

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:
2024-1039/P	Gunnar Thorarinnsson	28/04/2024 23:01:59	OBJ


Response:

We object to the proposed development in Darwin Court, and would like to reiterate the valid and well articulated objections already made.

One of our particular concerns is that the development would almost inevitably harm the mature trees surrounding Darwin Court, which provide shade, benefits to air quality and a general improvement to the aesthetic of the street. They are also used as nesting and roosting sites by a multitude of bird species. Additionally, no real structural survey has been carried out which raises safety concerns about adding additional weight to the building, worries that are exacerbated by the potential tunnelling underneath a section of Darwin Court as part of the HS2 development, which has already caused severe disruption to inhabitants of Gloucester Avenue. Furthermore the financial viability of the project and the developer is highly uncertain.

We believe that some of the benefits described by the developers as accompanying the project, such as providing funding for much needed updates to Darwin Court infrastructure, is misleading as this is maintenance that is long overdue and is obligatory for the freeholder/managing agent to provide, but has been put off with the expectation that this will be included in the development. It could set a dangerous precedent if Camden Counsel would support applications in situations such as these, as this theoretically could allow freeholders to neglect necessary maintenance (therefore keeping service charges artificially low) and essentially force approval of major disruptive developments by residents who may be unable to shoulder an increase to their service charges.

For the above reasons we urge you to reject this application.



Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2024/1039/P	Susan Leighton	28/04/2024 23:56:36	OBJ	<p>I am strongly objecting to this proposed penthouse development on a number of grounds. Unfortunately I've been unable to download the document I've written, nor have I been able to find the email of Daren Zuch in order to email it for him to post on my behalf. I will sort this out tomorrow and hope that my comments will be taken into account. My objections are on the grounds of</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">- Design and Visual Impact and relating to the Primrose Hill Conservation Area- Lack of detail and omissions in the planning application- Financial viability- Impact on wildlife <p>Thanks for your understanding Susan</p>

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2024/1039/P	Elizabeth Jane Dickson	26/04/2024 17:50:56	OBJ	<p>I object to the proposed erection of additional residential units on the roof of Darwin Court on the following grounds:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Residents of Darwin Court have not been provided with a comprehensive structural survey by the developer or freeholder. This prompts concern about the effect of additional residential units on the buildings' structural integrity. 2. The erection of additional structures may aggravate existing rooftop leaks and prevent/impede access for such repairs as may be necessary in future. 3. Residents have not been provided with a detailed Mechanical, Electrical and Plumbing Infrastructure survey, this carries significant risk that existing systems will be overburdened, with potentially catastrophic results. 4. Lack of clarity on fabrication methods, materials and construction processes raises doubts about the projects feasibility and safety. 5. The proposal lacks consideration of basic principles and safety standards; this raises concerns for the long-term safety and interests of Darwin Court residents. 6. Extensive glazing proposed for the penthouses, especially on the south and west elevations, risks significant solar gain , potentially leading to overheating in the buidings. The designer's proposals to offset this are at best questionable and at worst unsustainable. In light of climate-crisis considerations and the effect of overheating on residents' health,this suggests a reckless lack of foresight/planning. 7. The rushed nature of the proposals, and the lack of analysis/transparency in regard to points 1-6 above, raises concern that the developers have underestimated the final building costs, this potentially exposes residents to the risks of a partially finished project. 8. Darwin Court sits in a conservation area. The proposed extensions are out of scale with surrounding buildings and cannot be said to 'enhance or preserve' the appearance or distinctive character of the conservation area. 9. Camden badly needs new affordable housing. The erection of eight high-value units cannot be considered a public benefit and seems insensitive to public need at a time when local schools are facing closure due to lack of affordable housing driven by soaring property prices in the borough. 10. The area behind Darwin Court currently provides ecological and biodiversity benefits which are threatened by the proposed landscaping of this area.
2024/1039/P	Axel Wikner	28/04/2024 23:26:42	OBJ/NOT	Objection against development

