

| Application No: | Consultees Name: | Received: | Comment: | Response: |
|-----------------|------------------|---------------------|----------|---|
| 2020/5473/P | Moni Sheehan | 17/12/2020 14:47:00 | OBJ | <p>I am very concerned that the planning application for this development appears to be proceeding without any apparent opposition and with minimal consultation with local residents. None of the neighbours I have spoken to in my block knew anything about the proposal for a 15-storey building, and all of them oppose it.</p> <p>I object to the proposal and request that it be rejected for the following reasons.</p> <p>1) The development is a self-contained project that offers little, if any benefit to the local community. Rather, the construction of a 15-storey block for student accommodation will have a negative impact on existing local residents who are mostly families with children. It will be detrimental to their health, to the quality of their environment and their lives. It's a recipe for increased social problems. If it goes ahead, it will be disastrous for us.</p> <p>2) The area is already densely populated. The population here has risen significantly in recent years, and is about to increase even more, with the erection of high new residential and office blocks - on the Netley Primary School site, and ongoing developments on Longford Street, Regent's Place, St Anne's Church and the Lantern site on the corner of Hampstead Road and Drummond Street. Squeezing in an additional 239 student rooms in a block on 35-37 William Road will add extra stress to an already stressed, overcrowded and deprived area that lacks adequate space and community facilities.</p> <p>3) It compromises the health and welfare of local residents, particularly children, including the children in Netley Primary School opposite the site, for whom air pollution already constitutes a problem. This area has suffered continuously for many years from extensive building work on the sites listed above as well as from works related to HS2, causing significant disruption, air and noise pollution, traffic chaos and road closures in these narrow streets. Construction of the MBU scheme would add to that for a sustained period of time (years?), creating even more dust particles from demolition and rebuilding, as well as extra noise, traffic pollution and congestion from lorries and cranes trundling to and fro, plus additional access and road safety issues.</p> <p>4) It creates a poorer quality environment in an already deprived area. The proposed 15-storey building will obscure even more of the sky when so much has already been blotted out. Like other developers, MBU justifies the height of its development with the argument that this is an inner city area which already has some high buildings. Unfortunately this type of justification has resulted in more and more and ever higher buildings being erected over the past few years, dominating some of the narrow streets. Drummond and Longford Street, for example, have become claustrophobic and oppressive, hemmed in by tall buildings on either side with the sky just a passageway between them. This ugly high-rise environment deprives our children of a sense of space and beauty, and literally limits their horizons. If this proposal is approved, it will extend and intensify that inhospitable uninspiring landscape, as well as casting shadows and limiting the light.</p> <p>5) This is primarily an area for families with children. A concentration of 239 students in one block plus their visitors on our doorstep creates the potential for increased problems. These include increased nuisance and noise into the small hours from social gatherings, as well as increased littering and traffic of various kinds (for example, a lot more delivery vehicles from online shopping and food orders). I speak from years of experience of a succession of students living next door to me. Students are only here temporarily and have no particular interest in the welfare of, or contributing to the local community.</p> |

Application No: Consultees Name: Received:

Comment:

Response:

6) MBU Capital has not been upfront and transparent with local residents about their plans, contrary to their claim that their planning submission follows “months of conversation with local residents and groups” (their email to me dated 4 December). None of the neighbours I have spoken to in my block which is directly opposite the site, knew anything about the proposal for a 15-storey building.

Instead of an honest straightforward letter stating clearly that a 15-storey building was planned on that corner, I received two separate flyers about the plan through my letterbox, mixed in with, and easily mistaken for junk mail. Neither mentioned a 15-storey block or any building height. Moreover, the link given on the flyers to the online “Virtual Exhibition” didn’t work until after I emailed the Company to correct the error on 23 October, 5 days before the “consultation” period ended on 28 October. Even then, the plan for a 15-storey block was buried away in section 7 in small print with only a brief mention, not prominent at all and easy to miss on a website that isn’t very user-friendly. Only a person with a computer who is computer literate and determined could have spotted it. Many people here do not have computers, but similarly, if they had ordered a paper copy, the reference to a 15-storey building would have been hard to find.

