

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2020/5633/P	Linus Rees	02/01/2021 23:03:53	OBJ	<p>I wish to make the following comments on this application:</p> <p>Principle of demolition and rebuild</p> <p>I have no concerns about demolish-and-rebuild at Tottenham Mews as the existing building is of very poor quality and appears only to have been intended for temporary use.</p> <p>Principle of mix of uses at Tottenham Mews</p> <p>The applicant proposes a mix of social-rented and intermediate affordable housing on the ground and upper floors and affordable commercial floorspace on the ground and basement floors at this site. The mix of uses and type of housing proposed is acceptable.</p> <p>Housing quantity and quality</p> <p>The proposal is connected to the Network Building application whereby the applicant has chosen to remove existing private rented accommodation from Whitfield Street. As the applicant wishes to develop a purely commercial site at the Network Building all the housing offered by the applicant is being crammed on to one small site at Tottenham Mews. This has led to a very unsatisfactory proposal.</p> <p>Firstly, the housing target from these two applications is about 62 homes (6,203 sqm) to match the uplift in non-residential floorspace and the loss of the seven private rented flats. Of the 62 homes up to 27 should be affordable homes (2,679 sqm) as required by policy. Yet only 23 homes (2,339 sqm) are being offered and just ten of these at social rent. The proposals deliver a net loss of market homes and an insufficient number of affordable homes. The decision to put all the housing on the Tottenham Mews site furthermore produces a poor quality, cramped and a bulky and imposing overdevelopment. I object to the lack of housing being proposed and the way what is being proposed is being crammed on to one small site, instead of multiple sites.</p> <p>Public open space and private amenity space.</p> <p>Policy A2 of Camden's plan requires that nine square metres of public open space (POS) is provided per occupier of residential accommodation. Which means around 360 square metres of POS should be provided at the Tottenham Mews site. Yet none is being offered. Only some private amenity space is offered for some of the intermediate affordable flats and only Juliet balconies are offered for the rest. The public realm proposed to connect Tottenham Mews and Bedford Passage is very poor. The connection is not open to the sky but accessed by an uninviting covered alleyway. I object to the lack of any public open space and the lack of private amenity space.</p> <p>Tottenham Mews design</p> <p>The development of the Tottenham Mews site offers very poor quality of housing due the proximity of buildings to the west and the lack of any amenity - public or private - for the occupants of the social housing. Some of the homes have windows that are too close to the pedestrian and cycle thoroughfare connecting to Bedford Passage. The principle of pedestrian and cycle permeability I support but not the proposed design. I also feel this is an overdevelopment for a small mews site such as this and will have a very negative impact on the</p>

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
				<p>existing residents in Tottenham Mews, and would be a lost opportunity to construct a well designed scheme that fits in and improves upon its surroundings. The proposals as they are will not make for a very happy coexistence of existing and new residents. I object to this aspect of the application.</p> <p>For the reasons stated above the application should be refused, and the applicants instructed to present plans that deliver housing and public open space to comply with policy; and to deliver it across both sites, or find an additional site to deliver the full quantum of housing (about 62 homes) that is required by policy.</p>
2020/5633/P	Celia Collins	03/01/2021 11:33:54	OBJ	<p>While we believe that the regeneration of the disused NHS outpatient building will be beneficial, we object to the height of the building proposed. We believe it would significantly reduce our levels of sunlight. Their calculations seem to be based on a previous consented scheme, and at the very least should be redone according to the new buildings being constructed in the area.</p>