing in the area or directly behind my property, but i do object when the proposed development has a detrimental impact on our property, our neighbours and doesn't benefit the conservation area (In fact it causes more long term harm).</p> <p>I think this proposal should be refused especially when it contradicts Camdens own planning policy and guidelines in regard to overlooking, the 18M distancing is not sufficient when the proposed building is so much taller. I would also encourage you to do a site visit to fully understand how much of an impact this building will have on the local community and conservation area</p>
2020/3737/P	Joel	12/10/2020 18:49:46	COMMNT	<p>There is no justification for Camden to decide to circumvent conservation areas in developments such as this one. It is entirely contradictory that the council would even propose such a project, when they expect private developments to adhere so closely to protecting the historical character of various neighbourhoods across the borough.</p> <p>More so, the council cannot justify planning for this development to result in a building that is two stories taller than the existing site. The privacy of those living in Camden Mews is immediately affected. There is also a right to light issue, with the substantially taller building putting properties in the shade.</p> <p>Camden's social care policies are admirable, however one must object to the manner in which this being catered for in this case.</p> <p>This development must not be approved, for the all above reasons.</p>
2020/3737/P	Pascal	10/10/2020 15:22:29	OBJ	<p>Objection to proposed development at 248-50 Camden Rd:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The planned height of the building (6 storey) is two levels more than what is allowed in the neighbourhood (conservation area limited to 4 storey buildings).</li> <li>- The proposed layout does not meet the requirements for the target residents: the preliminary proposal states that the building is intended mainly for homeless families, but the proposed layout only comprises of 2 one-bedroom flats, and 36 tiny studios (also called emergency rooms by the preliminary proposal)!</li> <li>- Air quality concerns: the increase in air pollution due to the demolition and building process, alongside the increase in traffic (mainly big trucks and building equipment) on Camden road and especially on Camden Park road is very problematic. We have been living opposite of a building site for 3 years now (and still ongoing) (Ashton Court) and we aren't ready to put up with another massive development that will drastically lower our quality of life (given that the Camden Road/Camden Park Road crossing is already the most polluted spot in the whole borough!).</li> </ul>

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2020/3737/P	Anne Mullins OBE	09/10/2020 12:20:00	OBJ	<p>I live in the immediate area of the proposed plans for the hostel on Camden Rd. It is incredulous that such a design has been proposed for a hostel, which is supposed to offer refuge and safety for its vulnerable residents. Many have highlighted the concerns about it being entirely out of sync with the conservation area policies and those of the Camden Council with the addition two floors higher than the local skyline, the noise and light pollution and invasion of privacy of the neighbours in Camden Mews, as well as the enormity of the footprint.</p> <p>As a former social worker working with vulnerable families, and living and understanding the local issues of drug dealing, anti-social behaviour in the immediate area I'm alarmed that such a design with an open stair-case and outside and lighted corridors has been proposed given these issues. I have worked with the local police and neighbour association to combat the the difficulties of violence and drug dealing in this area for the past 20 years and it never goes away but we work hard to contain it.</p> <p>The neighbours and myself both welcome having vulnerable families in this location, as we understand their needs for shelter and refuge, but I believe the design has major safeguarding issues for potential residents, which has also been highlighted by the Metropolitan Police consultation response who suggest fences of 1.8 Meters to address the well known problems, including the use of the open corridor and staircase areas for drug taking but most importantly potentially targeting the residents by drug-dealers but also harassment from former partners. It is only a short while ago residents in Pandian Way directly opposite 248-250 Camden Road had drug takers 'injecting' on the 3rd floor of what is a secure building.</p> <p>I am alarmed that the design has not taken any account of the safety and security needs of the residents but also the local residents who will have to deal with the impact the problems that will inevitably arise and will cause tensions and issues for residents and neighbours. As an example, I have experienced issues of people camping outside my home in tents (on the Billiard Table) as they wanted to be close to their partners in the current hostel, this caused immense problems with both the police and local council having to intervene to remove a dangerous dog and the person camping conducting in open sexual relations with his partner, as well as drug-taking. So having a stairwell and lighted open corridors will only attract and exacerbate the anti-social behaviour we have to address on an ongoing basis and create real problems for the vulnerable residents themselves</p> <p>The potential vulnerable residents, including young children deserve to have a safe and secure environment, which is enclosed and respects the privacy of the neighbours both adjacent and of those living in Camden Mews who will be severely impacted. These needs are not in conflict but the design must be revisited and a better consultation undertaken by Camden Council.</p>

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2020/3737/P	Sophie Adams	09/10/2020 16:55:38	OBJ	<p>We Sophie Adams and Charlie Round own and live in 99 Camden mews and our property sits directly behind 248-250 Camden road. To be clear we support homeless housing in the area and have no issue with 248-250 Camden road's current use or proposed use for homeless housing but we object to the proposed development set out in application 2020/3737/P due to the severe impact it will have on the quiet low-build properties, gardens and terraces to the rear in Camden mews which conflicts with camden's own planning policy. The garden that would have originally belonged to 99 was sold to 248-250 long before our ownership. I hope this helps with the understanding of how close the proposed development and community will be to the boundary wall of 99. At the moment we enjoy open green views across the gardens. The extra two stories, tree removal, external stair core and community room will cause our property and roof terrace to be severely overlooked and will negatively impact our privacy and quiet enjoyment. The proposed scheme would create a sense of enclosure that does not currently exist and we would lose light levels that are deemed unacceptable.</p> <p>Our reasons for our objections and requesting that the application is refused are as follow:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1) Height – The extra 2 stories is out of character with the conservation area, would be out of line with the roofline on Camden road and would absolutely tower over the low build mews to the rear. it is detrimental to the conservation area and does not enhance it.</li> <li>2) Overlooking – The rear galleries and external stair/lift core where “residents can sit and have a chat with their neighbours” have by Camden’s own admittance been designed to overlook the gardens below. These gardens are next to residential windows and private outdoor spaces. Therefore these galleries, stair core and walkways have been designed to overlook us, our residential rooms and private outdoor spaces. In response to the concern raised by residents we were told by the applicant that visits will be brief with “no fixed tables and chairs, fleeting..”, a contradictory response that fails to address the conflict in policy when Camden clearly seeks to encourage overlooking.</li> <li>3) Proximity to our property – the decks would be 18m from the rear windows of 99 and our roof terrace. According to the Camden Planning Guidance Amenity document 18m is an absolute minimum where properties are of a similar topography. Where one building is higher the distance should be increased. The stair core which residents are encouraged to linger on and watch over the gardens will rise 6 stories above us and will be within 11.8m from our rear windows and roof terrace.</li> <li>4) Loss of light – The loss of light to our rear ground floor windows is unacceptable. Both window 53 and 54 will each experience a loss of 20.29% VSC and 24.83% respectively against a 20% target value. Planning permission has been granted to 99 which would make window 53 and 54 the only light source for two bedrooms. If the applicants proposal is granted we have been advised to pursue this matter in the courts. We will also loose the afternoon sun on our roof terrace.</li> <li>5) Sense of enclosure – Window 53 and 54 currently look out onto open green garden views (save for dumping of white goods and other large furniture items from the hostel). The community room would add a sense of enclosure to the ground floor that does not currently exist. Our roof terrace would also feel enclosed due to the ‘decks’ and stair core.</li> <li>6) Loss of amenity – Our roof terrace is our only outside space and we use it daily. From seated on the terrace we see two large trees with 248-250 poking between the trees, and see only 2-3 windows at the rear. The new scheme would cause 10 residential windows to overlook us as well as the stair core 11.8m from our terrace and the decked seating where residents will be encouraged to overlook their children in the gardens below – and us!</li> <li>7) Out of character in a conservation area – The green shiny tiles is an insult to our conservation area. It was made very clear to us at the early pre planning stages when we sought planning permission that we must use re-used London brick and recycled timber and the new builds I see around me are in keeping with this advice.</li> </ol>

Application No:      Consultees Name:      Received:

Comment:      Response:

The bulk and height are out of character and I support CAAC's strong opposition in this manner.

8) Application 2020/3737/P overlooks the planning permission that has been granted to 99 for application 2017/5313/P granted on 22nd November 2018. The daylight and sunlight assessment admits loss of light to my rear ground floor windows that is unacceptable. Camden say it is ok to build the community room across our windows and block the light because we currently have skylights. This overlooks the planning permission that has been granted which would make the rear ground floor windows the only source of light for our children's bedrooms in the future. The height and proximity of the community room is unacceptable and will add a huge sense of enclosure to children's bedrooms.

9) Community room – As well as the loss of light we have concerns over the sensibility of 127+ people tramping across a garden in all-weather to use a community room bringing the noise of daily life to the quiet rear of the mews instead of the transient Camden road. When we objected to it's location the only reason the developers gave us for it being away from the main building is so residents can look over from their decks and see if it is available. Another overlooking issue.

10) Security concerns – the community room with no windows to the rear creates a security threat to our property that does not currently exist, a potential corridor for crime as it is unseen from the main building. Defensive planting does not adequately address this concern.

