

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2024/1039/P	Sonia Diash	28/03/2024 12:07:02	COMMNT	VALID GROUND OBJECTION. I OBJECT THE PLANNING PERMISSION.
2024/1039/P	Fiona Paulus	28/03/2024 12:07:57	OBJ	<p>Failure to preserve and enhance the Primrose Hill conservation area.</p> <p>Visual impact on the Primrose Hill conservation area.</p> <p>Impact on the setting of Cecil Sharp House, which is a lovely, Grade 2 listed building.</p> <p>Potential harm to existing buildings by adding a floor without a full understanding of the foundation.</p> <p>Negative impact on the wildlife by developing land behind Darwin Court, which is currently a wild area harbouring wildlife, trees and shrubs.</p>
2024/1039/P	Rob Macdonald	28/03/2024 17:23:31	COMMNT	I would like to object to this application. It is aesthetically / visually wrong. It leads to overcrowding ton the services and facilities of this conservation area. it is over development.
2024/1039/P	Anna Lovell	30/03/2024 14:26:35	OBJ	<p>I love the Primrose Hill Conservation area and visit it regularly. It draws people from across the world who walk up from Camden to the beautiful green space and architecture of Primrose Hill.</p> <p>Darwin Court and Cecil Sharp House, opposite, are landmarks on that journey. Whilst Darwin Court itself does not enhance the conservation area the buildings are largely hidden by the mature trees that surround it and the height of the Darwin Court buildings is currently commensurate with the surrounding conservation area, and Cecil Sharp House.</p> <p>From the street the tops of the mature trees currently largely shield the sight of the top floor Darwin Court flats and create a green curtain which protects the visual impact of the Conservation area.</p> <p>If this development goes ahead, I believe it would have a significant adverse impact upon the area. I am concerned that the surrounding mature trees will be fatally damaged by the proposed crane lifting and heavy works around the buildings. The impact of this will not just be the destruction of the trees but will also remove the shielding effect of the trees of Darwin Court from the conservation area.</p> <p>Even with the trees in place, the new penthouses will significantly exceed the height of the surrounding trees and, with their different coloured brick will impose themselves upon conservation area skyline.</p> <p>At night the window positioning of the penthouses will create light pollution and act as a beacon drawing the eye, as you walk along Gloucester Avenue, away from the elegant streetscape to the ugly new proposed development.</p> <p>Please reject this application. It would ruin an iconic area.</p>

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2024/1039/P	Helena Reeves	28/03/2024 16:53:37	OBJ	This is a bad idea for locals for many reasons, aside from the nuisance of such works, noise and pollution, the impact on the local wildlife, animals and humans, as well as trees and the potential damage thus will cause, beneficial only to greedy developers.
2024/1039/P	Rom Ash	03/04/2024 11:50:47	SUPC	I like this proposed development. The impact on the local conservation area seems negligible, the only suggestion is to match the brick exterior colour closer to the rest of Darwin Court buildings, as they looked paler in the renderings, though that might just be the drawings. The proposed landscaping also looks great, I like the ground forms and the shrubbery. I used to live in Darwin Court.
2024/1039/P	Irfan Hemani	30/03/2024 12:26:10	OBJ	<p>1. Loss of sunlight to neighbouring properties</p> <p>The proposed extension at Darwin Court will have a significant impact on the amount of light that we receive in our property at 19 Gloucester Avenue. We therefore do not think the extension should go ahead.</p> <p>The plan states that "The design development should provide sufficient daylight and sunlight to new and surrounding housing that is appropriate for its context, whilst avoiding overheating, maximising overshadowing, and maximising the instability of outside amenity space".</p> <p>However, at 19 Gloucester Avenue, all flats will lose sunlight. The elevation at Darwin court will block a significant portion of sunlight to our windows. We estimate the elevation reduces the sunlight for 19 Gloucester Avenue beyond acceptable limits.</p> <p>We believe there have been errors in the analysis:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - We believe the analysis on impact to sunlight has been done incorrectly. - The work (as stated in the report) has been carried out without looking at the layout plans for 19 Gloucester Avenue. An incorrect assumption has been made of 4m room depths. - The work has been carried out without access to 19 Gloucester Avenue (or other neighboring properties). - The second and third floor in the building have smaller windows which have not been considered. There will therefore be a disproportionately large impact on those floors. <p>We believe the real impact, if calculated correctly, would put the reduction below acceptable limits.</p> <p>2. Visual impact on the Primrose Hill conservation area</p> <p>The construction is not in line with the conservation area. The extension would be visually striking, and draw attention away from the natural and historical landmark.</p>
2024/1039/P	Chahine Yamine	04/04/2024 18:22:53	OBJ	I strongly object to this plan. The additional risk of existing building collapse or damage far outweighs any flimsy promises made by developer to improve common spaces and facilities.