This area has suffered enough already. It's important that this scheme does not go ahead in its present form. Please reject this application.

| Application No: | Consultees Name: | Received: | Comment: | Response: |
|-----------------|------------------|---------------------|----------|--|
| 2020/5473/P | Moni Sheehan | 26/12/2020 15:39:54 | OBJ | <p>Further to my previous comment dated 17/12/20 I want to object strongly to the developer's comment that its development will have a positive health impact on the area. On the contrary, this plan will be detrimental to community health and will have a negative social impact. My comments here refer particularly to the developer's Health Impact Assessment, but also to their lack of consultation as well as to the lack of adequate site notices from Council.</p> <p>The Regent's Park Estate is a deprived part of Camden, an inner city area with a significant proportion of residents who are vulnerable and suffer from health problems. We have already endured years of continuous extensive demolition and construction works within a few hundred yards of our homes, bringing with them significant air, traffic and noise pollution as well as social disruption. These have all aggravated existing problems.</p> <p>So-called "mitigation" during building works has not prevented pollution and nuisance – you can smell it, taste it and hear it in this area. This new development promises years more of the same, and if it goes ahead we will continue to breathe in even more poisonous air and suffer more problems.</p> <p>1) The developer states that "the temporary (health) impacts brought by construction activities are considered to be neutral;" that with mitigation measures "the temporary construction phase impacts on air quality are expected to be neutral;" and that "any residual effects will not be significant." (sections 5.1.4 – 5.1.8). This is incorrect wishful thinking.</p> <p>2) The developer states that health services will be minimally impacted. This is incorrect. GPs surgeries around here are already under extreme pressure, given the poor health of the local population. Even before the Covid pandemic, it was impossible to get a doctor's appointment at most surgeries around here within two weeks unless it was really urgent. Similarly there were always long waits for hospital appointments and to be seen at UCH A&E. Increased use, however small by students, put an additional burden on already stretched services. (5.1.45-8)</p> <p>3) The developer states that the impact on the social infrastructure will be positive. On the contrary, it will be negative. The extra pressure of squeezing in another 259 people plus visitors and workers into this already densely-populated area, will add extra social and psychological stress upon residents. (5.1.54) The plan offers no benefit to the local community.</p> <p>4) The developer states that the plan will encourage healthier streets – it won't. The creation of 223 cycle spaces will cause extra congestion and traffic issues in these narrow, densely-populated streets, with so many students concentrated in such a small footprint of land. There could be swarms of cyclists. This is a particularly concerning road safety issue because of Netley School opposite the site. I have already nearly been knocked over several times by careless cyclists on the road and on pavements in the streets around here.</p> <p>5) The developer states that effective and extensive consultation has been conducted with residents. This is not true. Two flyers in letterboxes with NO mention of a 15 storey building do not constitute consultation.</p> <p>Additionally, this consultation has not met the statutory requirements regarding Site Notices. There are only three notices posted in this area, which I have just spotted today after deliberately looking for them. There</p> |