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2024/1039/P	Mark Harwood	27/04/2024 16:03:07	OBJ	<p>I am writing to strongly object to the above planning application.</p> <p>The proposed development, to build a penthouse floor on each of the blocks that constitute Darwin Court, will have a number of negative impacts on the area-</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">- it will detract from the nature of the current mid century Darwin Court buildings which provide an attractive gateway to Primrose Hill and which are of architectural merit- it will also detract from the setting of Cecil Sharp house on the other side of Gloucester Avenue and other properties nearby including the villas that preceded the building of Darwin Court- the proposed development is also likely to harm trees and wildlife and detract from the open nature of the site as viewed from the road- inevitably the new floors will be visible from other buildings and there will be an impact on available light as well as spillage of light at night ie additional light pollution- the proposed development will also negatively impact the conservation area through unnecessarily high buildings on what is a relatively open site.

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2024/1039/P	Ben Olins	28/04/2024 15:45:32	OBJ/NOT	<p>I wish to object to the above proposal in the strongest terms.</p> <p>I'm a lifelong Camden resident Camden and have lived in Darwin Court for the past 25 years. For much of that time I served on the committee of the residents (now leaseholders) association, of which I am currently the secretary.</p> <p>My reasons for objecting are as follows.</p> <p>Structural issues The lack of a comprehensive structural survey raises concerns about the safety of adding a new storey - or units - to the existing buildings, particularly since the cavity wall construction increases the risk of disproportionate collapse. It should also not be forgotten that HS2 is still proceeding between Euston and Old Oak Common, and these tracks run beneath much of Darwin Court. The effect of additional load on these blocks should be of significant concern to HS2 as well as to those of us who live in the buildings.</p> <p>Height of the new development At present, and as a result of careful negotiation with Camden's planners when the blocks were built, Darwin Court is no higher than the villas and terraces around it - in fact, it matches their height. This is why block E, at the Parkway end, is one floor shorter than the other blocks. The developers' plans show water tanks and heat pumps on the penthouse roofs, so instead of just one extra storey, there will be additional height.</p> <p>Appearance The proposed stock does not match the existing building's dark brickwork, which was selected to merge with nearby buildings. The new storey will starkly contrast with the existing structure, drawing attention to its increased height and making it more visible.</p> <p>Loss of original features On page 84, mock-up images show outdoor lifts on the inaccessible sides of doors; a drawing on p60 shows new doors, hand-painted signage replaced and positioned above the door. The lack of detail indicates original features will not be preserved.</p> <p>Loss of views and light The planned development would greatly affect nearby properties, especially their views and sunlight. It particularly impacts houses along Oval Road and Regent's Park Terrace, as well as those directly opposite in Gloucester Avenue and Regents Park Road. The Daylight and Sunlight Report only evaluates Gloucester Avenue, ignoring the development's wider impact.</p> <p>Environment and wildlife Proposed landscaping in the rear gardens threatens a wild area, disrupting habitat for nesting birds and other wildlife. The green space abutting the railway tracks, which serves as an urban wildlife corridor, will be lost. This area has hardly been touched since the mid-1970s and is home to bats (a protected species) and, we are informed in all likelihood, hedgehogs (also protected). Additionally, the potential damage or loss of large roadside trees at the front of Darwin Court could harm local wildlife. Questions arise about oversight and contingency plans for the developer's proposed 15% tree</p>

Application No: Consultees Name: Received:

Comment:

Response:

thinning. The mature – and magnificent – trees are crucial to Cecil Sharp House's distinctive setting and to the covering of the new penthouses, as referred to by the developers.

Asbestos

We know that both white and blue asbestos are present in the building. Given the scale of work proposed by the developers, I am alarmed by the lack of consideration for asbestos disturbance. It raises concerns about potential asbestos exposure for residents and visitors during development.