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2024/1039/P	Guncet Luther	02/04/2024 10:48:59	OBJ	<p>I strongly oppose the development of the roof space at Darwin Court. No consideration or thought has been given to the demographic of the building. There are many young families with young children living in the building, including myself. It is impractical to carry a child, pram and bags up and down the stairs whilst the lift is out of use. There are also many elderly residents living within the building. They will have a very difficult time with the lifts being out of use. No consideration has been given by the developer.</p> <p>The lifts are currently operating fine and have had no issues and are regularly maintained.</p> <p>It will also be very unsafe for young children to reside in the building whilst there will be loud construction in the communal areas.</p> <p>Furthermore, the funding provided to 'refurbish' the communal areas is completely inadequate and has not been calculated properly. There will be no material benefits to current owners.</p> <p>This planning application has been rushed by the developer for them to attempt to make a quick profit and no thought given to hundreds of leaseholders. This application should be rejected.</p>

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2024/1039/P	Shane Gibson	27/03/2024 12:10:25	OBJ	<p>The application is being made without the backing of residents. The developer promises much, but only items that will enhance the value of the permission given and not to the benefit of residents and neighbours. They do not have a track record or proven ability to complete the project, which could easily end in long-term misery for residents and neighbours, and therefore a long-term cost to Camden in having to support its council tax payers and voters.</p> <p>If none of the above have any weight in planning decisions, then the below are sound material conditions:</p> <p>Visual impact on the Primrose Hill conservation area</p> <p>Impact on the setting of Cecil Sharp House, a Grade 2 listed building</p> <p>DC is one of three intact mid-century blocks in the immediate vicinity alongside the Grade-2 listed Ernö Goldfinger building at 10 Regents Park Road and the James Stirling block at 41 Gloucester Avenue</p> <p>Failure to preserve and enhance the conservation area</p> <p>Loss of existing views from neighbouring properties</p> <p>Negative impact on wildlife by developing land behind Darwin Court,</p> <p>which is currently a wild area harbouring wildlife, trees and shrubs</p> <p>Potential harm to the large trees surrounding Darwin Court</p> <p>Potential harm to existing buildings by adding a floor without a full understanding of the foundations</p> <p>Light pollution: while the windows of the new flats are at 90° from the roadside direction, there will inevitably be additional light showing</p>
2024/1039/P	Gianluca Natale	27/03/2024 23:18:05	COMMNT	<p>As a resident of the Borough of Camden in Oval Rd I have to voice my concerns and I strongly object the building of the Penthouse development at Darwin court for the following reasons:</p> <p>Visual impact on Primerose hill conservation area.</p> <p>Loss of existing views;</p> <p>Light pollution;</p> <p>Potential harm to surrounding trees at Darwin court;</p> <p>Failure to preserve and enhance the conservation area.</p>
2024/1039/P	Denise McHale	27/03/2024 23:59:30	COMMNT	<p>We object to the plan as we are concerned that the plan has not adequately investigated whether the structure or foundation is sound enough to take another storey and this could potentially be damaging to the building. We are also concerned that the landscape around the building which provides an untouched area for wildlife will be damaged.</p>

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2024/1039/P	Jessica Lovell	29/03/2024 20:06:05	INT	<p>I would like to object to the application to add a single storey on top of the buildings comprising Darwin Court on the following grounds:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) These buildings which are already considered to be “a negative building” that “detracts from the character and appearance of the Conservation Area”, would further be out of character by adding another storey onto the building and taking it out of height with surrounding buildings. This particularly as it would affect the open view from the end of Gloucester Avenue looking towards ChalkFarm, as well as the relationship with the Grade 2 listed Cecil Sharp House 2) It is not clear that the foundations of the building are able to withstand the additional storey. The addition of the storey risks damaging the existing buildings 3) Financial viability of this project – Airspace figures show that on current estimates they will come with a loss if they complete the project, it therefore seems the point of this application is only to secure the right to develop, and therefore the specifics cited are not relevant, or to be held to account.
2024/1039/P	Emily Stewart	29/03/2024 12:02:58	PETITNOBJ E	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. There will be a detrimental visual impact on the Primrose Conservation area. 2. The Cecil Sharp House, a listed building, will be dwarfed by the height of the penthouse development. 3. Building the penthouses will involve a failure to enhance and preserve the conservation area. 4. The Victorian properties facing Darwin Court will lose light because of the added height of the penthouses. 5. Adding extra weight to an older building could have devastating consequences on the structure of Darwin Court. 6. Inevitably there will be extra light pollution which can affect people's health.
2024/1039/P	Emily Stewart	29/03/2024 12:26:10	PETITNOBJ E	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. There will be a detrimental visual impact on the Primrose Conservation area. 2. The Cecil Sharp House, a listed building, will be dwarfed by the height of the penthouse development. 3. Building the penthouses will involve a failure to enhance and preserve the conservation area. 4. The Victorian properties facing Darwin Court will lose light because of the added height of the penthouses. 5. Adding extra weight to an older building could have devastating consequences on the structure of Darwin Court. 6. Inevitably there will be extra light pollution which can affect people's health.
2024/1039/P	Pat Chrisostomou	31/03/2024 18:23:11	INT	<p>This is a conservation area, how does adding floors on top of Darwin Court fit in with the surrounding area? This plan should be dismissed and the building left in its original condition.</p>
2024/1039/P	Panos	31/03/2024 15:40:34	COMMNT	I oppose this development