| Application No: | Consultees Name: | Received: | Comment: | Response: |
|-----------------|------------------|---------------------|----------|---|
| | | | | <p>should have been ten. The instructions on the back of them state "Multiple Site Notices Required". It lists the locations: 3 on Stanhope St, 3 on William Road, 2 on Prince of Wales Passage and 2 on Netley St. Instead there are only 2 in William Road and 1 outside 54 Stanhope Street (not near the Addison Lee site). There are NO notices at all in any of the other locations. Most importantly there are none at all outside Pangbourne or in the part of Stanhope Street immediately affected by the proposal.</p> <p>The three notices that have been posted fall far short of the ten required. I don't know how long they have been there. They are not obvious and are easy to miss. It depends on exactly where you walk and what your vision is like as to whether you'll see them. The two on William Road may not have been seen by many local residents because some of us began avoiding that through-route when the footpath was impeded for a long time by building works at the junction with Hampstead Road, or we walked on the opposite side of the road to reach the bus stop on Hampstead Road. The solitary notice on Stanhope Street won't have been seen by many Regents Park Estate locals who, like me, usually walk on the opposite side of the street to the side the lamp post it is on.</p> <p>This plan will have a huge and disastrous impact on existing residents living near to this development and on local children. It is wrong to proceed on the false premise that we have been consulted.</p> |
| 2020/5473/P | Mark McQuillan | 24/12/2020 16:25:40 | COMMNT | <p>I am one of the leaseholders at 21-33 William Road.</p> <p>I don't here raise any objection in principle to the development but I have a comment and a question:-</p> <p>The proposed ground floor amenity area for the proposed new development at 35/37 William Road may provide only very limited amenity while at the same time it may have some potential to have some impact to rooms at the rear of the building at 21-33 William Road, which is all residential dwellings. The area is residential and very quiet. DP9 & the developers planning consultants (who have been very helpful)- have helpfully indicated to me at the 'phone that this area would not be capable of being used at night time (evenings?) and I believe they said this would be under a planning condition. The 21 -33 William Road leaseholders' rooms at the rear are very quiet both during the day (with some residents working nights and sleeping days or working from home) and in the evening. I wondered if the ground floor amenity area is really a vital part of the proposed development, given the overall proposed new development which incorporates several other amenity elements elsewhere.</p> <p>It is not clear to me from the plans (as a non expert) what type of windows are proposed for the new development generally. I asked DP9 and they are checking and coming back to me.</p> <p>Thanks.</p> |

| Application No: | Consultees Name: | Received: | Comment: | Response: |
|-----------------|------------------|---------------------|----------|--|
| 2020/5473/P | Mark McQuillan | 24/12/2020 16:25:54 | COMMNT | <p>I am one of the leaseholders at 21-33 William Road.</p> <p>I don't here raise any objection in principle to the development but I have a comment and a question:-</p> <p>The proposed ground floor amenity area for the proposed new development at 35/37 William Road may provide only very limited amenity while at the same time it may have some potential to have some impact to rooms at the rear of the building at 21-33 William Road, which is all residential dwellings. The area is residential and very quiet. DP9 & the developers planning consultants (who have been very helpful)- have helpfully indicated to me at the 'phone that this area would not be capable of being used at night time (evenings?) and I believe they said this would be under a planning condition. The 21 -33 William Road leaseholders' rooms at the rear are very quiet both during the day (with some residents working nights and sleeping days or working from home) and in the evening. I wondered if the ground floor amenity area is really a vital part of the proposed development, given the overall proposed new development which incorporates several other amenity elements elsewhere.</p> <p>It is not clear to me from the plans (as a non expert) what type of windows are proposed for the new development generally. I asked DP9 and they are checking and coming back to me.</p> <p>Thanks.</p> |

| Application No: | Consultees Name: | Received: | Comment: | Response: |
|-----------------|------------------|---------------------|----------|--|
| 2020/5473/P | Ian Potter | 15/12/2020 13:16:45 | OBJ | <p>I have three points to make about this proposal.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) Precedent for increased building height and light restrictions 2) Continued disruption to an already highly populated area. 3) Increased air pollution created by taller buildings and increased traffic in a highly populated area. <p>A smaller building of 6-8 stories, matching those neighbouring the site, will be less disruptive, cause less pollution, and take less time to construct.</p> <p>The proposed construction will cut off a big chunk of daylight from an already over-crowded pocket of London. This area already suffers from poor daylight due to the ever increasing height of recent and ongoing construction. (I note a current development on Hampstead Road and William Road has notched up two extra stories than the building it is replacing). It feels as if a precedent has been set, and therefore developers are given carte-blanche to continue reaching for the skies. If this plan is consented to, then that gives a green light to other developers to target other buildings for similar schemes. The area has been under almost continuous building work for the last 5 years, and will continue for at least another 10 years on HS2 causing huge disruption and continuous inconvenience to local residents. We are continually being re-routed, with traffic often at a standstill whilst trying to circumnavigate detours and road closures, causing terrible levels of air pollution in the process. This is a high density residential area with schools close by. To take away yet more daylight and impose yet more disruption on this small but highly populated part of London is in my view irresponsible and detrimental to the quality of life for its residents both in the short term and long term. Pollution levels are already extremely high along along Hampstead Road, and Euston Road - drifting into this enclosed pocket of tall buildings, where it sits. The building's position will inevitably increase traffic threading through the already too small streets. Please please please think of local residents in this case - somebody is going to make a huge amount of money from a building which in my view gives very little back to the area. It will cause more traffic, and thus air pollution, it will cause disruption and it will impair on our already low light levels. Please refuse this application.</p> |

