

Appendix 3: Neighbour representations

Key points	Objection (summarised)	Response
Loss of openness	Loss of openness and natural greenery is detrimental to visual amenity.	The proposed architecture would be of a high quality and the scheme would improve the public realm, particularly the access down to Tewksbury Road from Seven Sisters Road. The area of hardstanding, scrub, and bleak stairwell walkway which is detrimental to visual amenity would be improved.
Overdevelopment	The proposed development would not replace the public amenity space lost and would exhibit symptoms of site overdevelopment. It would be domineering and overbearing in relation to Cara House and the terrace on Seven Sisters Road which has some heritage value.	The part of the site to the corner of Seven Sisters and Eade Roads is a vacant plot that is in private ownership and allocated for development. Whilst this vacant plot would be built upon the development would improve the public realm, including the walkway and the land adjacent to the site on Tewksbury Road.
Out of scale and character	The proposed architecture is out of scale and character with the wider Warehouse District and is not a good indicative gateway, as it resembles luxury flats rather than warehouse living.	The design of the building is supported by the QRP and the GLA. The materials have been carefully selected to reflect materials in the Warehouse District whilst being sympathetic to the immediate surroundings.
Unaffordable	Affordability is a key component of warehouse living and so £950 per room would be inadequate and more indicative of renting a room in a luxury flat. This price would only be for a room, not a flat, so it would be impossible for people who live in the Warehouse District to live	The rent at £950 is at the upper end of rents in the District, given the new build nature of the scheme and the need for it to be viable and still deliver the proposed public realm improvements and commercial spaces. For comparison the figure would be similar to LLR rents for intermediate

	<p>in the building and so it would be out of character with the Warehouse District. The lack of an affordable housing payment in lieu is also unacceptable and weighs heavily against in the overall planning balance.</p>	<p>housing in the area. The scheme cannot support a payment in lieu due to the viability position which is at zero and a late stage review will secure a contribution should these rents be exceeded.</p>
<p>Daylight/sunlight assessment errors</p>	<p>The daylight impact assessment uses an alternative VSC daylight target of 15% instead of 27% - this is therefore not in accordance with BRE guidance.</p>	<p>An alternative target value has been set at 15%. This represents a more contextually appropriate level of daylight when taking into consideration the level of development in the area and the realistic levels of daylight currently enjoyed by residents. The use of the mid-teen VSC benchmark has been held to be appropriate in denser, more built-up areas like this one.</p>
<p>Unacceptable loss of light to Cara House</p>	<p>Based on the daylight/sunlight results provided, the proposal would result in a disproportionately adverse daylight impact with a high proportion of major adverse VSC impacts on Cara House. Along with increased sense of enclosure, loss of outlook and overbearingness issues, there would be an unacceptable impact on the amenity of Cara House residents.</p>	<p>Overall, where windows do not meet the BRE target value nearly all windows retain the alternative target VSC value or are within a room that contains at least one window which does so. In a small number of cases, the window is also obstructed by the architecture of Cara House itself and, were the obstructions to daylight not present, these three windows would also likely meet the alternative target value for VSC. As such, the overall impact to this building is considered minor adverse and thus acceptable.</p>
<p>Overshadowing</p>	<p>The ground floor area behind Cara House including Catwalk Place acts as a mini-town square of the Warehouse District and should be tested for how it is impacted in terms of appearing to be overshadowed by the proposal.</p>	<p>It should be noted that light to this area is already blocked by massing from existing buildings. Given this and the distance from the site it is not considered necessary that it is assessed. In any case, it is likely this space would not be heavily</p>

		overshadowed throughout the summer months when the space is most likely to be in use.
Consultation concern relating to Vivian House (VH) in Hackney	Residents of Vivian House were not consulted.	Vivian House is in Hackney. Hackney Council was notified of the application and a letter was sent to the building. Moreover, several site notices were placed around the site publicising the application and an advert was placed in the newspaper. Sufficient consultation was therefore carried out.
Overshadowing of VH	The building would overshadow Vivian House.	The tallest part of the proposal would be sited away from the built form of Vivian House and to the south of the site so would not overshadow it.
Noise and disturbance from construction/occupants	There would be noise and disturbance from construction and from future residents.	Building works would need to comply with the Borough's required timings for noisy works – i.e. Monday to Friday, 8am to 6pm and Saturday, 8am to 1pm. Any instances of statutory nuisance would be investigated and dealt with by Environment Health teams.
Pressure on health services	Pressure will be placed on GP services.	Whilst some residents are likely to move to the development from other local areas, there would be some additional pressure on services. The NHS has requested £65,761 to expand existing sites to mitigate this. However, the viability position would not allow for a contribution.
Overshadowing and loss of light to surrounding buildings	The proposal would overshadow the surrounding area and disregard the access to daylight that current residents enjoy.	The majority of windows around the site meet the target daylight and sunlight values with the proposal in place. Where this is not the case, the window in question either meets the alternative target value