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2024/1039/P	Sasha	01/04/2024 19:57:09	COMMNT	Please don't ruin the place with the building. The quality of lifestyle in London is hanging by a thread. We need the feeling of open areas and spaces to hold on to our sanity.
2024/1039/P	Sven Lindner	26/03/2024 21:40:46	APP	Dear planning team, as a direct neighbor to Darwin Court I'd like to appeal the planning proposal on the following grounds: 1) loss of daylight: any meaningful increase in building height will have an impact on buildings on the other side of Gloucester Avenue receiving less sunlight in the morning hours. 2) parking: residents are already facing a situation where frequently cars are being parked outside of designated spots because there's no spaces available. Adding 8 additional flats will put further undue stress on the parking situation 3) Conservation area: Darwin court does not add to the character of the local area - extending it will have a further detrimental effect on the appearance of the area, irrespective of all the improvements suggested as part of the proposal
2024/1039/P	Flora Lipman	26/03/2024 16:56:43	COMMNT	Loss of existing views from our property would adversely affect our amenities. Adverse affect of sight lines and sunlight reaching our property later in the day with the Penthouses added to the top of Darwin Court as it rises over Darwin Court towards our side of Regents Park Road. HGV's with telescopic lifts could easily irreparable damage mature trees that surround Darwin Court that as neighbours we also enjoy. This damage could easily occur as traditional building methods are not being employed and therefore these Prefabricated details will be lifted up to the top floors through the tree lines. Adding 2020's build style Penthouse buildings on 1970's style apartment blocks. Additionally using different colour brickwork and so exacerbating further the anomalies. The problem in the afternoon / evening of new adverse sunlight reflection problems onto our home that will reflect off the new penthouse windows.
2024/1039/P	James Kent	03/04/2024 20:18:42	COMMNT	I'm devastated at this proposal. The wildlife behind the building is bound to be effected. Never mind those magnificent trees. Who knows what the long term Impact will be on the residents beneath. And it's clearly being done solely for financial gain rather than the social housing Camden badly needs. Never

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2024/1039/P	Sheila Panchal	01/04/2024 15:04:34	OBJ	<p>I have been a ground floor Darwin Court resident for over 16 years and would like to object to the planning application for the roof penthouse development, for the following reasons:</p> <p>1) Negative impact of rear land landscaping/usage</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - This will significantly negatively affect quality of life of ground floor flat residents. This would cause noise during the day (when people work from home) and in the evenings (affecting relaxation/sleep). Visually, landscaping/fencing would be highly displeasing to those who directly look out onto those areas. Currently the view is natural and aesthetic, the railway is blocked out by trees, and any change to this would lead to a direct view of the railway. Many have purchased flats on the basis of existing views, and potential re-sale value of the flats could also be impacted. - The land provides a natural habitat for many plants, birds and animals - such wildlife would be negatively affected if the area is developed. - Allowing access to the land would potentially increase security risks and mean that ground floor flats in particular would be more vulnerable. Also, the area is very close to the railway, which is not a safe place for children, regardless of any barrier. - There is potential considerable extra cost involved with ongoing maintenance of the landscaping, adding to an already expensive service charge for residents. <p>2) Failure to preserve the Primrose Hill conservation area</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - There is a wider impact of the development on the Primrose Hill conservation area. - The immediate context and setting for Cecil Sharp House will be affected, which is a Grade 2 listed building. - Existing views from surrounding properties will be either lost or negatively impacted if height is added to the buildings. - Darwin Court itself is a rare example of a mid-century block of flats in the area, which to date has been preserved to maintain the original exterior form. <p>3) Additional resident impact</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - If the development is not financially managed properly, any potential benefits offered to residents may not come to fruition. - Darwin Court is a diverse community which includes both young families and elderly residents. Extended building work, particularly that affecting lift access, could prove very difficult for them.
2024/1039/P	Flat 4,11-13, Gloucester Avenue, London, NW1 7AU	02/04/2024 11:30:12	PETITNOBJ E	<p>I object to this proposed development on conservation and environmental grounds.</p> <p>I have put my comments in a previous submission.</p>
2024/1039/P	Van manh mai	02/04/2024 17:14:51	OBJ	<p>I dont see any benefit to this development for residents and local people</p> <p>Building and facilities are already old and there are concerns about structural integrity, noise and rubbish and safety concerns for existing residents.</p>