Financial viability

The developers' calculations for this build have little margin to make their proposal financially viable. But these figures are now out of date. They predate war in Ukraine, and the impact that has had on energy costs and they fail to take into account other costs that have increased - steel, labour, etc. It's unclear how the developers hope to achieve the required profit without adjusting the plans or reducing investment in the blocks. It would seem the only way to do it is by providing fewer benefits and/or lower quality materials. Even if we assume the developers have the best intentions, external factors such as war, climate change, recession, or unforeseen events such as the pandemic could force them to abandon the project, possibly midway, or sell it on to another developer.

Affordable housing

Eight luxury penthouses will do nothing to solve Camden's housing crisis. And a one-off payment, even of as much as £400,000 - if such a large sum is agreed, I understand this will be a negotiation between the developer and Camden - is barely a drop in the ocean.

Conservation area

The demolition of Victorian villas to make way for Darwin Court provided the impetus that resulted in the Primrose Hill conservation area. There is a horrible irony that developments on this same site may lead to its disintegration. If permission is granted, these blocks – effectively a gateway to the PHCA from Camden Town – will be irrevocably altered; the skyline and the streetscape will be changed for good. Worse than that, worse than all the little changes this will mean for those who live in the area, worse than the disfigurement of an intact mid-century housing estate, is that it will set a precedent. And any flat-roof building in the conservation area will become a potential source of short-term gain. And bit by bit, development by development, what makes the area so special, so loved – not just by those lucky enough to live here but people from around the world who come to visit – will be gone. And that would be an incalculable loss.

For these reasons, I ask that you refuse permission for this scheme

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2024/1039/P	Teri Grenert	28/04/2024 21:07:03	OBJNOT	<p>As a resident of Camden since 1994 who has been living in Darwin Court for 25 years and served on the committee of the residents association, I strongly object to this proposal.</p> <p>The leaseholders of Darwin Court, all bound by the terms of the same lease agreement, pay for the maintenance of the blocks through our service charges. I don't want to rely on external developers to cover my expenses in exchange for 'benefits' purported to be in my interest which come at great risk. I am prepared to shoulder costs like any other homeowner - however painful that may be. Furthermore, overdue works have been delayed by the freeholder to accommodate this development, placing undue pressure on residents to accept it.</p> <p>The supposed benefits are aimed solely at facilitating the sale of the penthouses. Fire upgrades were completed a mere four years ago, calling into question the necessity of further upgrades at this time. Additionally, there is insufficient evidence to support the claim that all five internal lifts require replacement. Indeed, the only survey done was for the lift that was in the worst condition and in one of the taller blocks. At the time, works estimated at around £10,000 were not carried out, which led to the lift failing. According to staff, three lifts are in fine condition while two may need further maintenance. Comprehensive surveys of all roofs have not been conducted, nor has the cost of the proposed works been accurately estimated.</p> <p>The installation of five new external platform lifts will inevitably incur additional costs for cleaning, maintenance, and insurance, as will the maintenance of a landscaped rear garden, all of which will ultimately be passed on to leaseholders as part of our service charges. These works are confined to private property and offer no tangible benefits to the wider public.</p> <p>Far from improving the character of Darwin Court, the front landscaping to replace original paving stones and entrance alterations would strip it away. The front doors and hand-painted signage are key period details. The attempt to design the penthouses as if they were part of the original plans is not achieved, particularly with the suggested new, lighter brickwork. It jars with the existing exteriors - which are dark and softened over decades - in no way enhancing them. Overall, the design is compromised by its goal of achieving planning permission.</p> <p>The proposed landscaping at the rear of the blocks would take away the habitats for wildlife, including bats and, we are told, hedgehogs - both protected species. The access it would provide substantially reduces privacy for all ground-floor flats looking onto it.</p> <p>It has been noted in the pre-application that the mature trees along the front boundary may allow for the proposed roof extensions to be obscured. However, we've been told by Airspace the trees may need to be reduced by up to 15% for crane installation of the units, meaning the new level would be fully visible for years until trees grow back - if they're not permanently damaged - thus impacting greatly on the conservation area, particularly Cecil Sharp House opposite. The extension would also impact on the views of neighbouring properties and increase light pollution.</p> <p>One of the reasons we live where we do is because it is within a conservation area. The proposals do nothing to enhance it, they only harm it. Should planning permission be granted, I am very concerned it would set a precedent for similar builds to forever alter it.</p>