11) Removal of a tree in a conservation area - The scheme requires the removal of a grade B tree in a conservation area that will soon become grade A. The tree gives us a leafy outlook and offers a significant amount of privacy on our roof terrace. Losing this tree would significantly affect our ability to enjoy our roof terrace.

12) Noise pollution – Exterior walkways, external stairways, galleries, the community room at the opposite end of the garden to the development all create noise pollution and impact our quiet enjoyment. The proposal builds issues into the design that a management plan will not adequately address.

13) Light pollution – At the moment we see the glow at night from the rear windows. The new scheme with the many exterior walkways, external galleries, stair/lift core will all need to be well lit and cause light pollution to the quiet rear gardens.

14) Lack of adequate basement assessment – The basement assessment says "a full GMA has not been undertaken as it is not considered necessary because the basement is far enough away from neighbours so as not to affect them". According to the 'section through proposed hostel' the site will be dug down so the community room is level with the Camden road entrance. This would mean the community room, 2.5m from the rear of 99 will be sunken 1.8m into the ground. The impact on 99 and our foundations has been overlooked and we have serious concerns about the structural integrity of 99 in an area that two structural engineers have confirmed is prone to subsidence.

15) Safeguarding concerns – The D&A shows that the galleries, balconies, walkways and even viewing platforms on the staircase are designed specifically to look over (the children in) the gardens below. There are serious safety concerns here and parents should not be encouraged to look after their children from up to 6 stories high, not to mention the stair core blocks the view from many units.

16) Fire risk – With only one exit point though a single staircase in the case of an emergency it will be difficult for 127+ people to escape safely especially with young children and who knows what would happen if that exit became blocked

17) Increased density – The available information we can find online under a freedom of information act says under it's current use the hostel houses 25 women with a range of support needs. The proposal for 37 units with at least 3 and up to 4 people in each unit could be up to 148 individuals. Given the site constraints the building is overdeveloped and too dense. With so many units crammed into one site there is not enough room for the staircase or living space in the building. Site constraints have been forgotten in the name of the

Application No: Consultees Name: Received:

Comment:

Response:

applicant going for as many units as possible.

18) Covid-19 concerns – Our density concerns are heightened in current Covid-19 times and the studios show no ability for social distancing if one family member becomes unwell. Covid hotspot.

19) Social problems - Social problems have been built into this design, from abusive ex partners who may be invited by the rear galleries and external stair/lift core (as we understand the neighbours on Camden road currently experience). A management plan will not be able to tackle problems inherent in the design such as noise issues and invisible corridors and pays lip service to genuine concerns. I am sure the current management plan does not allow for the illegal dumping of white goods on the site yet it is a more than regular occurrence. The scheme is creating conflict in a community that supports homeless housing but not this scheme.

20) Flaws in the process - The designs presented in the first round of consultation in 2019 talked about “site constraints and opportunities” outlining the need for “adequate distance between buildings” assuring us that “the building will be carefully designed so it does not create additional overlooking issues and does not further impact the privacy of existing homes. This will be carefully considered as the design develops”. Whilst we did not receive a leaflet at the time we later saw the plans from a neighbor and immediately understood why these plans were welcomed and not opposed by the community. The reason there is now so much opposition is these key initial considerations have been overlooked for the sake of building 2 more units on the site. We were invited to view these proposals online and submit our feedback but I want to highlight that the June 2020 letter clearly stated that due to the impact of Covid-19 “we are unable to hold an event to display the proposals and our normal response times may be affected”. This is contrary to the community involvement statement which states “The event was publicized by sending out an invitation by Royal Mail to the same database of 4,000+ local addresses. People expressed an interest by email and were invited to the event. Residents were encouraged to forward the invitation to anyone else they knew who may be interested.” I am keen to highlight this statistic is warped. The letter confirmed there would be no event due to Covid-19 and the very concerned surrounding community requested the event to discuss their concerns. 4,000+ residents were not invited to the event. The statement claims 12 residents attended the zoom meeting but my list shows at least 17 with some couples. This meeting was called for by the residents to discuss our concerns and at the end we are told the application will go in and to expect little changes if any. After this meeting we like many of our neighbours put in comprehensive objections to the radically different and newly controversial scheme. The statement of community involvement claimed John and Marcia represented the mews when actually the residents represented themselves and widespread opposition was presented although not publicised on the application.

21) Camden have a real opportunity to provide deserving homeless families good quality accommodation in a well thought out building that is future-proof and safe for the residents. The proposed scheme is not that.

When we were invited to view the second proposal online and saw the proximity and height of the community room, I thought there had been some kind of genuine mistake and Camden had mistakenly thought our house was abandoned. Because the proposed scheme raises so many concerns for us we have felt obliged to seek professional and legal advice. As daylight/ sunlight is of such a technical nature we have asked GIA to help and Charlotte Cook has confirmed there has been an error in the analysis used as well as unacceptable light loss in the results presented in the application. Mr Paul Watson will be writing to you on our behalf for a full analysis of our objections and how the proposal conflicts with Camden’s own planning policy and guidelines. I don’t think the impact was clear to him until he entered our property and his first words were “Wow it’s close, it’s big and it’s close”. We propose a site visit through rear gardens that could obey strict social distancing rules. In the case of this proposal we would strongly urge that a site visit is a fundamental part of the process of due diligence and if it’s not possible to visit the site in current times then a decision should be delayed until it

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
				is possible to do so.

---

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2020/3737/P	Chris	11/10/2020 11:57:58	OBJ	<p>Objection to Camden Road hostel development planning application 4th October 2020</p> <p>I am an owner resident of the ground floor flat in the property immediately next door to the hostel at 246 Camden Road. I purchased this home 13 years ago in full knowledge of the hostel and have 2 daughters (7 and 10) who live here. I have no objection to the hostel and I welcome the change of resident to temporary accommodation for families. I raised no objection to the July 2019 initial proposal. However, I profoundly object to this new amended proposal which is very significantly different to the first plans presented to residents in July 2019. These plans now formally submitted to planning permission are not appropriate for a number of reasons.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1) The current hostel already projects past the rear of our property and the new footprint projects further back blocking open sky space from our garden</li> <li>2) The rear stairs structure further blocks our sky space and means that the whole structure projects past the entire length of our garden. This profoundly changes the quality of life we experience as a family.</li> <li>3) The rear of the building is planned to have rear gallery balconies which will overlook our garden - indeed the top 5 floors will overlook our garden. This invades our privacy and materially alters our lived experience as home owners.</li> <li>4) The 'flipped round' nature of design with access and studio entrance to the rear necessitates electric lighting which will bleed into our garden in the evenings.</li> <li>5) Noise will increase substantially due to the significant increase in proposed scale of the new plans - initially shared with us in June of 2020, almost 1 year after the first proposal.</li> <li>6) The police / crime prevention response requires a significant fence around the property for safeguarding reasons given the vulnerability of some of the family residents. This additional fortification to the side and rear of the property again considerably changes our lived experience and alters the residential and domestic nature of our garden and makes it more comparable to living on or next to an estate or community institution building. This is a shame - not just for us but also the incoming families in need of temporary accommodation.</li> <li>7) Security is a further concern. We already have occasional intruders onto our property seeking to gain entrance to the rear of the property. We have a side alley to our garden which is directly down the side of the hostel. The stairs and rear entrance gallery balconies are ill judged and will likely increase rear intrusion. This omission in safeguarding puts my children more at risk to intruders on my property. Clearly, visitors to the hostel should have to enter from the front - locating the stairs externally is a massive error in practical safeguarding of vulnerable children and families.</li> <li>8) There is a detrimental impact on the Camden Mews Conservation Area. These gardens between Camden Road and Camden Mews represent a peaceful community garden environment where wildlife contribute to a genuine sense of urban retreat. This proposal ruins that. There is no comparable precedent for a 6 story stair tower in the centre of a community garden space. It is not in keeping with the Camden Local plan 2017.</li> </ol> <p>In summary, this is a grossly disproportionate building for this context. It sprawls into the peaceful garden space and lifts well beyond the current roof line. The design (while reversed) is comparable to a council estate block where the balconies and stair tower access are hidden to the rear - bringing the business of access and departure and associated lighting bleed and noise to the tranquil gardens. The proposal robs local residents of open sky space and substantially impacts upon the conservation area. The safeguarding of the families staying at the hostel and families of local residents have not been well considered and this plan presents genuine risk. In a likely attempt to increase the number of studios within the property, the access points have been located outside to the rear even though there is no precedent for this.</p>

Application No:      Consultees Name:      Received:

Comment:      Response:

I would also like it noted that while the proposed plans state that 'specific regard' should be given to adjacent neighbours, the planning department rejected to visit the site to see the proposed consequences for us 'on the ground'. As a comprehensive school headteacher remaining open to all during these covid times, I find the excuse of coronavirus to be insulting. As we explained to the planning department, a visit would be possible whilst remaining outside the entire time with as much social distance as you like. A covid secure visit was entirely possible - still the invitation was rejected. I would consider this grounds for a complaint - the Camden Local Plan also states "We will seek to ensure development contributes towards strong and successful communities by balancing the needs of development with the needs and characteristics of local areas and communities".