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2024/1039/P	Daniel Neale	26/03/2024 22:10:22	OBJ	<p>I'd like to object to the proposal on the following grounds:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - As referenced in the previous planning appeal in 1996, Darwin Court was intentionally included within the Primrose Hill Conservation Area. This was done primarily to control future development such as this proposal. It should therefore not be relevant that the building is of 1970s style - Darwin Court is already one of the highest and bulkiest buildings in the Primrose Hill Conservation Area. The proposal would be visible, bulky and inappropriate for a 1970s building especially one in a conservation area. - It sets a precedent for any house in the Primrose Hill Conservation Area to add another floor on top. - The additional flats will add light pollution to the area especially in winter. The developer has not submitted images to cover this. - It is likely to have a long term nuisance level from the noise impact for those of us who live on the top floor. The developer states that this should be no more than exists between existing flats; however, as someone who bought a flat on the top floor, there is currently no existing noise. - Outside lifts will be added which will change the façade. This is inappropriate. - The development does not have the support of residents. The government has been reviewing the relationship between freeholders and leaseholders and this seems like a good example of where the current law offers no protection to leaseholders. Furthermore, the proposal breaches a number of terms within the lease (leaseholders' right to a quiet and peaceful occupation, temporarily removing the lift, adding elements such as outdoor lifts to the service charge). It is not reasonable to expect leaseholders to fund legal action to enforce these terms. - The development will involve weeks of noisy work, the removal of residents' lifts and weekend works. To extend the stairwell and lift upwards requires a significant hole to be cut in the concrete next to where I usually work. This is far above the level of inconvenience neighbours are expected to suffer during development works as the flats are likely to be unusable whilst these works are ongoing. The developer has argued that the lifts would need replacing anyway, but this would happen on a timetable to suit residents and would not involve removing the roof. <p>Considerations should the approval be granted:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The proposal puts at risk a number of aspects of the building during the development. Additional weight will be added, a hole will be cut in the concrete to allow the lift/stairs to be extended and the water system (already very fragile) will be amended. If the developer were to abandon the project before completion, it is not clear who will make good these works. The residents would, presumably, be able to sue the freeholder, but it is unlikely that the freeholder will be able to fund the remedial works. Therefore, it is imperative that the developer provides a substantial completion bond (from a creditworthy third party) that will ensure any remedial works are not funded by residents. - The developer should not be allowed to remove or prune the trees - A significant number of families now live in Darwin Court. A development of this size would usually include some provision for children.