		<p>which is more reflective of the context or is obstructed to daylight and sunlight by the architecture of adjoining buildings itself. As such, the daylight and sunlight impact is considered acceptable.</p> <p>In overshadowing terms, the neighbouring gardens at 347-351 Seven Sisters Road do not meet the target sunlight amenity value in March but are shown to be well sunlit in June and thus are likely to be well sunlit across the summer months when this space is most likely to be in use. This would also be the case for other open spaces further from the site.</p>
Lack of parking	The development lacks sufficient parking spaces for both existing and future residents.	Sufficient parking in line with planning policy has been provided. In any case, surveys carried out by the applicant identify sufficient capacity on neighbouring streets.
Privacy concerns	The proximity and scale of the proposed development raise significant privacy concerns. It would compromise the privacy of residents in Cara House, Cut Room, and Tewkesbury Road. The design allows for direct visibility into private spaces.	Window to window distances between Cara House and Block B would be approximately 13m. These distances would be shorter (approximately 9m at the closest point) from Block A. However, these views would be oblique given the orientation/angle of the north elevation of Block A. These distances and relationships would preserve privacy and be acceptable.
Security concerns	The inclusion of units designated for "creative commercial" use positioned in close proximity to residential areas poses security risks and further intrudes upon the privacy of residents.	These uses would be located within Tewksbury Yard where there is currently no activation or passive surveillance or on the busy Seven Sisters Road. They would be sited within the scheme but in

		suitable locations and/or away from the existing and proposed residential areas.
Restrict road access	Additionally, the proposed development would restrict road access for both Cara House and Cut Room, leading to challenges in transportation, creative endeavours, and general movement within the area. This limitation could have a negative impact on the overall liveability and functionality of the neighbourhood.	The proposal would include bays and turning space for vehicles within Cara Yard for delivery and servicing.
Removal of trees	The proposed development would necessitate the removal of existing trees and disrupt the wildlife habitat behind the Fish and Chip van. This loss of greenery and environmental diversity would negatively impact the visual appeal and overall character of the area.	Some trees of little amenity and biodiversity value would be removed. Landscaping would be secured by condition which would improve greening and biodiversity.
Disabled access	The development obstructs disabled access to Cara House by blocking the back entrance. The absence of alternative solutions, such as ramps or other accessible features, raises concerns about the elimination of disabled access entirely.	Accessibility across the area has been a key issue for the design team and as a result of the proposals access for wheelchair users will be significantly enhanced within all public realm areas. With the specific issue in relation to rear access to Cara House there is no intention to change the access arrangement.
Loss of car parking	With the car park of my home being the site of the build, this will force people who use and need their vehicles to park on the road and not have direct access to the house for transferring equipment and will push these vehicles to park on the road and, making the area busier and force locals to move further out in to other areas	There is no formal parking in this area. However, the applicant recognises the needs of certain residents to load and unload equipment etc which would still be possible through use of the delivery bays. Parking is possible on Eade Road and if this is not possible then the applicant has committed to

	<p>to park. The proposed development will also bring with it more vehicle owners which will contribute to the overpopulation of the area and further lack of parking available.</p>	<p>looking to accommodate any essential parking needs within the existing Estate.</p> <p>The development would be car free with sufficient cycle parking in an area of high public transport accessibility.</p>
<p>Cotton Mill Yard</p>	<p>Concerned about the proposed development in general, but especially the development in the private Cutting Room Yard (Miss-labelled as Cotton Mill Yard on proposed plans).</p>	<p>As part of the site wide strategy (Masterplan Framework), it is envisaged that this space will be remodelled in consultation with residents. Key works would include implementation of wider SUDS strategy, provision of replacement and new cycle spaces and new refuse storage, lighting and seating and ecological enhancements. Given the need to work with residents on the design of this space the final design and delivery of this space would be controlled via a condition attached to any future planning permission.</p>
<p>No CEMP</p> <p>Ownership of yard space</p>	<p>This application does not include a Construction and Environmental Management Plan (CEMP).</p> <p>Cutting Room Yard labelled as Cotton Mill Yard on the plans is a private amenity space.</p>	<p>A condition would be attached to any planning permission requiring submission of a CEMP.</p> <p>The applicant has confirmed that the open space in this area does not belong to any particular building or group. Informal arrangements and use has developed over time. The applicant has committed to consulting with residents on its detailed design which would be secured by condition.</p>