It is important to point out that local consultation has not been well managed - the first proposal changed radically with no additional consultation to residents. The new proposals do not seem in keeping with the Camden Local Plan to be sensitive to 'character, heritage and built form'. The community dynamic of this area is damaged by this plan - surely this is contrary to the Camden Local plan.

We would like to specifically request that the initial plan be returned to - one that stays on the current footprint and does not unreasonably raise the roof line; one that does not bring the balconies and overlooking to the rear and damage privacy; one that does not locate access to the rear and jeopardise safeguarding of the most vulnerable; one that does not deny sky space to local neighbours and replace it with concrete stair towers and evening electrical light.

Finally, please note that I have photographs to support my objection. I will send these by email as I cannot upload them here. It is worth noting that no impressions of the view have been included from our perspective as neighbours so I have tried to produce my own. The true impact of these proposals can best be understood by visiting the site - something that is eminently safe to do. I am amazed that Camden planning has neglected to attend the site and has rejected at least 3 invitations for covid secure visits that I am aware of. I consider this to be potential grounds for complaint as special regard should be given to adjacent properties.

Please also note that I uploaded my objection over a week ago and also emailed it, but it has still not appeared on the planning portal. Other contributions have been made more recently and have been published so I am uploading it again now.



**Application No:** 2020/3737/P  
**Consultees Name:** Andrew Llowarch  
**Received:** 11/10/2020 19:48:51  
**Comment:** OBJ

I support the ongoing use of the site as a hostel, though object to the height, massing and design of the proposed building based on detailed comments as follows:

Note: supporting diagrams to follow by email (no option to post diagrams on this website).

#### MASSING AND HEIGHT:

Sections 8.14 - 8.19 of The Planning and Heritage statement consider the impact of the proposed development on the Conservation Area.

According to Section 8.15:

"The height of the proposed building has been raised slightly to re-establish a massing more in keeping with the surrounding townscape, in comparison to the diminutive existing building. The chimneystacks and dormers of the adjacent Victorian villas provide variety to the streetscape and raise the appearance of the roofscape's height, accommodating the height of the proposal within the streetscape. The proposal echoes this variation in the stepped appearance of its façade"

It is misleading to suggest that the height of the proposed building is raised slightly.

Using the ground floor level of the proposed building as a reference point (43.00AOD):

To the Camden Road elevation, the existing eaves are approximately 11.65 metres above 43.00AOD. The proposed development would increase the parapet height to approximately 20.15 metres above 43.00AOD.

This represents an increase of approximately 8.5 metres.

Expressed as a percentage of the existing this represents an increase of approximately 173%.

Similarly with regard to the adjacent properties:

The height of the new parapet relative to the eaves of 252 Camden Road represents an increase of approximately 150%.

The height of the new parapet relative to the eaves of 246 Camden Road represents an increase of approximately 163%.

Eaves and parapet heights used as they represent the vertical part of the facades. The slope of the existing roofs has less impact in terms of massing, and is less meaningful as a way of comparing with the vertical facades and flat roof form of the proposed development.

The new proposals are monolithic in appearance and exceed the height of the chimney stacks in adjacent properties by approximately a full storey.

To compare the mass of a monolithic full storey with the relatively narrow mass of the chimney stacks is not a true comparison.

This is particularly evident in Appendix 1 (pages 18-21) of the Daylight & Sunlight Study.

Application No: Consultees Name: Received:

Comment: Response:

The proposed change in height is significant, and the monolithic massing is not in keeping with the surrounding townscape.  
 The proposed new development does not fit in with the prevailing heights, nor does it respect the massing and variety of the street.  
 In this respect the proposals do not preserve nor do they enhance the character and appearance of the Conservation Area.

## OVERLOOKING:

The proposals will increase overlooking onto the properties along Camden Mews, and from Camden Mews into some of the new accommodation.

Habitable rooms of the accessible unit will be as close as 7.7 metres horizontally to number 97 Camden Mews, and 13.2 metres to 99A Camden Mews.

The external stair within the new development will be between 12.2 - 15.5 metres to the rear windows of 97 - 99 Camden Mews.

I disagree with the design and access statement that the stairs will be rarely used (because a lift is provided). From experience people don't always wait for a lift to arrive from one floor to another - or wait if the lift turn out to be full - especially if descending from high level, or where the travel distance is only 2-3 storeys.

The comparison with any overlooking along the opposite side of Camden Mews and North Villas is spurious. The proposals at 248-250 Camden Road is new development and should meet relevant planning policies. Between Camden Mews and North Villas, any overlooking is the result of accumulative changes over the years, many of which pre-date current policy.  
 Development in this area is not exempt from current planning policy with regard to overlooking.

## LIGHTING / LIGHT POLLUTION:

The proposals should include a lighting assessment in accordance with the Camden Local requirements, providing details of the external lighting or floodlighting, including:

- hours of operation
- light spillage
- light levels
- column heights
- layout plan with beam orientation and light maps
- equipment design
- impact on nearby dwellings or roads and use of planting to mitigate effect.

Application No:      Consultees Name:      Received:

Comment:      Response:

The information submitted for the application does not provide adequate information regarding the above, and it is a concern that the lighting impacts do not seem to have been considered.

In comparison with the existing building where the main source of any light spillage is from windows, the proposed development introduces a need for increased levels of external artificial lighting to areas such as the external stairs, the open deck access and external spaces close to the community and accessible unit - to meet the needs for amenity, safety reasons, security and emergency lighting.

The additional height of the proposed development would only exacerbate this, and seems likely to result in increased levels of light pollution to nearby properties, in particular along Camden Mews.

#### PLANTING:

The proposed new tree planting and landscaping does not seem to have been taken into account in the Daylight and Sunlight Study.

For example - the proposed new planting of trees adjacent to the rear of number 99 seems likely to impact negatively on their daylighting, and in addition the tree roots could potentially undermine foundations.

There is no scope for occupants of number 99 Camden Mews to manage new landscaping immediately adjacent to their windows or walls.

#### NOISE:

From experience of living in Camden Mews for over 10 years, noise is amplified by the canyon effect of the mews itself and the walls of the rear of North Villas.

Noise from the new development - the open stairs, open deck access and plant - has potential to carry uninterrupted to adjacent and nearby houses and across Camden Mews to the rear of North Villas.

The Planning Noise report doesn't not seem to take fully into account the impact of noise from the development on the surrounding properties - for example noise from people using the stairs, open deck access and/or from all of the plant, all of which are proposed new additions to the site.

Some observations:

1. The only nearby property that seems to have been considered in any detail is number 246 Camden Road (the dormer is mentioned in section 8.2 of the Planning Noise report).

2. The baseline noise measurements were taken only within the site boundary and not elsewhere in the surroundings.

It seems therefore that no measurements were taken to demonstrate the noise impacts on the surroundings, where ambient noise levels might be expected to be lower than the development site (which is adjacent to the relatively noisy Camden Road).

3. The Planning Noise report is inconsistent with the Energy & Sustainability Statement, and with the architect's plans:

Application No:      Consultees Name:      Received:

Comment:

Response:

The Planning Noise report makes limited reference to plant (condenser units) at roof level at the south end, and MVHR units along the walkways (assumed to be the external deck access).

The Energy & Sustainability Statement mentions more plant and in different locations, for example:

- CO2 air source heat pumps at 4th floor level.
- Heating and cooling via VRF system (no mention of locations).
- a CO2 heat pump for the accessible dwelling.
- a VRF system for the community building.

The different types of plant might have different noise characteristics.

This full range of plant, their precise locations and the associated potential noise impacts has not been taken into account in the Planning Noise report.

In addition the architect's drawings do not accurately convey the type of plant and all of their locations - the only plant identified on the drawings is an external enclosure at 4th floor level - the type of plant within this enclosure is not identified. The drawings do not identify the type and position of plant along the walkways, nor the plant that serves the community room and the accessible dwelling (as referenced within The Energy & Sustainability Statement).

4. The heating and ventilation strategy for the new development (a 24 hour building) seems to be reliant on use of plant at all times with air source heat pumps for hot water, and for air conditioning units to provide ventilation to the rooms, night and day and through the seasons.

There is nothing in the application documents to say that the plant would operate at reduced noise levels overnight, when ambient noise levels from other sources are generally reduced such that the perceived noise from plant will be greater.

My understanding of air source heat pumps is that their operation is reliant on noisy fans - reaching to 40-60dB. Air handling (MVHR) units also generate noise. This could be a cause of disruption to sleep patterns of the occupants and nearby residents.

Given the limited information provided regarding noise, and the level of inconsistency within the different sources of information (planning noise report, energy & sustainability statement and architects drawings) as outlined above, it is a concern that the noise impacts of the development have not been fully considered, and that the various noise sources and types of plant - individually or cumulatively - could generate noise levels that would impact on the surrounding dwellings.