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2024/1039/P	Lucy Grant	03/04/2024 14:17:56	OBJNOT	<p>As the Operations Director for Cecil Sharp House, a Grade 2 listed arts venue, across the road from Darwin Court, I would like to raise a concern regarding the potential relationship with new residents.</p> <p>As a live music venue since the 1950's we are aware of noise levels and work continuously to have a good relationship with our neighbours. However, we are concerned that new residents might not be aware of our status and not expect noise levels appropriate for a live music venue. Any impact on our programming would have a negative effect on our abilities to carry out our charitable works.</p>
2024/1039/P	Tim and Patricia Lankester	28/03/2024 11:07:06	COMMT	<p>We object to the proposed penthouse development on the following grounds:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The design is out of keeping with the existing Darwin Court architecture and will be an eye-sore. 2. The proposal to install the prefabricated units using cranes will cause irreparable damage to the adjacent trees, which for many residents, including ourselves, are an important aesthetic asset and form part of the enjoyment of living at Darwin Court. 3. We are not persuaded by statements from the developer that the existing infrastructure (especially water systems) will be able to cope with the extra burden resulting from the proposed development, with inevitable consequences for existing residents. 4. We are concerned that the foundations will not be adequate to cope with the extra weight of the proposed penthouses, especially given the recent news that the HS2 tunnel is now likely to go under blocks A and B and the impact this might have on their foundations.
2024/1039/P	Shirin Nabavi	28/03/2024 10:22:57	APP	<p>I strongly oppose the penthouse developments on these grounds</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1; This is a conservation area and the visual impact is considerable. 2;The impact on Cesil Sharp house which is opposite us is also incredible, considering it is a Grade 2 building. 3; we will have failed to preserve and enhance the Primrose Hill conservation area. 4; There will be a loss of view from other properties. 5; impact on the wildlife behind Darwin court, which has old trees that birds nestle among. 6;Harm to Darwin Court buildings, which have aged significantly and without an understanding of the foundations of Darwin Court. 7; light pollution through new windows with inevitable light showing from road sides.
2024/1039/P	Shirin Nabavi	28/03/2024 10:22:58	APP	<p>I strongly oppose the penthouse developments on these grounds</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1; This is a conservation area and the visual impact is considerable. 2;The impact on Cesil Sharp house which is opposite us is also incredible, considering it is a Grade 2 building. 3; we will have failed to preserve and enhance the Primrose Hill conservation area. 4; There will be a loss of view from other properties. 5; impact on the wildlife behind Darwin court, which has old trees that birds nestle among. 6;Harm to Darwin Court buildings, which have aged significantly and without an understanding of the foundations of Darwin Court. 7; light pollution through new windows with inevitable light showing from road sides.

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2024/1039/P	Rebecca Lovell	29/03/2024 11:05:40	OBJ	<p>Hello</p> <p>I am writing on behalf of my mother who is in her eighties who lives in Darwin Court on the top floor and strongly objects to the proposals.</p> <p>She has mobility issues and relies on the lift to get out of her flat to get provisions and collect medicine. She cannot manage the stairs. There is no plan in place to adequately provide for this.</p> <p>There has been very limited resident engagement, consisting mainly of an online meeting with no chance to have a two way conversation with residents. She felt the company talked at them not with them. This is not adequate when producing plans which will directly affect the lives of so many residents.</p> <p>She objects to removal of any mature trees - these provide considerable sound insulation at the front and back for residents(from the railway noise and traffic) and shading in the increasingly hot summers, as well an undisturbed haven for wildlife. She sits in the garden regularly in good weather as she finds walking to the park difficult now. she doesn't want the garden "landscaped" as the space functions well for residents who don't have outside space.</p> <p>She also has concerns about this being in a conservation area and adding such extra height will not be consistent with this.</p> <p>Also the bin provision doesn't make sense. there is already an issue with rubbish collection and putting the bins in an even more inaccessible area will lead to rubbish being left in the wrong place and make collections more difficult.</p> <p>Obviously this is causing my mother a huge amount of stress and anxiety.</p>

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2024/1039/P	Ceri smith	29/03/2024 20:23:28	OBJ	<p>I object to the proposals to build luxury penthouse flats on the roof or Darwin court.</p> <p>My elderly mother in law lives there and the proposals will means many weeks without access to the lift. She will be unable to get to her apartment. They have dropped their proposal to find alternative accommodation.</p> <p>The financials appear to suggest that the flats are uneconomic as specified. So if this application is approved I expect significant modifications to be proposed which will undoubtedly mean the final Proposals lose the mitigants and reduce the spec.</p> <p>There appears to be no provision of affordable housing. This is surely unacceptable given the need for affordable housing in the area. The last thing Primrose Hill needs are more luxury homes. In needs real homes.</p> <p>The development fails to preserve and enhance the conservation area. Darwin court is already judged to have a negative impact on the conservation area (not that I agree). This will Make it worse. Given the location opposite Cecil sharp house and the goldfinger flats (both Grade II listed) any development needs to enhance the area not detract from it. The proposed stock does not match the existing building dark red brickwork which was originally chosen to reflect the conservation area, and will mean the new build will stand out and emphasize the mass. The photos in the townscape report show clearly how visible the new floor will be, and they totally destroy the clean lines of the existing building. The new flats jar with the existing aesthetic. And will be higher than any surrounding building which will again make them more visible and noticeable.</p> <p>The development access statement makes no reference to how the developers will manage the asbestos they will undoubtedly disturb.</p> <p>I worry the existing foundations will not support the new floor. There is very little information on what studies have been done of the structural soundness of the plans.</p> <p>Loss of habitat for the wildlife in the network rail strip of Land - the work will disturb the hedgehogs, nesting birds and other wildlife.</p> <p>The hoisting of prefab units onto the roof risks signifiant damage to the existing trees. As acknowledged by the developers</p>