Application No: Consultees Name: Received:

Comment: Response:

Airspace Group is a newly formed company (incorporated on 2 December 2022) whose financial projections for this project leave little room for adjustment to ensure its economic viability. Outdated by at least two years, calculations on which the scheme is based cannot be relied upon. Airspace has now made an additional promise (sent to leaseholders 27 April 2024) to repair pipework, which makes their business plan even more unrealistic. It remains unclear how the developers plan to achieve the necessary profitability without lowering quality or reducing investment in the blocks. I'm concerned they would need to seek amendments to planning permission, and development would stall or be abandoned as it has done at 100 Avenue Road.

In addition are safety concerns. I am deeply troubled by the apparent lack of consideration for the potential disturbance of asbestos during works, putting residents, staff, contractors and visitors at risk. Essential details about construction and infrastructure are lacking, and without a thorough structural assessment, there's a risk of damage to existing buildings and disproportionate collapse due to cavity walls.

I fail to see how public benefits outweigh potential significant harm caused by the development. Works are on private property. Two- and three-bed flats may be a high priority to the borough, but penthouses do not supply homes for those in need. The developer's ability to make a payment-in-lieu of affordable housing seems unlikely.

For these reasons, I urge you to refuse planning permission.

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2024/1039/P	Andrea Wu	28/04/2024 19:31:00	OBJ	<p>Dear Camden Planning Department,</p> <p>I would like to object to Planning Application 2024/1039/P. My career as an Architect in the UK has allowed me the privilege since 2002 to work at World leading practises including Foster & Partners, RSHP (formerly Richard Rogers Partnership), Grimshaw Architects and Wilkinson Eyre Architects. I was part of the onsite delivery team of Chiswick Park (3 years of Construction) with RSHP, Lusal Plaza & Towers (2 years Construction) with Foster & Partners, Redevelopment of Battersea Powerstation (1 year of Construction) and HQ of Deutsche Bank (2 year of Construction, both for Wilkinson Eyre Architects).</p> <p>The above experience gives me the confidence to identify the level of incompetency reflected in the Airspace Group's proposal for new penthouses to be constructed on top of Darwin Court that dates back to the early 1970's.</p> <p>I have produced a concise report on the below objections that I will email separately as it cannot be attached to this online objection:</p> <p>1) The majority of the amenity land to the rear of Darwin Court is owned by BlackRock and therefore not accessible for Airspace Group's proposal. I have attached the original lease from the early 1970's that clearly demarcates the amount of amenity land (2,205 sq yd) that was originally owned by Network Rail. It is now owned by BlackRock. I have added an overlay that highlights that the landscaping proposal by Airspace Group is not legitimate as the land belongs to BlackRock. The landscaping proposal incl. the new bin area will need to be re-submitted - all documentation that makes reference to this incorrect proposal incl Design & Access Statement, relevant Plans & Elevations etc. will need to be re-submitted.</p> <p>NB. This shows a severe lack of Due Diligence as the proposal featuring strong on the improvements to communal amenities is incorrect and doesn't show any understanding of BlackRock's amenity land. This is not mentioned anywhere in the submitted documentation.</p> <p>2) Airspace Group Ltd. were established in December 2022 and have no trading history/ filing history on Companies House. The website claims that Airspace Group are experts in off-site modular construction, however, have not undertaken any work under this company name. The website presents Airspace Group as Design Consultants. Tony Fretton Architects produced a high-level design for the new Penthouses but will not deliver this proposal. The proposed high-level Construction timeline lacks any relevant data. No Construction Method Statement and risk Assessment was submitted and the Principal Contractor hasn't been confirmed.</p> <p>NB. After having delivered both new-built projects on-site and Battersea Powerstation, where a complex collaboration with English Heritage highlighted the urgency to issue a comprehensive Construction Methodology and Risk Assessment from Day 1. Only the Principal Contractor will be able to verify this and the Construction Programme.</p> <p>I strongly urge the relevant Planning Team members to listen to Experts of the Built Environment as this proposal evidently lacks the Architectural & Construction expertise that is required to deliver a successful project that should enhance this neighbourhood. The lack of Due Diligence is extremely concerning and evidence for this proposal not granted planning approval.</p> <p>Thank you, Andrea Wu</p>

