
From: [REDACTED]
Sent: 28 January 2023 18:54
To: Planning Planning
Cc: Sian Berry (Cllr); Anna Wright (Cllr); 'Dan Carrier'
Subject: Application 2022/5320/P - Mansfield Bowling club site

[REDACTED]

I write to object to this planning application. I live on Laurier Road, though the site lies behind the houses opposite me so this is not a NIMBY objection.

Underestimated water

A weakness in the planning application is underestimating the local water table. The documents submitted with the planning application include a study of potential water problems, saying it will be perfectly all right. I don't believe that. There are small underground streams crossing the site on their way to the Fleet River, which runs under York Rise. One such goes under my neighbours' house at 39 Laurier Rd. The previous owners were accustomed to a couple of inches of water in the cellar every time it rained hard. Paul Epstein and Laura Binns who live there now built a sump to collect the water and pump it out into the drains. Fay and Dan Lapaine who live opposite Paul and Laura at number 44 have a permanently soggy patch at the end of their garden. Varma's care home, with its basement level full of plant and machinery, will be hard up against the fence at the bottom of their garden.

The people who used to live at 32 Laurier Rd (the last Victorian house on the Bowling club side of the road, with the church hall on the other side of their fence) had their lower ground floor made into one level and, despite assurances from the architects who had done test boreholes that it would be okay, it filled up with water. I remember Pia saying how she saw her life savings floating around in muddy water.

One of the reasons the very first planning application by the Bowling club, to build a line of houses up against the gardens of the houses on York rise, was refused was on the grounds of the likelihood of their foundations filling up with water.

When Generator put the site up for sale, having gained planning permission, it proved very difficult to sell. A conversation with the estate agent revealed that one of the things deterring buyers was the access Thames Water has across the site, following the underground channel taking water from the ponds on Hampstead Heath through to the Fleet River.

Parking

I don't have a car so this won't affect me, but local residents value being able to park on the street more or less outside their houses. As this would be a private care home, my guess is many visitors will not be local and not coming to see friends and relatives by bus, but driving from further afield. If only 10% of residents have a visitor, there will be enough parked cars to cause considerable inconvenience to local residents. One can envisage this leading to having to extend the two hour controlled parking, which successfully prevents commuters from parking here and walking down to Tufnell Park tube station, to much longer controlled parking hours. This will be both inconvenient when we have visitors, and also much more expensive.

One solution would be to provide more parking spaces on the site for visitors, but Generator tried this after getting planning permission to build houses on the site and was turned down. Quite apart from the environmental arguments against providing more parking, there will be the noise from endless slamming car doors.

Public park

The plan includes a small public park. This will last a matter of months. The same park was included in the previous planning application and Camden made it very clear that it would not be maintained by the council. In the case of the current proposed plan, the cost of maintaining the park would have to be the responsibility of the care home. Call me cynical, but I don't think they will wear this.

There is an example very nearby of what happens in these circumstances - Goddard Place, located just inside Islington, off Monnery Road. The development was built with open green space that was accessible to the public. The cost of maintenance and keeping it tidy was the responsibility of Goddard Place residents. After a few months, they got very tired of paying to pick up crisp packets dropped by visiting riffraff, and the gates went up so only residents could get in.

With so many schools in the area, there is constant pedestrian traffic on Croftdown road. A little park will be a magnet to 6th form LASWAP students who can be found sitting on the walls of the houses of Regency Lawn throughout the day. You only have to visit the park next to the reservoir on Dartmouth Park Hill and see the Acland Burghley students there during school hours to see what would happen to a park tucked away just off Crofton Road.

Then there are all the children going to and from Brookfield school. As it is, the residents of Regency Lawn object to sound carrying from the Brookfield playgrounds 200 hundred yards away. The noise of children playing so close to their living room windows will cost the NHS a fortune in measures to reduce the collective blood pressure of Regency lawn.

Other objections, concerning building design, mass and materials are being made by others more qualified to speak on such matters, but can you take it that I think this proposed building is far too big for the site, nor is it within the footprint of the former Mansfield clubhouse, which was a condition of any development on the site. Has this changed?

Yours,



Amy Silverston

*37 Laurier Road
London NW5 1SH*