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2024/1039/P	Michelle Kopp	28/03/2024 14:05:40	APP	<p>I am living opposite of Darwin Court at a top floor flat (second floor) and feel strongly negatively impacted by the proposed penthouse development for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Loss of sunlight in the morning hours. We do not agree with Darwin Courts subjective daylight & sunlight analysis report and believe any raise in the building will negatively impact light exposure due to the proximity of our flat to Darwin Court - Allowing the penthouses to be build sends a wrong signal to the area as it increases the incentive for other houses to stock up as well in order to compete for sun light - Negative visual impact on the Primrose Hill conservation area. Darwin Court visually does not fit in with the rest of Primrose Hill, despite proposed upgrades. Making Darwin Court even bigger would be a failure to preserve the conservation area - Negative impact on the setting of Cecil Sharp House, a Grade 2 listed building - Negative impact on wildlife by construction noise and developing land behind Darwin Court, which is currently a wild area harbouring wildlife, trees and shrubs - Years of construction that require construction vehicles to park on the street will put a huge amount of pressure on the already poor parking situation. Even now people are parking outside market parking areas due to a lack of availability
2024/1039/P	Sandra Lovell	30/03/2024 13:45:24	OBJ	<p>I live on the top floor of Darwin court. I object to the plans for multiple reasons. These include:</p> <p>Impact on the skyline and visual impact on the conservation area, given that Darwin Court is already out of kilter, this is making it worse. The different brick colour will make the addition stand out and change the overall visual impact of the building. It will destroy the current visual alignment with Cecil Sharpe House</p> <p>Impact on the wildlife (especially at the back) which has taken years to evolve as a haven.</p> <p>The damage which will occur to the beautiful mature trees that surround the buildings</p> <p>Concern that the buildings foundations and infrastructure is not sufficiently robust to bear the weight of the additional floor and that this has not been sufficiently investigated</p> <p>Concern about ongoing noise from air source heat pumps, given that I am on the top floor and at home a lot.</p> <p>Concern that I or my guests will not be able to readily access my property, with footpath access and the temporary removal of the lift. Given that I am 84 this would have a major impact on my quality of life.</p> <p>Loss of privacy - I chose to live on the top floor so that I did not have anyone above me.</p> <p>Impact of lights making the tops of the building stand out as it is approached from Gloucester Avenue</p> <p>I am concerned that this planning application is being made to increase the value of the freehold, with little intention of carrying out this work on a timely basis and that it will be sold on with none of the current promises adhered to or the development will be postponed indefinitely, during which time the building will fall into disrepair and flats will be blighted.</p>

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2024/1039/P	Dr M Panayi	03/04/2024 10:45:44	OBJ	<p>Objection to 2024/1039/P Darwin Court, Gloucester Avenue, London, NW1 7BG Residential Extension</p> <p>On the following grounds:</p> <p>Primrose Hill is a conservation area and the proposed extension is yet another example of:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i) significant increasing density and body of existing building, out of kilter with the conservation area guidelines ii) significant impact on the visual and light amenities iii) adding to pressure on parking iv) contrary to the spirit of Camden's own local and long term development plans v) this residential over-development will not add affordable housing vi) this proposal is contrary to original planning consent when 'villas' were removed and blocks of flats were built, these were built on planning permission consent for restricted height for low impact within a conservation area - as such needs to be referred for further scrutiny vii) this application for a residential extension is conflated with other associated works that may be necessary viii) the period of consultation has been inadequate and my need referral to scrutiny committee
2024/1039/P	Penelope Meredith	01/04/2024 21:44:13	OBJ	<p>I object to the proposed works. I live in Darwin Court and I choose to live here because Primrose Hill is a peaceful and safe area for me as a single mum of two girls. I have lived in this building for nearly three years and I do not understand how the building's infrastructure would cope with the addition of another story. I am concerned about the risk of disproportionate collapse and from what I have seen I am far from reassured about the structural safety of this project. I vehemently object to the development and I am extremely worried about this going ahead, to the point where I would not feel safe continuing to live here with my daughters without proper assurances.</p>
2024/1039/P	Grace Moynihan	31/03/2024 16:56:07	COMMNT	<p>Object.</p> <p>I can see this block from my window. It is currently a good example of its era. The proposals will be detrimental to the look of the building itself and in the context of the conservation area. There will be negative visual impacts for the surrounding homes as well as remove light and sun for neighbours.</p>
2024/1039/P	Doug Wregg	01/04/2024 08:39:24	COMMNT	<p>I am against this development for a number of reasons. Primrose Hill is a conservation area. This proposal does not respect that status.</p> <p>Environmental impact - light pollution, obstructing views, more building work - noise etc.</p> <p>This does not look like affordable housing, more the construction of expensive property.</p> <p>Allowing this through would generate further planning applications as property holders would feel that planning applications to build extensions to property would now be more likely to go through. In a conservation zone this would set a bad precedent.</p>