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2020/3737/P	Haim Hillel	11/10/2020 21:10:07	OBJ	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Conservation Area - Under the Camden Local Plan, the council is obliged to ensure that development enhances rather than damages the conservation area. The proposed development will have a significantly negative impact on the conservation area and so is not compliant with the local plan.</li> <li>2. Privacy and overlooking - access balconies and stair tower will have a significant negative impact on privacy. There is no evidence in the proposal that any consideration has been given to rights under the human rights act article 8 to respect residents privacy and home. This is not complaint with the Camden plan in multiple ways.</li> <li>3. Light pollution – the walkways and stair tower will need to be lit when it is dark. This will have a negative effect on residents health and well-being. There is no evidence that this has been considered and detail on this is not given in the proposal. This also contravenes the Camden Local Plan.</li> <li>4. Noise – walkways will be in use day and night, noise and voices carry across the enclosed space between the Mews and Camden Road. This will create stress during the day and make it difficult to sleep at night and will have a negative effect on residents health and wellbeing.</li> <li>5. Daylight and Sunlight. The loss of sunlight to 103 Camden Mews exceeds BRE guidance. This contravenes the right to light under the 1959 act.</li> <li>6. Massing and size - It is two clear storeys higher than surrounding properties on Camden Road. It blocks the sky for residents on Camden mews and further afield in North Villas. In Camden Mews it will create a sense of enclosure and claustrophobia. The walkways and stairway extend out from the existing footprint of the building, significantly increasing the true footprint of the building.</li> <li>7. Trees and green spaces – there will be building in the garden and the loss of trees including one important grade B whitebeam tree. Neighbours in Camden Mews and North Villas will no longer be able to see the magnificent London Plane trees above the Hostel, a significant loss of amenity and contrary to the Local Plan.</li> <li>8. Height – maximum height for buildings in the conservation area is 4 stories. The drawing on page 63 of the Design statement (5) is misleading. It doesn't show the slope from north villas down to Camden Road. The roof line should decline in line with the slope so that the maximum height remains – as it is – 4 storeys. If we followed the logic of the drawing on page 63 of the design and access statement – we would be building skyscrapers at the bottom of Dartmouth Park Hill.</li> <li>9. Community division – a previously cohesive and diverse community, welcoming to homeless families, will be over-stretched and divided by this proposal which will create conflict between residents, homeless families and Camden Council.</li> <li>10. Flawed consultation and misleading account of this in the statement of community involvement. There is no reference to the number of objections and no details of the objections Radical differences between the schemes presented at the first and so-called second consultations, including the addition of two storeys and the external walkway and stair tower meant that in effect there was only one consultation on the proposed scheme. This consultation was mishandled. A letter from Camden dated 26 May 2020 only arrived at most neighbouring properties during week commencing 15 June 2020 - giving until 19 June 2020 to submit comments on the proposal.</li> <li>11. Fire risk - the proposal refers to a fire risk assessment document. But this doesn't appear to be included in the documentation. There is only one exit which would also have to be an entrance for emergency services in the event of a fire. With 37 kitchens in crowded accommodation it is important to understand how the building will manage that risk.</li> <li>12. Security The submission from the Police calls for a number of stringent security measures including a fence almost two metres high and defensive planting. This will further mark the building out as separate and divorced from the surrounding neighbourhood. The levels of security required will make it look like a secure</li> </ol>

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
				unit, creating stigma for the residents.

---

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2020/3737/P	Alan Morris	10/10/2020 18:47:01	OBJ	<p>We strongly object to the development of the Camden Rd Hostel, 243-250 Camden Rd, NW1 9HE</p> <p>Alan &amp; Margaret Morris, 86 Camden Mews, London NW1 9BX</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Margaret and I have lived in Camden Mews since 1975. Our house was designed and built as one of five by David Goldhill (now deceased) in 1970.</li> <li>2. David Goldhill was also the chairman of the Conservation Area and took the preservation of the area very seriously. (1974)</li> <li>3. The Conservation Area means the preservation of anything of historic interest or importance which is protected by law against undesirable environmental changes.</li> <li>4. The houses in Camden Road are most certainly of historical interest with period houses either side of the hostel.</li> <li>5. I have noticed over recent years that Council Planning has allowed a massive erosion of the principle values of conservation by allowing larger and higher buildings in the area thus setting a precedence for even more larger and higher buildings, destroying the whole principle of protecting the environment.</li> <li>6. Some may call this progress but if that is the case, why have a conservation area if Planning and the Council do not respect their own rules and, in some cases, laws.</li> <li>7. It also appears that when the Council is involved in a project, the rule book seems to go out the window exacerbating the whole situation.</li> <li>8. Camden Mews and the general conservation area has been reasonably protected over the years. However, in the last ten years Planning has had a massive swing to almost 'anything goes' and conservation is completely irrelevant.</li> <li>9. The hostel in question is now the latest Council project in which it appears to have torn up the principles of conservation and the environment.</li> <li>10. Higher building with more floors, increased volume to the point of a real danger over density, through fire, recreational area, visitors' parking, gas, water, electricity, and sewage services.</li> <li>11. Loss of light to Camden Mews houses adjacent to and near the hostel.</li> <li>12. Light and noise pollution plus privacy problems to the environment in the locality and to the existing local residents.</li> <li>13. The principle of having the hostel, on balance is clearly very good, it is a pity the whole concept is being spoilt by pushing a good idea over the top to the point of making it a nuisance. This is not good for the residents of the hostel, most certainly the environment and of course at the risk of alienating adjacent and permanent local neighbours.</li> </ol>

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2020/3737/P	Rosa Kurowska	11/10/2020 15:48:51	PETITNOBJ E	<p>What will happen to the residents of the women's hostel? Please can the council confirm they will be housed in the same area?</p> <p>I am also concerned about the safety of the new building with so many studios and lack of fire exits it does not seem safe. Surely if this is accommodation for families they need decent sized flats with 2-3 bedrooms? Families in Camden need decent housing. Please look again at the plans and consider this. I look forward to hearing more about the plans.</p>



Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2020/3737/P	Christophe Prince	11/10/2020 18:39:42	OBJ	<p>I strongly support the development of new hostel accommodation on the current site but believe the proposed design significantly, negatively impacts on the neighbours. In particular it does not demonstrate respect for the right to privacy. For those reasons I believe the proposed design should be rejected.</p> <p>It also appears that some relatively simple adjustments could be made which would materially reduce the negative impact. It seems unreasonable that they have not been considered given the disproportionate impact on the nearest neighbours from the proposed design.</p> <p>1) Change in height at rear</p> <p>The proposed rear skyline will be 8.23m higher than the existing skyline for the nearest neighbours and the back wall will be 9.12m and 84% taller than the existing structure. Nearly doubling the existing height. In addition the stairwell at the rear will be approximately 9m closer to their rear walls.</p> <p>These two changes represent a very significant, negative change in the amenity for the nearest neighbours.</p> <p>(a) Change in skyline for the nearest neighbours is based on height of existing rear wall 54.62m elevation (not top of the roof, see 08005) and proposed new building height 62.85m elevation (taken from 08300). <math>62.85 - 54.62 = 8.23\text{m}</math></p> <p>(b) Existing vertical wall height is est 10.76m (54.62-43.89 elevations taken from 08005 and 08006 respectively and excluding the sloped roof). Proposed vertical wall height 19.85m (62.85-43m elevations from 08300). <math>19.85 - 10.76 = 9.12\text{m}</math></p> <p>(c) Estimated distance of rear structure is from plan 08107.</p> <p>2) Right to respect for privacy</p> <p>The proposed design entails multiple neighbours sites being overlooked by c33 rear doors, open walkways and an open stairwell. The last of which will, as noted above, be significantly closer than any part of the existing building. They will result in significant traffic and the ability to overlook neighbours at all hours of the day.</p> <p>Given the significant, negative impact on the privacy of the nearest neighbours it is not clear this interference with the right to respect for the neighbours private and family life and homes is necessary to meet the objectives of the building's future users.</p> <p>3) Reasonableness</p> <p>Whilst we are not being asked to provide alternatives it would appear that some combination of enclosure for the walkways, height reduction or indeed reversal of the site design so the walkways face onto Camden Road, would be sufficient to address all of these concerns. It is not clear that reasonable consideration has been given to these alternatives at any stage.</p>

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2020/3737/P	Angela Mason	11/10/2020 19:35:37	COMM	<p>I would like to record three fundamental concerns with the application for full planning permission for a new Camden Rd. hostel.</p> <p>Firstly I believe the consultation has been flawed and inadequate. The present proposals are fundamentally different from those put forward originally in 2019 for which there was general support from residents. The latest proposals were notified to residents in a letter which was not received by many until days before the reply date , 19 June, and a Teams meeting was only organised after the intervention of Cllr. Beales. The present scheme includes an extra 2 stories, external walkways, and the use of green tiles.</p> <p>The new design seems calculated to make this building standout from the local area. It will be higher, have a different facade, and intrude on the privacy of residents in Camden Mews. The walkways are described as a generous gallery space allowing seating and opportunities to watch children play. Even if the walkways are scaled back it is likely that they will be used, understandably, by people smoking and making telephone calls. They will also presumably be lit at night. The height and proximity of the proposed building must also be likely to diminish the light of Mews residents.</p> <p>Thirdly I am concerned that designing this building in a way that is so out of character with its surroundings will inevitably call attention to its purpose and make life more difficult for its residents. It will be very easily identifiable and I fear make it harder to integrate residents in the life of the community.</p> <p>This is a very mixed ward but residents live in considerable harmony and I am not aware of any objections to a homeless hostel per se. Indeed no objections were made to the original proposals.</p> <p>It has never been clear why the design altered so dramatically. Residents have speculated that reductions in the size of the Chester Rd hostel have been compensated for by increasing the size of the proposed building in Camden Rd.</p> <p>Whether this is true or not I don't know, but it a flawed response to what everyone acknowledges if the desperate needs of those without a home.</p>
2020/3737/P	Elizabeth Williams	11/10/2020 18:12:28	OBJ	<p>I have serious concerns about this development for several reasons listed below.</p> <p>1) The new building is significantly larger than the current building. This is not inline with roof heights in the area. This will now overlook my property and garden significantly more than the current structure.</p> <p>2) Security - with the building entrance now via external walkways at the rear of the property I have concerns of how the building will be secured. We have worked with the current development team to address concerns where we had trespassing on our property from individuals visiting residents and worked to address these issues. With the new access points and the increase in size I can't see how the security has been addressed to the level it should be.</p> <p>The police have called for a two metre high fence which will further block light from my property and impose on the look of the street.</p> <p>3) The new stair tower and walk ways will cause light and noise pollution which doesn't currently exist.</p> <p>4) Fire risk - there does not appear to be documentation included on the safety of this building.</p>

