
From: Mariachiara Butt [REDACTED]
Sent: 30 January 2023 12:15
To: Planning Planning
Cc: Camron Aref-Adib (Cllr); Sian Berry (Cllr); Anna Wright (Cllr);
editorial@camdennewjournal.com; dcarrier@camdennewjournal.co.uk
Subject: Mansfield development- 2022/5320/P

A leaflet put through my letterbox has prompted me to consider the question of parking and traffic in our tranquil neighbourhood should this proposed huge care home for 78 patients be approved. As the leaflet correctly points out, there has been a total disregard for Transport Strategy: **no adequate provisions have been made for on site parking of staff and visitors' cars and there will be a lot of these every day 24/7 , with 78 people in care and using the standard 7:5 staff/patient ratio, that equates to 109 workers. All these people will need to get to the home, often at unsocial hours. This will apply 7 days a week.**

There will also be hundreds of visitors during the week and every weekend, equalling to a potential hundred+ cars every weekend, marginally fewer during the week ...with no parking facilities on site they will all spill onto Croftdown rd, York Rise and Brookfield Pk first (these roads already chock-a-block at weekends because of the Farmers' Markets, Heath users and events at the 4 local schools) and this will have a ripple effect on all other roads in the neighbourhood (Laurier Rd, Boscastle Rd).

In Dartmouth Park we only have a 2 hour a day CPZ and we would hate to be forced to extend this to a 8 hour a day 7 days a week as it is in some other parts of London.

I am not opposed to a care home in principle but provision for parking on the site **MUST** be made. An underground car park would be the obvious solution, if geologically feasible, this being a solution adopted everywhere else in the world these days. This solution would allow the green space /gardens to be retained and it would solve the parking problem and the negative impact on the wider community, namely the residents of Croftdown Rd, York Rise, Laurier Rd, Woodsome Rd, Brookfield Pk etc... It would not solve the traffic problem of course... but it would be better than nothing. Unfortunately the developer's approach is all about maximising profit at the detriment of others: the residents of Dartmouth park (and I am one) do not deserve to see their parking amenity taken away from them so a greedy developer can save himself money and turn a huge profit.

On the contrary, the residents of Dartmouth Pk have all the right to see the parking status quo preserved: many are elderly and rely heavily on family members to visit for care, bring in groceries or be taken shopping..others are growing families with a lot of food shopping that can only be done by car.. some may use their cars for business...all have contractors coming and going to attend to the constant repairs that ageing Victorian houses need...Parking is a big issue in our area (as everywhere else) and not one that deserves to be dismissed so lightly as part of the eco war on cars. (We all use them and need them sooner or later).

I also object to this planning application on other grounds:

1. HEIGHT: vastly increased, in order to maximise profit the building has been made taller and wider than the original footprint of the clubhouse (now demolished) on which the planning approval/consent had been originally granted back in 2017. (Planning Inspectorate APP/X5210/W/16/3153454 of 27/01/2017)

The developer thinks he can get away with this by using as a point of reference for the height of the new building the height of the top of a tiny prefab plant shed that was originally plonked on top of the clubhouse roof. This little prefab shed represented only about 5% of the original building roof area yet this height has been extended to the whole of the new building. It is an insult to everyone 's intelligence that the developer thinks that the height of the original little shed can be used as the parameter on which to base the final height of the whole building (a dishonest expedient). Thus the volume of the building is a lot greater than the original clubhouse volume, upon which the developer is pretending it is based as per original approved planning application - Planning Inspectorate APP/X5210/W/16/3153454 of 27/01/2017.

2. LIGHT: As one of the neighbours in York rise points out, all the gardens in York rise are in a dip, at a lower level from the proposed building, so the height of the new building will greatly affect sun light (sun rises behind the building and the taller the building the later it will rise for the residents of York rise) and reduce the number of hours of enjoyment of such light at the detriment of wellbeing and mental health.

3. PRIVACY: The fact that York rise properties are in a dip also contribute to the total [REDACTED] both in gardens and homes as the new building will be towering over in a most [REDACTED] with windows and balconies looking straight onto gardens and into windows.

Moreover: **the new building has been moved out of the footprint of the original clubhouse (going against the existing planning permission currently granted)** and closer to the York rise residents' tiny gardens, thus towering in a menacing and intrusive way.

This will greatly affect residents quality of life, enjoyment of their properties, wellbeing and mental health. Why should one group of people (the developer and his profit) have their amenity at the cost of others!

Setting aside that moving out of the footprint of the clubhouse had been ruled out in the previous planning application that the council granted in appeal in 2017 (Planning Inspectorate APP/X5210/W/16/3153454 of 27/01/2017) (that must count for something right?) and that the new developer bought the land with that planning application in place if, and I stress IF, the building was ever in need to be moved out of the above mentioned footprint of the original Mansfield clubhouse, surely it should be moved towards the tennis courts and the greater open spaces of Dartmouth pk Avenue where the residents' gardens are so large that such move would be of negligible effect and hardly noticed. It is only in the name of fairness.

M Butt

Designer

MCBI

T [REDACTED]

E [REDACTED]

W. www.mcbinteriors.co.uk

[REDACTED]

Mariachiara Butt

Designer

MCBI

T [REDACTED]

E [REDACTED]

W. www.mcbinteriors.co.uk