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2024/1039/P	maureen chu	30/03/2024 10:44:22	COMMNT	<p>Comments on planning application 2024/1039/P Darwin Court Gloucester Avenue NW1 7BG</p> <p>Conservation Area status of Primrose Hill</p> <p>This development will compromise and violate the duty to preserve, protect, and enhance the conservation area. The surrounding properties (some listed) will suffer loss of existing views,and the creation of light pollution from the new alignment of the proposed flats.</p> <p>Concern about the impact on the wildlife, existing trees ,and general appearance of this special area.</p> <p>Neighbourhood Impact</p> <p>As commented above, this plan will have a visual impact on the whole area, and will set a precedent for other and future schemes of this nature. This will potentially lead to a degradation of the environment for all in Primrose Hill.</p> <p>There has been concern expressed about the structural impact of this development on the existing building- reassurance is needed.</p> <p>Thank you</p>
2024/1039/P	Richard Ward	01/04/2024 12:03:01	OBJ	<p>I object to this development on the grounds that:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. It undermines the principles of the Primrose Hill conservation area. If this development is allowed then others of similar nature will follow. 2. It breaches the building height restrictions that have been followed in Primrose Hill and that give the area its special character 3. The development undermines trees and wildlife in the area. 4. The development is to provide expensive luxury penthouses with no provision for affordable housing.
2024/1039/P	Elena Moynihan	01/04/2024 09:12:31	OBJ	<p>I visit the area regularly and I find this planning proposal quite egregious. The current building, though relatively modern, sits at the same height and colouring as the victorian buildings nearby, and is thereby reasonably in keeping with the conservation area. Adding a new floor with different materials will ruin this ad set a very bad precedent. Buildings and gardens nearby will be affected by the extra height, as will the green corridor at the side of the railway. This proposal ha no advantages whatsoever for the community, and is only detrimental to the character of this lovely conservation area.</p>

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2024/1039/P	Harpreet Sandhu	01/04/2024 14:18:15	OBJ	Objection to Planning Application 2024/1039/P

As a flat owner in one of the impacted blocks at Darwin Court, and a fully qualified Architect (25+ years experience with 16+ of those years at the worlds leading Architecture practice Foster + Partners) registered in the UK with the Architects Registration Board (ARB) and Royal Institute of British Architects (RIBA), I strongly object to this Planning Application on the grounds of it being a unviable proposal with poor quality and seriously lacking planning documents with material issues including Daylight/Sunlight/Overshadowing, Overbearing qualities Overlooking issues and most critically MEP & structural safety and viability.

Material Issue 1

In the documents we have been given by the applicant, we have not seen any evidence of a comprehensive, detailed structural survey or analysis. Without a structural assessment of each of the Blocks A-E, any proposal of roof mounted, erected, constructed or installed residential units is a material risk, due to the unknown, unqualified and unquantified structural resilience of the buildings.

My biggest concern is the risk of DISPROPORTIONATE COLLAPSE. Darwin Court buildings are brick buildings, and when they were built the construction techniques deployed advocated and widely used cavity wall structures for many internal, but also importantly external, perimeter load bearing walls. We have evidence from over 10 years ago that confirms Darwin Court perimeter walls are indeed cavity walls as many other internal walls could well be also. This is known because many flat holders had cavity wall insulation installed into these walls to improve thermal comfort of their flats. Cavity walls, constructed out of brick, dating back to the early 70's pose a material and significant health & safety risk, that of potential disproportionate collapse of the existing buildings.

Its beyond me how any developer could propose multiple, heavy (pre fabricated using steel frames?, clad in external brickwork and concrete floors / slabs) onto Darwin Court existing buildings without doing a Block by Block, roof by roof detailed structural assessment with real data demonstrating that these buildings, with their cavity wall construction can even be considered for roof top construction. This is a major material health & safety and financial risk to the current flat owners, the neighbouring buildings and all visitors to Primrose Hill. To be clear - I am concerned the lack of information in the planning application, shows naive if not negligent behaviour on the part of the applicant that could ultimately if un-checked, pose a risk of structural collapse of part of whole of some of the blocks.