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2024/1039/P	Carole MacLeod	28/04/2024 18:02:28	OBJ/NOT	<p>To whom it may concern</p> <p>I object strongly to the above planning application. As a resident who lives diagonally across the road from the Darwin Court buildings I cannot support the proposed development for the following reasons -</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The building of 8 luxury flats above the current Darwin Court buildings contradicts the principles of the Primrose Hill Conservation Area, particularly impacting Cecil Sharp House. Adding another layer to the Darwin Court buildings will dwarf this heritage property and its gardens and will devalue the attempts of keeping Primrose Hill protected in the future. 2. The proposed penthouses would disrupt the existing aesthetic along Gloucester Avenue and change the area's architectural integrity. It is a modern extension in an area which prides itself on maintaining period and character buildings. 3. This proposal sets a precedent for future development and many other flat roofed buildings in the neighbourhood may consider an extra storey or two being constructed so the nature of Primrose Hill could fundamentally change. 4. The plans show an increase in height, which deviates from the current landscape of the area which is made up of low rise buildings. 5. The proposed single storey roof extension will overlook neighbouring properties especially on my end of Gloucester Avenue from 15 to 23, impacting on our privacy, views and light. The windows of the extension face out onto Gloucester Avenue and will cause light pollution. 6. I am concerned that the proposal would effect the lovely trees in front of Darwin Court which provide essential shade in the summer months. The front gardens and lawns of Darwin Court are a valuable green space which is much appreciated by local residents. During the increasingly hot summers due to climate change the Darwin Court trees offer shade and respite from the heat. 7. Construction will lead to traffic disruption and congestion, affecting access to Gloucester Avenue. My section of Gloucester Avenue has already been affected severely by other construction work over the past 4 years including ongoing HS2 works, 3 x months of traffic mayhem replacing the railway bridge over the canal in December 2022, 9 x months of disruption during the Thames Water sewer work in 2023 and most recently the ongoing Network Rail bridge wall work at the intersection with Oval Road. 8. It is hard to believe that a development of this nature that will affect so many people is for just 8 x luxury penthouse flats. There is no provision made for affordable housing for young couples, key workers and families. I cannot condone this much disruption for no obvious benefits to our local community. There is no need for any more luxury properties in Primrose Hill. 9. I have read through the planning proposal in detail, studied the associated website, attended meetings and the development reads as a marketing campaign with very little substance underpinning the construction and what will be put in place to mitigate a lot of disruption for the neighbours. It seems that the freeholder will be the sole financial beneficiary of this project. As an immediate neighbour I cannot support a project that

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
				<p>generates no meaningful benefit to our community except disruption, disturbance and long term destruction of our Primrose Hill conservation area,</p> <p>I hope my objections to this unnecessary and unwanted proposal will be taken seriously by Camden Council's planning committee.</p> <p>Kind regards Carole</p>

2024/1039/P Mr R. Little 27/04/2024 10:09:38 AMEND

The proposed development, set to occur opposite Cecil Sharp House, home of the English Folk Dance and Song Society and a vital cultural landmark, raises significant concerns. Adding eight new residential properties to Darwin Court, intended for high-net-worth individuals, is likely to impact Cecil Sharp House. The noise levels generated by the venue, which are accepted by local residents, may not be understood by affluent new neighbors. This lack of understanding could lead to legal action from the newcomers, threatening the existence of this esteemed institution. Cecil Sharp House plays a crucial role in Britain's cultural landscape and must be safeguarded.