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2020/3737/P	Angela Mason	11/10/2020 19:35:39	COMM	<p>I would like to record three fundamental concerns with the application for full planning permission for a new Camden Rd. hostel.</p> <p>Firstly I believe the consultation has been flawed and inadequate. The present proposals are fundamentally different from those put forward originally in 2019 for which there was general support from residents. The latest proposals were notified to residents in a letter which was not received by many until days before the reply date , 19 June, and a Teams meeting was only organised after the intervention of Cllr. Beales. The present scheme includes an extra 2 stories, external walkways, and the use of green tiles.</p> <p>The new design seems calculated to make this building standout from the local area. It will be higher, have a different facade, and intrude on the privacy of residents in Camden Mews. The walkways are described as a generous gallery space allowing seating and opportunities to watch children play. Even if the walkways are scaled back it is likely that they will be used, understandably, by people smoking and making telephone calls. They will also presumably be lit at night. The height and proximity of the proposed building must also be likely to diminish the light of Mews residents.</p> <p>Thirdly I am concerned that designing this building in a way that is so out of character with its surroundings will inevitably call attention to its purpose and make life more difficult for its residents. It will be very easily identifiable and I fear make it harder to integrate residents in the life of the community.</p> <p>This is a very mixed ward but residents live in considerable harmony and I am not aware of any objections to a homeless hostel per se. Indeed no objections were made to the original proposals.</p> <p>It has never been clear why the design altered so dramatically. Residents have speculated that reductions in the size of the Chester Rd hostel have been compensated for by increasing the size of the proposed building in Camden Rd.</p> <p>Whether this is true or not I don't know, but it a flawed response to what everyone acknowledges if the desperate needs of those without a home.</p>

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2020/3737/P	Angela Mason	11/10/2020 19:35:40	COMM	<p>I would like to record three fundamental concerns with the application for full planning permission for a new Camden Rd. hostel.</p> <p>Firstly I believe the consultation has been flawed and inadequate. The present proposals are fundamentally different from those put forward originally in 2019 for which there was general support from residents. The latest proposals were notified to residents in a letter which was not received by many until days before the reply date , 19 June, and a Teams meeting was only organised after the intervention of Cllr. Beales. The present scheme includes an extra 2 stories, external walkways, and the use of green tiles.</p> <p>The new design seems calculated to make this building standout from the local area. It will be higher, have a different facade, and intrude on the privacy of residents in Camden Mews. The walkways are described as a generous gallery space allowing seating and opportunities to watch children play. Even if the walkways are scaled back it is likely that they will be used, understandably, by people smoking and making telephone calls. They will also presumably be lit at night. The height and proximity of the proposed building must also be likely to diminish the light of Mews residents.</p> <p>Thirdly I am concerned that designing this building in a way that is so out of character with its surroundings will inevitably call attention to its purpose and make life more difficult for its residents. It will be very easily identifiable and I fear make it harder to integrate residents in the life of the community.</p> <p>This is a very mixed ward but residents live in considerable harmony and I am not aware of any objections to a homeless hostel per se. Indeed no objections were made to the original proposals.</p> <p>It has never been clear why the design altered so dramatically. Residents have speculated that reductions in the size of the Chester Rd hostel have been compensated for by increasing the size of the proposed building in Camden Rd.</p> <p>Whether this is true or not I don't know, but it a flawed response to what everyone acknowledges if the desperate needs of those without a home.</p>

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2020/3737/P	Angela Mason	11/10/2020 19:35:41	COMM	<p>I would like to record three fundamental concerns with the application for full planning permission for a new Camden Rd. hostel.</p> <p>Firstly I believe the consultation has been flawed and inadequate. The present proposals are fundamentally different from those put forward originally in 2019 for which there was general support from residents. The latest proposals were notified to residents in a letter which was not received by many until days before the reply date , 19 June, and a Teams meeting was only organised after the intervention of Cllr. Beales. The present scheme includes an extra 2 stories, external walkways, and the use of green tiles.</p> <p>The new design seems calculated to make this building standout from the local area. It will be higher, have a different facade, and intrude on the privacy of residents in Camden Mews. The walkways are described as a generous gallery space allowing seating and opportunities to watch children play. Even if the walkways are scaled back it is likely that they will be used, understandably, by people smoking and making telephone calls. They will also presumably be lit at night. The height and proximity of the proposed building must also be likely to diminish the light of Mews residents.</p> <p>Thirdly I am concerned that designing this building in a way that is so out of character with its surroundings will inevitably call attention to its purpose and make life more difficult for its residents. It will be very easily identifiable and I fear make it harder to integrate residents in the life of the community.</p> <p>This is a very mixed ward but residents live in considerable harmony and I am not aware of any objections to a homeless hostel per se. Indeed no objections were made to the original proposals.</p> <p>It has never been clear why the design altered so dramatically. Residents have speculated that reductions in the size of the Chester Rd hostel have been compensated for by increasing the size of the proposed building in Camden Rd.</p> <p>Whether this is true or not I don't know, but it a flawed response to what everyone acknowledges if the desperate needs of those without a home.</p>

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2020/3737/P	Angela Mason	11/10/2020 19:35:42	COMM	<p>I would like to record three fundamental concerns with the application for full planning permission for a new Camden Rd. hostel.</p> <p>Firstly I believe the consultation has been flawed and inadequate. The present proposals are fundamentally different from those put forward originally in 2019 for which there was general support from residents. The latest proposals were notified to residents in a letter which was not received by many until days before the reply date , 19 June, and a Teams meeting was only organised after the intervention of Cllr. Beales. The present scheme includes an extra 2 stories, external walkways, and the use of green tiles.</p> <p>The new design seems calculated to make this building standout from the local area. It will be higher, have a different facade, and intrude on the privacy of residents in Camden Mews. The walkways are described as a generous gallery space allowing seating and opportunities to watch children play. Even if the walkways are scaled back it is likely that they will be used, understandably, by people smoking and making telephone calls. They will also presumably be lit at night. The height and proximity of the proposed building must also be likely to diminish the light of Mews residents.</p> <p>Thirdly I am concerned that designing this building in a way that is so out of character with its surroundings will inevitably call attention to its purpose and make life more difficult for its residents. It will be very easily identifiable and I fear make it harder to integrate residents in the life of the community.</p> <p>This is a very mixed ward but residents live in considerable harmony and I am not aware of any objections to a homeless hostel per se. Indeed no objections were made to the original proposals.</p> <p>It has never been clear why the design altered so dramatically. Residents have speculated that reductions in the size of the Chester Rd hostel have been compensated for by increasing the size of the proposed building in Camden Rd.</p> <p>Whether this is true or not I don't know, but it a flawed response to what everyone acknowledges if the desperate needs of those without a home.</p>

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2020/3737/P	Angela Mason	11/10/2020 19:35:44	COMM	<p>I would like to record three fundamental concerns with the application for full planning permission for a new Camden Rd. hostel.</p> <p>Firstly I believe the consultation has been flawed and inadequate. The present proposals are fundamentally different from those put forward originally in 2019 for which there was general support from residents. The latest proposals were notified to residents in a letter which was not received by many until days before the reply date , 19 June, and a Teams meeting was only organised after the intervention of Cllr. Beales. The present scheme includes an extra 2 stories, external walkways, and the use of green tiles.</p> <p>The new design seems calculated to make this building standout from the local area. It will be higher, have a different facade, and intrude on the privacy of residents in Camden Mews. The walkways are described as a generous gallery space allowing seating and opportunities to watch children play. Even if the walkways are scaled back it is likely that they will be used, understandably, by people smoking and making telephone calls. They will also presumably be lit at night. The height and proximity of the proposed building must also be likely to diminish the light of Mews residents.</p> <p>Thirdly I am concerned that designing this building in a way that is so out of character with its surroundings will inevitably call attention to its purpose and make life more difficult for its residents. It will be very easily identifiable and I fear make it harder to integrate residents in the life of the community.</p> <p>This is a very mixed ward but residents live in considerable harmony and I am not aware of any objections to a homeless hostel per se. Indeed no objections were made to the original proposals.</p> <p>It has never been clear why the design altered so dramatically. Residents have speculated that reductions in the size of the Chester Rd hostel have been compensated for by increasing the size of the proposed building in Camden Rd.</p> <p>Whether this is true or not I don't know, but it a flawed response to what everyone acknowledges if the desperate needs of those without a home.</p>
2020/3737/P	Ismay	09/10/2020 14:46:57	OBJ	<p>I object to the proposed development in this conservation area. It is totally out of character in the conservation area to propose a building two storeys higher than those already there. The rear balconies and external stairwell will overlook the mews buildings and invade the privacy who those who live there.</p>

<b>Application No:</b>	<b>Consultees Name:</b>	<b>Received:</b>	<b>Comment:</b>	<b>Response:</b>
2020/3737/P	Mimi Belaye	09/10/2020 18:21:49	COMMNT	

9 October 2020

Objection to proposed development at 248-50 Camden Road on behalf of 246 Camden Road Ltd.