Material Issue 2

The current Darwin court rooftops often have leaks and issues and any additional accommodation with its penetrative footings and foundations will amplify this and cause further water ingress issues both from the placement of the structures but also from the weight of such structures that could cause deflection in the existing roof tops, creating new routes of water ingress, cracks and defects in the main structural assembly of the buildings.

Material Issue 3

I have not seen in the planning application any evidence of a full, complete and comprehensive MEP Mechanical, Electrical & Plumbing infrastructure survey. I am personally aware of water pressure issues on the existing upper floor flats, and where noisy water pumps have been installed for owners to shower / access water, we already have had to suffer significant noise issues from building noise and vibration transmission

Application No: Consultees Name: Received:

Comment: Response:

that is now being addressed through various mitigating measures. Adding new flats on the existing roof tops, will further amplify this issue, but critically, the pipework infrastructure that exists is the original!. The pipework that would deliver MEP utilities to these new flats, will continue through all existing flats, and this already strained (often problematic, but so far manageable) infrastructure was not designed for additional flats on the roof. I am therefore deeply concerned that any additional service this infrastructure will be required to provide could lead to catastrophic failure of the existing MEP systems in the Blocks. There is significant evidence that demonstrates the issues we have had to deal with and manage.

Material Issue 4

The lack of quality in the planning application drawings is a material risk also. The drawings have been assembled at a very high level with no regard to the basic fundamental issues of structural and MEP infrastructure resilience of existing buildings. The lack of quality and detail in the application should be a concern to all flat owners, and the neighbours on Gloucester Avenue and the applicant themselves - if a proposal is simply not viable due to basic structural issues - it cannot simply be ignored - its a major red flag and we expect the Camden Planning Officers to treat this a major material issue.

Material issue 5

Overlooking will be a primary concern due to the extent of proposed terraces on the roof tops to Gloucester Avenue residents particularly. Whilst daylight/sunlight and overshadowing could be a material issue for the apartments behind Darwin Court - where is the solar access study?

Material Issue 6

Overbearing nature of the proposal in respect to outlook are a concern due to matching the 70's brickwork colours, tone, texture and the proposed extent of glazing in a conservation area - but - fundamentally the overbearing load of this type of construction (details of which are simply not provided) will potentially have a serious, adverse effect on the structural assembly of the Blocks.

Material Issue 7

Details of how the new flats will be fabricated or constructed are not sufficiently or convincingly provided - are they even known by the applicant?? Without them, how can an assessment be made as to their impact on an existing series of 70's buildings? If these flats are made off-site and installed via crane?, what are fabrication details? What are the materials being used? What are the external finishes specifications, full bricks or "fake" exterior brick look/effect? What are the internal finishes? What are the NEW dead and live loads of these structures on each rooftop? How many bathrooms, what appliances and therefore utility load is in the kitchens - what are the NEW Mechanical, Electrical Plumbing loads onto the existing MEP infrastructure?

If new pipework is being proposed for MEP, where will they run? Internally our existing 70's risers are full, we can evidence this. Will there be external new MEP pipework and infrastructure - resulting in overbearing and detrimental visual impact to the Blocks.

Where is the construction methodology? Is it known? Its fundamental, as these existing brick blocks are - EXISTING - and over 100 flats are contained within them with hundreds of residents, owners and tenants - safety is therefore the MOST important issue and for me and my fellow flat owners / residents - the most material issue in this ill considered, rushed & poorly assembled planning application.

Application No: **Consultees Name:** **Received:****Comment:** **Response:**

It must also not be forgotten that HS2 is still being proposed and still going ahead, at least between Euston and Old Oak Common and the tracks alignment is also underneath most if not all of the Existing Darwin Court blocks - whilst this matter in isolation is studied by professional engineering firms and well document, the impact of additional live/dead load to these structures will be of grave concern to HS2 also, not only all of the existing and future flat owners.

I have over 25 years experience in this field and never have I seen a proposal so lacking in its consideration of the basic fundamental principles. Its not something I can take seriously, rather its a quick-job trying to capitalise on new planning law for personal commercial gain with no regard to over 100 flat owners and their significant vested interest in these beautiful buildings.

I urge all involved to reject this application fully - and demand a full, detailed and comprehensive investigation into the viability of these proposal whereby independent surveyors / engineers (which have not been appointed thus far) complete a Block by Block detailed assessment and this is reviewed by qualified professionals to determine its basic viability.

Upgrades to existing areas of the existing buildings are also clearly defined, so any "upside / benefit" to existing owners, should this proposal ever go head, should be made explicit clear and detailed designs with cost plans should form part of this proposal - this is not currently provided. Loose "promises" are not adequate when such a significant and serious matter is being asked of us to consider.