Moreover, Darwin Court itself holds architectural significance as an example of everyday 1970s housing. The addition of single-story roof extensions would compromise its aesthetic value and historical importance. The proposed luxury penthouses offer no solution to the affordable housing crisis and may even exacerbate it. Additionally, the potential damage or loss of roadside trees would harm local wildlife.

Granting permission for these flats would have adverse effects on Cecil Sharp House, a listed building, and its surroundings. The looming presence of the new development would spoil views from the venue's garden and alter its setting irreversibly. This could disrupt programming at Cecil Sharp House, jeopardising its charitable work and cultural contributions.

Darwin Court represents the everyday mid-century architecture that enhances our streetscape. While modest, its significance should not be underestimated. Such buildings are often at risk of insensitive alterations, as seen in nearby examples like Haverstock Hill, where every flat roof block has undergone development. We must protect and preserve structures like Darwin Court for their architectural and cultural value.

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2024/1039/P	Alexey Nenarokov	27/04/2024 08:58:26	OBJNOT	<p>I strongly object to this development on the grounds that this development:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) will have a negative visual impact on the Primrose Hill conservation area; it must be taken into account that while it is claimed that the proposed flats will add just one floor to Darwin Court, in reality, they will add TWO floors when the water tanks, heat pumps and other infrastructure required for these flats are counted; 2) will constitute a failure to preserve and enhance the Primrose Hill conservation area; 3) will create a substantial risk of harm to the large trees surrounding Darwin Court during the construction process; 4) will create significant risks to the buildings of Darwin Court by adding a living floor and another technical floor without a full understanding of the risk to the structure of the buildings and the foundations. This is of particular importance in light of the HS2 tunnel planned under Darwin Court; 5) will create significant risks to Darwin Court and the surrounding area due to the questionable financial viability of the project; in the course of communication with the leaseholders of Darwin Court, financial viability issues were raised many times and were not addressed/answered by the developer in a clear, transparent and satisfactory manner; 6) will create unacceptable light pollution in the area; 7) will negatively impact the local wildlife by developing land behind Darwin Court, which is currently a wild area harbouring wildlife, trees and shrubs.
2024/1039/P	Julia Bloomfield	28/04/2024 20:12:47	OBJNOT	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The development is against the mandate of the Primrose Hill Conservation Area and particularly impacts the Cecil Sharp House. 2. The added height to the building is not in keeping with the planning and architecture of the Primrose Hill area. It deviates from the very habitable quality of the existing area. 3. The addition of the penthouses would be a precedent and more of the same would impact the Primrose Hill area and put a strain on local services. 4. the loss of green space around the railway tracks is of concern 5. More cars, more traffic is undesirable 6. We do not need more luxury housing in this area without a balance of more affordable housing.

