

[REDACTED]

From: Patrick Marfleet
Sent: 13 September 2021 16:06
To: Planning Planning
Subject: FW: Comments on 2021/3504/P have been received by the council.

Please upload to the above.

Thanks

Patrick Marfleet
Senior Planning Officer

Telephone: 020 7974 1222



The majority of Council staff are continuing to work at home through remote, secure access to our systems. Where possible please communicate with us by telephone or email.

From: Elizabeth Mabey [REDACTED]
Sent: 18 August 2021 11:14
To: Patrick Marfleet <Patrick.Marfleet@camden.gov.uk>
Subject: Re: Comments on 2021/3504/P have been received by the council.

[EXTERNAL EMAIL] Beware – This email originated outside Camden Council and may be malicious Please take extra care with any links, attachments, requests to take action or for you to verify your password etc. Please note there have been reports of emails purporting to be about Covid 19 being used as cover for scams so extra vigilance is required.

Dear Patrick,

I have noticed that my below planning objection has not yet been uploaded onto the portal. Please can you do so at your earliest convenience.

Many thanks,

Elizabeth

On 13 Aug 2021, at 10:57, Elizabeth Mabey [REDACTED] wrote:

Dear Mr Marfleet,

I hope you are well. I wanted to forward you my objection comments on Application 2021/3504/P directly, as you are the case officer.

Many thanks in advance for considering them.

Best wishes,

Elizabeth Mabey

Begin forwarded message:

From: <planning@camden.gov.uk>
Subject: Comments on 2021/3504/P have been received by the council.
Date: 13 August 2021 at 10:53:51 BST
To: <[REDACTED]>

FAO Patrick Marfleet (patrick.marfleet@camden.gov.uk)

13 August 2021

Beaufort Court Planning Application Objection Comment

Application Reference: 2021/3504/P

Re: Application for a Single Rooftop Extension at Beaufort Court, 65 Maygrove Road, London NW6 2DA
Class A, Part 20, Schedule 2 of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) (England) Order 2015 (as amended)

As a current leaseholder and occupier in the building in question, I would like to lodge my objection to Planning Application No: 2021/3504/P in the strongest possible terms. The reasons for this objection and subsequent recommendation that this application is rejected outright are all made in line with Camden Council Planning Guidance on Amenity (January 2021) and the Camden Local Plan (2017), and are as follows:

1. Adverse effect on the property's residential amenity of neighbours WITHIN Beaufort Court:

1.1. Waste Management – The additional burden of 16 flats' worth of waste would further exacerbate the building's already poor waste management. Due to the applicant's poor management of the building's waste and recycling facilities, pest contractors have been engaged in the waste management area and across the building to exterminate vermin such as mice and rats. The applicant documentation states that sufficient facilities will be provided within the refuse storage areas on the basement floor and that 'space within the corridor of the basement will be used to store 2x1100lts bins for waste, 2x1280lts bins for recycling and 1x500lts bin for food waste.' The addition of more large bins will worsen what is already a risk to residents and waste removal professionals, as well as exacerbate the already high risk that vermin will proliferate further within the building and beyond to the surrounding neighbourhood and Peace Park. Policy CC5 (Waste) of the Camden Local Plan states that the Council will make sure that developments include facilities for the storage and collection of waste and recycling – the current application documentation falls well short of demonstrating that this will be provided safely.

1.2. Access – Cycle storage – Adequate cycle storage for all residents of the development, including for the 16 additional flats proposed by this extension, is of key importance given that the building is a car-free development. The applicant documentation states that ‘Thirty cycle spaces will be provided for the new development. These will be accommodated in the basement with the existing provision.’ However, it must be pointed out that the building’s current provision of cycle storage already falls well short of the required standard, even without the additional burden of 16 additional flats’ worth of necessary storage. Firstly, the provided cycle storage is not a safe or secure environment, with at least 3 separate burglaries of multiple bikes from the current cycle storage facility reported to Police (16 August 2019, 27 July 2020, 11 January 2021). Secondly, the documentation has not adequately evidenced how 30 additional cycle storage berths will be accommodated. Proposed plans show that only 56 bicycles will be able to fit into the reconfigured main cycle storage room, when, with an additional 16 flats, over 100 total cycle berths will need to be provided to accommodate the additional 30 berths that the application states must be added on top of current provision. Even with an additional 20 berths in another cycle room the number of cycle storage berths falls well short of the recommended number for the building as stipulated by The London Plan 2021. As per the Fortune Green & West Hampstead neighbourhood plan as adopted by Camden, Policy 8.5 recommends the provision of appropriate bicycle storage in residential and commercial development in order to meet the aims of Camden Local Plan Policy T1 - Prioritising walking, cycling and public. The Council must seek to ensure that this development provides for accessible, secure cycle parking facilities exceeding minimum standards outlined within the London Plan, and taking into account the size and location of the development and proposed extension as well as local cycle route infrastructure, the applicant should be demonstrating how to accommodate higher levels of provision. The current and proposed cycle storage provision means that the proposed extension will fall far short of meeting these requirements.