Dear Sir/Madam

As the managing agents of the above development we are writing to you on behalf of 246 Camden Road Ltd to object the proposed development of a new hostel at 248-50.

246 CAMDEN ROAD OBJECT to the planning application for the following reasons:

- Light pollution – Walkways and stair tower will need to be lit when it is dark and this may have a negative effect on their health and well-being
- Noise – Walk ways will be in use day and night, this will create stress during the day and make it difficult for residents to sleep at night
- Massing and size – The new design is two clear storeys higher than surrounding properties on Camden Road. It will create a sense of enclosure, furthermore 246 Camden Road will also be overlooked
- Community division – A previously cohesive and diverse community, welcome to homeless families, will be over-stretched and divided by this proposal which may create conflict between residents, homeless families and Camden Council. If the building of the new hostel continues it may also result in a gradual migration of existing residents which could be damaging to community in the long-term.
- Fire risk – The proposal refers to a fire risk assessment document but this does not appear to be included in documentation. There is only one exit which would also have to be an entrance for emergency services in the event of a fire.
- Security Safety – A submission from the police calls for a number of stringent security measures including a fence almost two metres high. This will further mark the building out as separate and divorced from the surrounding neighbourhood.

It is also important to note that in addition to affecting our client's quality of life, the proposed design – for the above mentioned reasons- may also affect the market value of their property and as a result its saleability.

Our client' nonetheless have no objection to the presence of the temporary accommodation hostel being next door to them and welcome the repurposing of the accommodation for families in the borough. Their concerns and objections are about the proposed design of the building.

Furthermore we were advised by our clients at 246 Camden Road that the planning officer for the new Homeless shelter (Charlotte Meynell) declined to conduct a site visit to one of our residents back garden due to Covid-19 despite her referencing Page 22 of the Design and Access Statement which states that "Particular regard will also need to be given to the gardens of the adjacent properties" (please find attached email dated 30 September 2020). If this is the case then surely building plans can be postponed for the same reason, that



Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
				<p>is until a thorough in-person inspection and investigation is carried out in order to properly address the concerns of individuals in the community who will ultimately have to suffer the consequences of the new design. Adjustments can then be made to the building plans as a result of such inspections and local residents would feel that they have a voice in the proceedings.</p> <p>Having said the above, on behalf of 246 Camden Road Ltd we urge that you carefully review the objections submitted by our clients and the wider community, consider the long term implications of the new design and finally retract and revise plans submitted for the new homeless shelter at 248-50.</p> <p>Thank you in advance for your consideration.</p> <p>Yours sincerely  Mimi Belaye  Mimi Belaye  Property Manager  RMG Ltd</p>

---

<b>Application No:</b>	<b>Consultees Name:</b>	<b>Received:</b>	<b>Comment:</b>	<b>Response:</b>
2020/3737/P	Mimi Belaye	09/10/2020 18:21:56	COMMNT	

9 October 2020

Objection to proposed development at 248-50 Camden Road on behalf of 246 Camden Road Ltd.

Dear Sir/Madam

As the managing agents of the above development we are writing to you on behalf of 246 Camden Road Ltd to object the proposed development of a new hostel at 248-50.

246 CAMDEN ROAD OBJECT to the planning application for the following reasons:

- Light pollution – Walkways and stair tower will need to be lit when it is dark and this may have a negative effect on their health and well-being
- Noise – Walk ways will be in use day and night, this will create stress during the day and make it difficult for residents to sleep at night
- Massing and size – The new design is two clear storeys higher than surrounding properties on Camden Road. It will create a sense of enclosure, furthermore 246 Camden Road will also be overlooked
- Community division – A previously cohesive and diverse community, welcome to homeless families, will be over-stretched and divided by this proposal which may create conflict between residents, homeless families and Camden Council. If the building of the new hostel continues it may also result in a gradual migration of existing residents which could be damaging to community in the long-term.
- Fire risk – The proposal refers to a fire risk assessment document but this does not appear to be included in documentation. There is only one exit which would also have to be an entrance for emergency services in the event of a fire.
- Security Safety – A submission from the police calls for a number of stringent security measures including a fence almost two metres high. This will further mark the building out as separate and divorced from the surrounding neighbourhood.

It is also important to note that in addition to affecting our client's quality of life, the proposed design – for the above mentioned reasons- may also affect the market value of their property and as a result its saleability.

Our client' nonetheless have no objection to the presence of the temporary accommodation hostel being next door to them and welcome the repurposing of the accommodation for families in the borough. Their concerns and objections are about the proposed design of the building.

Furthermore we were advised by our clients at 246 Camden Road that the planning officer for the new Homeless shelter (Charlotte Meynell) declined to conduct a site visit to one of our residents back garden due to Covid-19 despite her referencing Page 22 of the Design and Access Statement which states that "Particular regard will also need to be given to the gardens of the adjacent properties" (please find attached email dated 30 September 2020). If this is the case then surely building plans can be postponed for the same reason, that

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
				<p>is until a thorough in-person inspection and investigation is carried out in order to properly address the concerns of individuals in the community who will ultimately have to suffer the consequences of the new design. Adjustments can then be made to the building plans as a result of such inspections and local residents would feel that they have a voice in the proceedings.</p> <p>Having said the above, on behalf of 246 Camden Road Ltd we urge that you carefully review the objections submitted by our clients and the wider community, consider the long term implications of the new design and finally retract and revise plans submitted for the new homeless shelter at 248-50.</p> <p>Thank you in advance for your consideration.</p> <p>Yours sincerely  Mimi Belaye  Mimi Belaye  Property Manager  RMG Ltd</p>

---

<b>Application No:</b>	<b>Consultees Name:</b>	<b>Received:</b>	<b>Comment:</b>	<b>Response:</b>
2020/3737/P	Mimi Belaye	09/10/2020 18:21:57	COMMNT	

9 October 2020

Objection to proposed development at 248-50 Camden Road on behalf of 246 Camden Road Ltd.

Dear Sir/Madam

As the managing agents of the above development we are writing to you on behalf of 246 Camden Road Ltd to object the proposed development of a new hostel at 248-50.

246 CAMDEN ROAD OBJECT to the planning application for the following reasons:

- Light pollution – Walkways and stair tower will need to be lit when it is dark and this may have a negative effect on their health and well-being
- Noise – Walk ways will be in use day and night, this will create stress during the day and make it difficult for residents to sleep at night
- Massing and size – The new design is two clear storeys higher than surrounding properties on Camden Road. It will create a sense of enclosure, furthermore 246 Camden Road will also be overlooked
- Community division – A previously cohesive and diverse community, welcome to homeless families, will be over-stretched and divided by this proposal which may create conflict between residents, homeless families and Camden Council. If the building of the new hostel continues it may also result in a gradual migration of existing residents which could be damaging to community in the long-term.
- Fire risk – The proposal refers to a fire risk assessment document but this does not appear to be included in documentation. There is only one exit which would also have to be an entrance for emergency services in the event of a fire.
- Security Safety – A submission from the police calls for a number of stringent security measures including a fence almost two metres high. This will further mark the building out as separate and divorced from the surrounding neighbourhood.

It is also important to note that in addition to affecting our client's quality of life, the proposed design – for the above mentioned reasons- may also affect the market value of their property and as a result its saleability.

Our client' nonetheless have no objection to the presence of the temporary accommodation hostel being next door to them and welcome the repurposing of the accommodation for families in the borough. Their concerns and objections are about the proposed design of the building.

