

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2024/4134/P	Alex Mavrocordatos	27/10/2024 14:05:15	OBJ	<p>* demoliton of Garage block will remove current parking facilities.</p> <p>* addition of three new dwellings will add furather three households needing parking on-street.</p> <p>This will surely pose undue pressure and further congestion of on-street parking outside, which is already congested.</p> <p>It is not clear whether the roof extension will restrict sky view to houses around.</p>
2024/4134/P	Jeremy Townsley	26/10/2024 23:56:27	PETITNOBJ E	<p>I am totally against the proposed developments at Hylde Court. The erection of a roof extension will cause months of misery for the residents of Hylde Court. They have already suffered from all kinds of incompetent building alterations. Despite unsympathetic alterations already carried out, Hylde Court remains an example of significant and locally unique art deco architecture. Any addition will compromise its aesthetic merit. The garages are needed by the present residents and the desire to create more dwellings stems from nothing more than greed.</p> <p>I hope the council will have the courage to deny the application.</p>

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2024/4134/P	Anina Henggeler	27/10/2024 19:44:49	OBJ	<p>To Whom It May Concern,</p> <p>My partner and I recently moved into Hylda Court and were made aware of planning application 2024/4134/P by other tenants in the building, just days after signing a 12-month lease. We are expecting a baby in April 2024, and the disruption this project would cause during early parenthood presents substantial concerns. For these reasons, I am formally objecting to this planning application based on the following key points:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <p>1. Lack of Tenant Consultation</p> <p>One of the most troubling aspects of this proposal is the lack of consultation with tenants currently residing at Hylda Court. Despite the significant impact that this project would have on residents' daily lives, no formal efforts were made to inform or engage with tenants or indeed prospective tenants such as ourselves, before submitting the application. Camden Council's planning guidelines emphasize the importance of community engagement, especially for developments that may severely disrupt current residents. We urge the Council to reconsider the application process until tenants are adequately consulted and have the opportunity to share feedback on how this construction will affect their quality of life.</p> <p>2. Overcrowding, Noise, and Loss of Light for Lower Flats</p> <p>The proposed development would significantly increase resident numbers in Hylda Court, leading to concerns over overcrowding, increased noise, and diminished living conditions for current residents. The architectural drawings portray an expanded, open space, but in reality, the layout will restrict light flow to key areas in lower flats, reducing natural light and creating a more confined, overshadowed environment. Camden's guidelines prioritize maintaining quality living standards for existing residents, and the projected influx of new tenants threatens to compromise this, especially given the area's limited amenities. If the application is approved, I urge Camden to consider measures to limit resident density, particularly in light of current street parking constraints and community facilities already strained by peak demand.</p> <p>3. Disruption to Living Conditions and Noise Impact</p> <p>While Camden Council cannot reject an application solely due to construction noise, it is within your scope to regulate working hours to mitigate disturbance. With a newborn expected soon, the extensive construction noise, dust, and disruption will create an uninhabitable environment, conflicting with our needs during early parenthood when we will be homebound. As the planned works affect multiple units within Hylda Court and adjacent properties, including nearby residences with tenants working non-traditional hours, we request that, if permitted, the development observes strict limits on construction hours to accommodate existing residents and vulnerable individuals.</p> <p>4. Health Concerns Related to Air Quality</p> <p>The proposed construction within Hylda Court will generate substantial airborne dust and pollutants, posing significant health risks to residents in close proximity, especially young children, pregnant women, the elderly, and those with respiratory sensitivities. This level of disruption will make it difficult for residents to safely open windows or properly ventilate their homes, essential for maintaining indoor air quality and minimizing exposure to construction dust. Camden Council's guidelines emphasize the health and well-being of residents, and this project's proximity threatens to undermine this priority, particularly with a newborn expected in our household.</p> <p>The viability of safely accommodating residents during this extended construction period is questionable. It raises serious concerns about maintaining adequate air quality and protecting public health throughout the duration of the project. Vulnerable individuals, especially children and pregnant women, face increased risk for</p>

Application No: Consultees Name: Received:

Comment:

Response:

respiratory and cardiovascular conditions from construction pollutants, with both immediate and long-term health impacts. Given the scale, duration, and direct proximity of the work to residential units, this development would place residents' health at substantial risk.

We urge the Council to thoroughly assess these health risks and, if approved, enforce strict dust control and air quality monitoring measures to minimize health hazards for those living within and around the construction site. The well-being of residents must remain a primary concern, and measures to safeguard public health must be upheld rigorously if this project is permitted to proceed.

5. Community Displacement and Loss of Local Services

The proposal includes the removal of the "caretaker's flat," currently occupied by Anna Hawes, a vital community figure who has resided here for over a decade. Ms. Hawes not only resides in the caretakers' flat but is also an active community volunteer, organizing programs such as those at the Parliament Hill Lido. Displacing Ms. Hawes would disrupt this community cohesion, which Camden Council recognizes as a valuable resource. I urge the council to consider the broader social impact of removing such an integral member of the community.