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2024/1039P	Susan Warren	27/04/2024 17:13:00	OBJ	<p>I am writing to express my concerns regarding the proposed penthouse development at Darwin Court. Below are the reasons for my opposition:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none">1. Disruption of Appearance: The proposed penthouses would disrupt the area's architectural integrity, deviating from its current landscape.2. Environmental Concerns: Proposed landscaping would disrupt wildlife habitats and result in the loss of green space along railway tracks.3. Lack of Affordable Housing: The proposal lacks provisions for affordable housing, disregarding the community's needs.4. Height of the Development: Plans show an increase in height, which would alter the area's distinctive charm.5. Overlooking and Loss of Views: The proposed terraces may overlook neighboring properties, affecting residents' privacy and views.6. Strain on Existing Residents: Construction will impose strain on existing residents, particularly vulnerable groups like the elderly and families with young children.7. Lack of Transparency: There has been a lack of meaningful consultation and transparency regarding the proposal.8. Financial Viability Concerns: The absence of quality designs raises concerns about the financial viability of the plans.9. Risk of Damage to Buildings: Without a structural assessment, there is a risk of damage to existing buildings, compromising residents' safety.10. Precedent for Future Development: The proposal sets a precedent for future development that may not align with the community's interests.11. Traffic Disruption: Construction will lead to traffic congestion, affecting access to Gloucester Avenue and surrounding areas.12. Contradiction with Conservation Principles: The extension contradicts the conservation principles of the area, particularly impacting Cecil Sharp House. <p>I urge you to reconsider this proposal and prioritize the well-being of residents and the conservation of the area.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2024/1039/P	Plumelia Tarrant	26/04/2024 22:01:01	COMMNT	Strongly support installing full accessibility to the buildings - essential to any building, a very good idea. All proposed renovation and upgrading to facilities included is good, necessary for upkeep of buildings.
2024/1039/P	Emmy	28/04/2024 22:34:41	OBJ	<p>I am writing to express my strong objection to the proposed planning application for single-storey roof extensions to the properties comprising Darwin Court. As a resident and stakeholder in the area, I have several concerns regarding the potential impact this development would have on both my property and the surrounding community.</p> <p>First and foremost, I am deeply concerned about the potential loss of natural light to my property that would result from the construction of these roof extensions. Natural light is not only essential for the well-being of residents but also plays a significant role in the aesthetics and ambiance of our homes. This reduction of light would affect all residents along Gloucester Avenue - not only myself. Any reduction in light would have a detrimental effect on our living environment and overall quality of life.</p> <p>Furthermore, the proposed extensions would undoubtedly compromise the visual integrity of the Primrose Hill conservation area. This area is cherished for its unique architectural character and historical significance, and any development that detracts from its charm and beauty should be carefully reconsidered.</p> <p>Moreover, the construction process itself would inevitably lead to years of disruption for residents, including noise, dust, and limited access to parking. Our roads are already under strain, with residents struggling to find parking spaces, and the additional burden of construction vehicles and equipment would only exacerbate this issue.</p> <p>Darwin Court possesses a distinctive mid-century charm that contributes to the character of the neighbourhood. Any alteration that deviates from its original design risks diminishing its architectural value and cultural significance.</p> <p>In light of these concerns, I urge you to carefully reconsider this planning application and its potential consequences. It is crucial that any development in our community respects the needs and interests of all residents and preserves the unique character of our neighbourhood for future generations.</p>
2024/1039/P	Steven Short	26/04/2024 15:16:15	OBJ	As someone invested in maintaining our conservation areas, I live in one myself, I am against this penthouse proposal. Maintaining the integrity of the area for those who live there and who visit should be at the forefront of any development plans.
2024/1039/P	Jeff Travers	28/04/2024 22:04:14	AMEND	<p>I support the proposals from a townscape point of view... providing the amenity of the existing residents of Darwin Court is not impacted both during the proposed work and after. By this I mean that temporary work, enabling work and final finishes don't impact residents current access and residential amenity.</p> <p>But I am concerned that a substantial amount of new brickwork appears to be being proposed. In my view the new residential units should be completely prefabricated to minimise the amount of on-site work. And prefabricated units set back behind a fringe of rooftop greenery could enhance the townscape much more than the current proposals.</p>

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2024/1039P	Lucia Sivilotti	28/04/2024 20:49:18	OBJNOT	I am against this development because I think it will affect the area badly, especially around Cecil Sharp Hall, because of the increase in the height of the blocks. The flats are luxury penthouses, not affordable to the average Camden resident. The disruption that the building work will cause will be long and add to the general HS2 chaos.