Furthermore we were advised by our clients at 246 Camden Road that the planning officer for the new Homeless shelter (Charlotte Meynell) declined to conduct a site visit to one of our residents back garden due to Covid-19 despite her referencing Page 22 of the Design and Access Statement which states that "Particular regard will also need to be given to the gardens of the adjacent properties" (please find attached email dated 30 September 2020). If this is the case then surely building plans can be postponed for the same reason, that

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
				<p>is until a thorough in-person inspection and investigation is carried out in order to properly address the concerns of individuals in the community who will ultimately have to suffer the consequences of the new design. Adjustments can then be made to the building plans as a result of such inspections and local residents would feel that they have a voice in the proceedings.</p> <p>Having said the above, on behalf of 246 Camden Road Ltd we urge that you carefully review the objections submitted by our clients and the wider community, consider the long term implications of the new design and finally retract and revise plans submitted for the new homeless shelter at 248-50.</p> <p>Thank you in advance for your consideration.</p> <p>Yours sincerely Mimi Belaye Mimi Belaye Property Manager RMG Ltd</p>
2020/3737/P	simona hughes	09/10/2020 18:41:41	OBJ	<p>I have grave concerns about this proposed development.</p> <p>My greatest concern is the height of the building. At 6 stories high it is completely out of keeping with all the other buildings in its vicinity. It will be an eyesore on the skyline and view from many surrounding properties and more importantly it sets a dangerous precedent.</p> <p>My other concern is that it will significantly compromise this peaceful conservation area in terms of light pollution and scale. The staircase in particular which intrudes on an existing green area and is not in keeping with any of the other architecture in this area.</p> <p>I fully support the building of a hostel for vulnerable families, but I have strong objections to this design which completely fails to integrate with the existing Camden square conservation environment.</p>
2020/3737/P	David Broder	09/10/2020 19:08:49	OBJ	<p>This building is out of keeping with the other buildings on Camden Road and is unsuitable for the Camden Square conservation area. It is obviously too high at 6 stories and plainly is a bad design. It needs a complete rethink and redesign.</p> <p>I do not object to the rebuilding of the hostel and welcome improved facilities for the residents.</p> <p>I have been working for the Irish Centre as a volunteer delivering food parcels to vulnerable people in the area. One of our clients lives in Ashton Court on Camden Road, 2 doors adjacent to the proposed development and I have seen how this building functions. The new development should be similar in height, design and function.</p>
2020/3737/P	Rob Dean	10/10/2020 09:06:02	OBJ	<p>Camden Mews is a conservation area, and the proposed height of this building will have an adverse impact on the area.</p> <p>I have no objection to the building in principle, just to the proposed height, which I believe should be no higher than other nearby buildings on Camden Road.</p>

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2020/3737/P	Liz Aslin	10/10/2020 09:07:58	OBJ	<p>Dear Sir/Madam,</p> <p>I have many concerns over the proposed development at 248-250 Camden Road. Here are my points of concern..</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- I'm worried that the proposed walkways at the back leading to the entrances of the flats will create a massive increase in noise throughout the day and particularly the night, opposite to what, at the moment, is a very peaceful rear to the house and our garden downstairs. This also includes the need for lights being permanently on during the evening to light these walkways, adding to light pollution as well as noise. It also looks possible that, as the proposed development is two storeys higher than our property I have grave concerns that I will be overlooked into the privacy of my own home which goes against Article 8 of the Human Rights Act. Being in a Conservation Area I cannot understand why, with the inclusion of the walkways at the back, the overall footprint of 248-250 is being proposed?</li> <li>- With the proposal being for an extra two storeys I'm particularly worried that my top floor light and airy flat will be robbed of this, being overlooked and towered above.</li> <li>- I have noticed that the police have called for a fence nearly two metres high to cover security requirements. This also feels imposing next to our period house and creates a real segregation to something in our community. Saying this, we have previously had issues with residents from the hostel coming over the side wall and into our garden, so the increase in residents only makes me worry that this may continue to happen.</li> <li>- We are in a Conservation area and under the Camden Local Plan any developments need to enhance the conservation area but I feel this is not the case by adding an increased number of residents to the area and adding to the building creating an imposing feature on Camden Road.</li> <li>- Green space is being lost by building into the garden, which in a Conservation Area seems baffling. Along with the fact that I've been informed through a residents meeting that trees will be lost, including a grade B whitebeam tree. I don't feel that other residents would be allowed this level of green destruction.</li> <li>- Something else that was brought to my attention by the other residents of the area is the height of the building doesn't take into account the slope of the land. Surely, the roofline should decline inline with the slope. As one person put it " If we followed the logic of the drawing on page 63... we would be building skyscrapers at the bottom of Highgate Hill.'</li> <li>- I have also been made aware of other applications in the area that were, rightly, rejected due to the Council's diligence to protect the Conservation Area. I include these again...</li> </ul>

Details Page for Planning Application - 2019/6164/P  
 Site Address 128 Camden Road London NW1 9EE

#### Reasons for rejection

The proposed two storey upwards extension, by reason of its height, form, location, prominence, proportions and design would harm the pattern of historic development and introduce an incongruous building type into the streetscene, to the detriment of the character and appearance of the host building, neighbouring buildings and the Camden Broadway Conservation Area contrary to policies D1 and D2 of the Camden Local Plan 2017. The proposed upwards extension, by virtue of its height, location and proximity to neighbouring properties, would bring about an unacceptable loss of outlook and privacy to residential windows serving nos. 128b Camden Road and 159 St Pancras Way contrary to policy A1 of the Camden Local Plan 2017. The proposed window openings and works of residential conversion would bring about an unacceptable loss of privacy to 157 and 159 St Pancras Way contrary to policy A1 of the Camden Local Plan 2017.

**Application No:**   **Consultees Name:**   **Received:**

**Comment:**   **Response:**

Details Page for Planning Application - 2019/2837/P

Site Address 65 Camden Square London NW1 9XD

Reasons for rejection

The proposed second floor roof terrace would result in unacceptable loss of privacy to the occupants of nos. 29 and 4 Camden Mews, contrary to policy A1 (Amenity) of the London Borough of Camden Local Plan 2017. The proposed development, by reason of its location, design, form, height and bulk, would appear as an overbearing and visually intrusive addition, out of context with the characteristic mews typology, and would be detrimental to the character of the streetscene and surrounding conservation area, contrary to policies D1 (Design) and D2 (Heritage) of the London Borough of Camden Local Plan 2017.

Details Page for Planning Application - 2017/5303/P

Site Address 157 York Way London N7 9LN

Reason for rejection

The proposed extension, by reason of its siting, scale, and design would result in an overly dominant and incongruous addition to the area, adversely impacting the character and appearance of the building and this part of the conservation area contrary to policies D1 (Design) and D2 (Heritage) of the London Borough of Camden Local Plan (2017).

The proposed development, by reason of the excessive level of overlooking from the HMO unit into the rear windows of the proposed two bedroom duplex, would provide a poor quality of accommodation for future occupants, contrary to policy H6 (Housing Choice and Mix) of the London Borough of Camden Local Plan (2017).

The proposed development, by reason of its rear roof terrace, external staircase, and proximity to neighbouring properties, would result in harmful overlooking and a substantial loss of privacy to no. 155 York Way, contrary to policy A1 (Managing the Impact of Development) of the London Borough of Camden Local Plan (2017).

The proposed development, by reason of its height, depth, design and proximity to no. 159 York Way, would result in undue harm to the daylight, sunlight, and outlook of the occupants of no. 159, particularly at lower levels, contrary to policy A1 (Managing the Impact of Development) of the London Borough of Camden Local Plan (2017).

2018/2619/P

Site Address Flat B, 8 Cliff Road London NW1 9AN

Erection of outbuilding for ancillary use as artist's studio, and garden access stair.

Reason for rejection

The proposed access stair, by reason of its siting, would lead to undue overlooking to the existing and future occupiers of Flat B which would be detrimental to their amenity contrary to policy A1 of the London Borough of Camden Local Plan 2017.

The proposed outbuilding by virtue of its siting and scale would dominate the rear garden of the host property and fail to appear as a subordinate garden addition, resulting in a loss of the green open character to the rear of the property and surrounding area resulting in harm to the character and appearance of the conservation area contrary to policies D1 and D2 of the Camden Local Plan 2017.

The proposed outbuilding by virtue of its siting, scale and height would result in a loss of outlook to the occupiers of the ground floor flat within 8 Cliff Road to the detriment of their amenity, contrary to Policy A1 of the Camden Local Plan 2017.