1.3. Relating and critical to both points above, it is my understanding that the Applicant does not own the basement space and must therefore demonstrate how it will gain the right to make the necessary changes (including building reconfiguration) and additions to waste and cycle storage despite having no ownership of these spaces.

2. Impacts of the proposed extension development on the amenity of residential neighbours surrounding Beaufort Court:

2.1. Overlooking - As the application itself states, the proposed additional storey would make the roof more prominent and highlight a more horizontal element of the scheme when viewing the site from the front than the rear. As per the Fortune Green & West Hampstead neighbourhood plan as adopted by Camden Council: ‘Roof extensions should fit in with existing rooflines [...] Such extensions should be in proportion to the existing building and should not block views.[...] C7. Maygrove Road: a number of large developments have been built and are planned for this road. Any further developments should be no higher than existing buildings on the street and should be mindful of the impact of other recent developments.’ The proposed extension will not fit in with existing rooflines, making the tallest building in the surrounding area even taller and therefore more overbearing.

2.2. Loss of privacy - furthermore, given that balconies are considered to impact on the privacy of neighbours even more than windows, the provision of 16 additional balconies will have a significant impact on privacy levels to the surrounding area and neighbours, especially those at 61-80 Maygrove Road.

2.3. Visual impact of the extension on the open aspect of the neighbourhood - an additional floor will enlarge the physical 'presence' of the building - its scale and mass will create an overbearing effect and oppressive feeling on surrounding neighbours and amenities; this will affect both residential neighbours along 61-80 Maygrove Road and users of the adjacent Peace Park.

2.4. Impact on use of local green spaces - The proposed development, in the absence of a legal agreement to secure a financial contribution towards the provision of, improvement to and maintenance of public open space in the surrounding area, would be likely to contribute unacceptably to pressure on the Borough's open space facilities which are already under significant load such as the Maygrove Peace Park, contrary to policies Policy A2 (Open space) and Policy DM1 (Delivery and monitoring) of the London Borough of Camden Local Plan Framework Core Strategy.

2.5. Loss of light - It is particularly important in this densely developed part of the borough to prevent overshadowing of amenity space and open spaces given the limited amount of open spaces and the existing amount of overshadowing; this extension will create an intrusive feeling as a result of the development for those residents of 61-80 Maygrove Road opposite Beaufort Court whose rooms are most sensitive to overlooking, ie. The main living areas and bedrooms will be in the line of sight, negatively affecting the quality of life of occupants and enjoyment of their properties by adjoining residential occupiers. and users of the Maygrove Peace Park, including children who use the playgrounds. Impact on one of a small number of Local Green Spaces within the area - The NPPF states as a core planning principle (17) that planning should “contribute to conserving and enhancing the natural environment” – this additional floor will do the opposite, hindering local users’ enjoyment of this award-winning public park that forms a focal point for the community in this part of the area and a highly significant local asset.

2.6. Independent verification of loss of light – As per the application documentation on the planning portal, no independent verification of the sunlight and daylight implications of the Development has been undertaken by a qualified surveyor on behalf of the Council. We would ask the Council to do so. Without this, it cannot conceivably be the case that the pre-application advice provided by officers was predicated upon any definitive or accurate (i.e. expert) conclusion that the Development would not give rise to unacceptable impacts in terms of loss of light and outlook for neighbours). This absence of proper scrutiny of the likely sunlight and daylight impacts of the Development represents a further basis on which the Application must be rejected.

2.7. For all of the reasons above, the proposed extension, by virtue of its additional height, mass and scale would result in an overdominant form of development causing harm to the streetscene and negatively impacting on enjoyment of neighbourhood amenity along Maygrove Road and the adjoining Peace Park, contrary to Policy A1 (Managing the impact of development) of

the London Borough of Camden Local Plan – that the Council will seek to protect the quality of life of occupiers and neighbours.

3. The proposed extension, in the absence of a legal agreement to secure the proposed affordable housing on-site, would fail to maximise the contribution of the site to the supply of affordable housing in the borough, contrary to policy H4 (Maximising the supply of affordable housing) of the London Borough of Camden Local Plan.

4. In line with the objection letter from lawyers instructed by Regal Property Investments Ltd sent on 12 August 2021 regarding this application, I would also like to highlight, repeat and strongly agree with the following further points which further strengthen the case for this application to be rejected outright:

4.1. The building is at least 18 metres high and so an application for prior approval should include a fire engineer's report confirming the external wall complies with Building Regulations. The current application does not provide such a report. Additional to this, the Council are currently investigating the external wall of the development.

4.2. The application does not sufficiently demonstrate that the building is detached, which it must be to qualify under permitted development rights.

4.3. The current compliant EWS1 form for the building would become invalidated (having taken over a year to obtain). Since the tragedy at Grenfell Tower and the concurrent heightened importance of fire safety in residential apartment buildings across London, it would be catastrophic to invalidate the work done by current leaseholders to acquire this certificate by granting this extension application.

Please consider the above objections and reject this Application.

Comments made by Elizabeth Mabey of Flat 77 Beaufort Court, 65 Maygrove Road, London, NW6 2DA

Phone [REDACTED]

EEmail [REDACTED]

Preferred Method of Contact is Email

Comment Type is Objection