| | | | | |
|------------------------|-------------------------|------------------|-----------------|------------------|
| Application No: | Consultees Name: | Received: | Comment: | Response: |
|------------------------|-------------------------|------------------|-----------------|------------------|

| | | | | |
|-------------|-----------------|---------------------|--------|-----------------|
| 2020/5473/P | Raymond Cansick | 17/12/2020 13:18:35 | COMNOT | Dear Mr Farrant |
|-------------|-----------------|---------------------|--------|-----------------|

Re: planning application 2020/5473/P, 17-37 William Road London NW1 3ER

I am a leaseholder and resident of one of the residential units in 17-33 William Road and am a Director of the management company responsible for the building (Base Central NW1 Management Company Limited).

Overall I am supportive of this planning application but have the following comments.

Community engagement – whilst this was extensive and multi-faceted (e.g. letter, form, website, video conferencing), responses to questions raised were not answered appropriately. I sent questions on 29 September and participated in the video conference on 1 October when it was indicated I would receive answers to my questions 'within days'. I did not and had to chase multiple times including contacting the owners of the freehold. Eventually I received a response on 29 October to which I sent a follow-up question on 5 November which was never answered.

Existing 23-27 William Road residential facilities – currently the open area between the 17-33 and 35-37 William Road buildings contains three residential facilities which will need to be moved (1) electricity sub-station, (2) residential bin store, and (3) bike store that also contains storage for our cleaner and their lavatory and basin, and water pumps and tank(s). It is proposed that all these facilities will be moved to front onto William Road. During community engagement I raised concerns as to whether sufficient provision had been made for the relocation of these and offered to meet architects on site which was not taken up. Although a small change was made to the plans I remain unconvinced that the concerns raised have been fully addressed. It is less than ideal for these facilities to be located on the front of the building. However I welcome that there will be ongoing dialogue as the detailed designs are developed and hope that my concerns will be addressed fully in due course.

Planning notification – the company responsible for the community engagement made me aware of the planning application and I have seen the notices affixed to the lamp posts on William Road. However I have not received a letter from Camden Council and believe I and all residents of 17-33 William Road should have done so.

Public realm improvements – I particularly welcome the proposed improvements to the footway/pavement on William Road including the levelling and proposed use of paving slabs and the planting of trees. However I am concerned about the planters that are being proposed outside of the entrances to the residential units as it is unclear who would be responsible for the upkeep/maintenance of these and attempts at planters outside other properties on William Road have been a failure as the plants are vandalised and the planter areas used as waste bins. In addition these could be used as seating – see comments from PC Cope.

Student accommodation – it is unclear from the proposals whether the internal outside area will be accessible 24 hours a day and whether there will be an on-site and available facilities person to deal with any anti-social behaviour. If the outside space is accessible 24 hours a day then it has potential to cause a noise disturbance to the residents of particularly 27 William Road.

Transport routes and egress – due to COVID-19 and Camden's Health Schools Street initiative access to

| Application No: | Consultees Name: | Received: | Comment: | Response: |
|-----------------|------------------|-----------|----------|--|
| | | | | <p>William Road has changed since it seems some of these plans were developed e.g. there is no longer a turn into William Road from Hampstead Road and turning into William Road from Stanhope Street is limited to authorised vehicles during school drop-off and collection times. This needs to be factored into the construction management plan.</p> <p>Construction timing – timing of the re-development should take into account other developments currently underway in the immediate vicinity i.e. Regents Place, Longford House, Stephenson House replacement and of course HS2.</p> |