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
				<p>The proposed access stair would appear as an incongruous addition at an elevated height which would constitute unnecessary visual clutter and result in harm to the character and appearance of the conservation area contrary to policies D1 and D2 of the Camden Local Plan 2017.</p> <p>Details Page for Planning Application - 2017/7049/P  Site Address 59 Camden Road London NW1 9EU  Erection of first and second floor rear extensions to existing 8 bed House in Multiple Occupation (HMO) to form a 10 bed HMO</p> <p>Reason for rejecting  The proposed development, by reason of its siting, scale and location, would cause harm to the amenity of neighbouring residential occupiers, by way of loss of light and loss of outlook with increased sense of enclosure, contrary to Policy A2 of the London Borough of Camden Local Plan (2017).</p> <p>All the above concern me in the fact that it will affect the market value of my property as one of its attractive features is the leafy outlook and not being overlooked by an imposing building next door. Buying in a Conservation Area I thought would protect this lovely part of London.  I am glad the building is being repurposed to house homeless families but the design and imposing nature of the building gives me grave worries about my position having a flat next door. My neighbour on the ground floor has also informed me that the planning officer, Charlotte Meynell) declined a site visit (due to Covid restrictions) to her garden (mine backs onto hers directly) even though the Design Statement states "Particular regard will also need to be given to the gardens of the adjacent properties." I don't feel that this has been properly taken into consideration.</p> <p>The above said I would appreciate and urge you to review these, and other, objections and think about your residents' well being and happiness and revise the plans for 248-250.  Kind Regards  Liz Aslin</p>
2020/3737/P	Thomas Adams	10/10/2020 00:03:37	OBJ	<p>My objection to this redevelopment is that it's not in keeping with Camden's conservation standards, specifically the increased 2 story height, as well as the rear galleries that overlook the adjoining properties. If the surrounding buildings with much less population density are subject to such high standards to allow for neighbour privacy and sunlight why is it that a hostel with a much larger density should be allowed to be literally and figuratively above said standards?</p>
2020/3737/P	Wanda	11/10/2020 11:27:02	OBJ	<p>I live next door and I am 7.  I like that the hostel will become a home for families. I want families but I want privacy too and I don't want to feel blocked in by the new and much bigger hostel. I like to imagine and play games in my garden and I would feel uncomfortable and less free with lots of balconies overlooking me.  Please don't let the hostel be built with all the balconies at the back and please make it the same size as it is now.</p>



Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2020/3737/P	Dr Alyson Hall Yandoli	09/10/2020 19:18:31	OBJ	<p>As a resident of North Villas I am lodging an objection to the proposed development on behalf of myself and family. Firstly I was very concerned that we had not received notice of this planning application and so I have only just learned about a potential development that directly affects my family, that does not comply with the requirements of Camden Square conservation area and may have a detrimental impact on the vulnerable adults and children who would be housed in it.</p> <p>1. The proposed development would adversely affect my family as a six story building would be intrusive, visible from all floors of our house (present building cannot be seen) blocking existing views of trees and open skyline.</p> <p>2. Camden is becoming very densely populated with new tall buildings crammed into all available spaces and in particular the high rise developments of King's Cross have changed a leafy borough with views over London into a cityscape to the south. The Camden Square conservation area with beautiful streets, tall trees and its local outdoor amenities provides an oasis, especially for flat dwellers who live here. The development does not comply with the requirements of Camden Square conservation area that the borough has protected so well and would set a dangerous precedent. The present building is lower than the trees and houses on Camden Rd and its roof design is in keeping with surrounding older buildings whereas the proposed building is six storeys instead of four, has a flat roof and projection with stairs and balconies to the rear that would encroach on the privacy and environment of the mews.</p> <p>3. I accept the acute need for social housing and homeless family accomodation but I am astonished that Camden is proposing replacing the existing building providing such accommodation with an expensive new build, crowding many more families onto the same site. So many small units on one site would be difficult to manage and likely to pose risks to vulnerable adults and children. Homeless families should live in their own borough with access to health, mental health, social care services and continuity of education for their children but the provision needs to be relatively small, well managed and integrated in the community. I support Camden in its attempts to improve such provision but a development of this size within the few streets that already have a lot of residential accommodation for vulnerable individuals, including those with severe mental health problems, must be rejected. There is currently a vacant privately owned hostel for homeless families in North Villas that should be used by Camden with on site management and access to local services to increase our local homeless provision. Its use by other boroughs over many years without on site support has proved very problematic for local residents, dangerous to those living there and a huge drain on local emergency services.</p> <p>I would not object to a redevelopment of the existing building or replacement with a new build but maintaining the existing size and contours and protecting the trees for this purpose. The desired increase in units could be achieved by using the vacated buildings in North Villas.</p>

<b>Application No:</b>	<b>Consultees Name:</b>	<b>Received:</b>	<b>Comment:</b>	<b>Response:</b>
2020/3737/P	Margaret Harvey	09/10/2020 17:31:50	OBJ	Proposed Homeless Families Hostel 248-250 Camden Road NW1 9HE

My property in Camden Mews is just behind 246 Camden Road.

I have NO objection whatsoever to the current Women's Hostel being demolished and replaced with a Homeless Families Hostel. We all realise and sympathise with the Council regarding the current homeless housing situation, that there is an urgent need to house vulnerable and homeless families in Camden.

I am a Chair of Governors in two Camden Primary schools, one of which is acknowledged to be the school with the highest deprivation in Camden, so I am well aware of the plight of families who find themselves homeless often through no fault of their own and others who are escaping abusive partners.

When the original plans were drawn up and the public invited to view them last July 2019, no one objected to the design as it looked very much like the current 4 storey building on the same size footprint with internal stairs and corridors. Residents were also pleased that the Council had engaged one of the UK's leading Passivhaus Sustainable Architects. Then a year on, we learnt that another company had been commissioned to design a 6 storey building with external rear balconies/walkways and a large external stair tower. Instead of the usual London brick, there was to be green gloss tiles which are not in keeping with the Conservation Area. Local residents asked to meet with the architect and planning officer and a Zoom meeting was arranged for the 14th September. Both architect and planning officer noted the many comments and concerns and promised to take note and call another meeting to answer/comment on the points raised. This second meeting was held on the 23rd September. Residents noted at that meeting that very little if anything had changed. To say there was disappointment, was an understatement.

My objections to the proposed Hostel are based on the following:

- 1) the sheer height and size of the building being 2 storeys higher than the current building and any of the adjoining houses along that part of Camden Road. This makes me anxious for those families who will occupy the two top floors.
- 2) 6 storeys will obliterate the skyline for residents in the Mews behind and those on North Villas.
- 3) the use of green gloss tiles which will be totally out of character in our Conservation Area where London brick is the preferred building material and more acceptable on the eye.
- 4) the placing of the long open balconies/access on each floor for access to the 36 studio flats with a stair tower thus causing excessive noise and light to all those residents at the back and beyond. Noise travels across the Mews and over to the higher buildings on North Villas due to the lower buildings along the Mews. (this was evident in roofing works being carried out recently on Camden Road on a nearby property which gave the impression that the talking and music was on North Villas when in fact it was on Camden Road!)
- 5) Upon looking at the plans of the stair tower itself, we were informed that the open plan stairway corridors would have limited seating and that a parent could look down on their children playing in the limited play area below. There could well be a possible safeguarding issue here in that it would be difficult for any observer to see all of the garden/play area but only half of the area due to the stair tower jutting out into the garden/play area.
- 6) the one common entrance/exit into the building was another cause for concern and raised questions around fire risk. Given that residents would need to exit from the back should there be a fire (God forbid) or another kind of emergency, they would be exiting out as the fire service or emergency service would be entering through the same exit/entrance!

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
				<p>We have asked THREE times to see a Fire Risk Assessment and none has been forthcoming.</p> <p>7) We were informed that the number of residents that could occupy the site at any one time given the increased capacity with the 2 extra storeys, would probably be in the region of 120. This is an enormous number given the size of the actual footprint of the property.</p> <p>8) The limited space at the back which is designed to offer a play area/ sandpit/ garden seating/ veg patch plus a community room and a one bed flat for wheelchair access was another concern again given the footprint of the property.</p> <p>9) Two residents whose property will be up against the community room were concerned at the loss of light into their living room/kitchen.</p> <p>We want to work with the Council not against it and we want to see these families placed in comfortable, safe accommodation for the duration of their stay.</p> <p>So, please Camden, do the following for all our sakes:</p> <p>A) Reduce the height from 6 to 4 storeys</p> <p>B) Use London brick and not green glossy tiles</p> <p>C) Have internal corridors and stairs so as to make it safe for young families and reduce the light intrusion and noise to adjacent neighbours</p> <p>D) Re-examine the entrance/exit to make any escape safe if a fire breaks out or other emergency</p> <p>E) Insure that the back area is sufficiently fenced to prevent dealers or abusive ex-partners being able to scale properties and enter the building as they could well do if the open corridors at the back go ahead as per the current plans.</p> <p>Thank you.</p> <p>Margaret Harvey.</p>

---

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2020/3737/P	Kavita Kapoor	09/10/2020 17:32:08	OBJ	<p>To whom it concerns, I own property next door to this proposal and OBJECT to the planning application for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-Light pollution ĳ The proposed walkways and stair tower will need to be lit when it is dark and this will harm the residents and our neighbour health and well-being</li> <li>-Noise: The proposed walks ways will be in used 24 hours, this will create stress during the day and make it difficult for residents and neighbours to sleep at night</li> <li>-Massing and size: The new design is two clear storeys higher than surrounding properties on Camden Road. It will create a sense of enclosure, furthermore, 246 Camden Road will also be overlooked</li> <li>-Fire risk ĳ The proposal refers to a fire risk assessment document but this does not appear to be included in the documentation. There is only one exit which would also have to be an entrance for emergency services in the event of a fire.</li> <li>- Boundary Security: The submission from the police calls for several stringent security measures including, a fence almost 2 metres high which will be on the boundary between our properties. I believe this will result in 246 Camden Rd needing a new front and side gate, new boundary walls and a rebuild of our shared garden spaces. However, the plans indicate the removal of the front boundary wall and boundary gates.</li> <li>- Parking Security: The proposal reduces the parking space to a single spot for residents requiring disability assistance. The property in its current form needs more than a single parking spot and often has emergency cars blocking the pavement outside.</li> </ul>

Thank you

---