6. Incompatibility with Conservation Area Character

Hylda Court is within the Dartmouth Park conservation area and is notable for its Art Deco architectural style, making it an essential contributor to the area's character. Camden Council's guidelines emphasize the importance of preserving the historic and architectural identity of such conservation areas. The proposed penthouses, in a modern style that clashes with the Art Deco design, would visually disrupt the harmony of the existing structure and neighborhood, diminishing its historical and architectural integrity. This development risks eroding the very character that conservation efforts seek to protect, making this a highly concerning alteration for residents and the broader community.

7. Privacy and Daylight Concerns

The proposed development will reduce natural light and compromise the privacy of nearby residences, particularly those at 7 St Albans Road and the lower level flats. The daylight and sunlight assessment submitted lacks accuracy, as it was completed without any site visits or precise measurements of neighboring properties. Camden's guidelines emphasize the importance of privacy and light for neighboring properties, both of which this development could severely impact. Given these deficiencies, I request a more thorough, site-specific evaluation to ensure compliance with daylight standards and privacy considerations.

In conclusion, the proposed development poses significant disruptions to our living conditions, community cohesion, the health of residents, and the character of the Dartmouth Park conservation area. I urge the Council to reconsider the application in light of these issues or, at the very least, impose stringent conditions to mitigate the impacts outlined above.

Thank you for considering my objections.
Kind regards,
Anina Henggeler

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2024/4134/P	Alison McGrath	27/10/2024 21:47:25	OBJ	I Object to this proposal. The roof extension of 3 flats will make the building too tall and not in keeping with the area. In addition it will block light reaching other homes and gardens nearby and create an intrusion of privacy for those living nearby or in many overlooked properties.

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

2024/4134/P	Graeme Bruce	27/10/2024 19:55:46	OBJ	
-------------	--------------	---------------------	-----	--

Dear Mr Campbell

I write to record my objections to the pre-app's dated 2022/2036-2023/2703PRE and Planning application 2024/4134/P as set out in the points numbered below.

1. Made on Health and Safety grounds on the basis that objections logged since 10 October 2024 have reported risks to health by known defects which are widespread in both front and rear sections of the building and did not exist prior to the last phase of works handed over in late 2018 and spring 2019.

2. Made in relation to Structural, Architectural, Fire Escape and Lift issues which have been accurately reported by accredited professionals of these disciplines. These bring into planning consideration the repeat prospect of imposed restricting modifications and unnecessary evacuations.

3. Although the above points may not fulfil the criteria which is defined in the application process documents. The administration underway since the notice was posted in the street, has been more than adequately responded to by the objections logged since 10 October 2024.

4. The process underway has not been subject to the Consultation process which must and should have taken place. This is specifically relevant in relation to points 1 and 2.

5. There are a substantial and growing number of cogent objections which form a consensus of agreement from Hylda Court residents, near neighbours and wider members of the community and Dartmouth Park Conservation Area members, on not demolishing the garages and not building the proposed town houses.

6. In support of this, I object on the grounds already logged by which the caretaker's flat and garages have been deemed unsuitable for demolition, and additionally confirm that the garages are suitable for modern day cars.

7. Please check the Hylda Court planning and environmental records which will confirm that there was a previous proposal and objection lodged against similar plans to build a top storey of flats and canopy roof covering, and conversion of the garages and 'Caretakers Lodge' into a Mews Terrace. This was refused by LBC.

8. Following this in the 2001 to 2006 remodelling works, in April 2006 the demolition and rebuild of the garages began. They had to be rebuilt specifically of the same dimensions, on a like-for-like basis. This was required in order to maintain the garages as part of the Art deco architectural design, as a unified enclosed layout contained within the curtilage of the HC boundary walled site.

9. The nautical liner architectural features and designed for purpose cowled ship vents can be seen clearly from the opposite pavement of St Alban's Road. These vents are installed on all roof areas immediately above each of the six columns of flats, adjacent to the chimneys and rear central funnel features. These architectural components were rightfully left in place on the roof line at the end of the 2019 works. I request that the unique architectural character and nautical component designs are also acknowledged as an integral part of the character of the whole estate be preserved.

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
				<p>I request that this application be rejected and that the historic character of Hylda Court be preserved.</p> <p>Thank you. G.Bruce.</p>
2024/4134/P	P Smith & R Schon	26/10/2024 20:52:29	OBJ	<p>We are neighbours who can see the imposing bulk of Hylda Court from our home in the Dartmouth Park Conservation Area.</p> <p>Overdevelopment / massing: Hylda Court is unique in this area as it is taller than other residential buildings in the immediate vicinity. Additionally it is a very large & densely occupied building in an area of largely single family housing. Adding another storey will make Hylda Court out of proportion with its neighbours & the street & area as a whole.</p> <p>Architecture / design: The building is of unique architectural merit in this area & altering it will spoil the integrity of the original 1930s concept.</p> <p>Housing need: providing private rental homes currently in this large Block We fear this is a with profit exercise designed probably ultimately to sell off the flats, new penthouses & townhouses so losing important rental units in the area and possibly taking away the homes from those who currently live there</p>

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2024/4134/P	Andrei Townsley	25/10/2024 20:55:56	OBJ	<p>I am writing to object the proposal for Hylde Court. The new residential development in question will affect the character of a building which is of both historical and architectural significance, with few examples of the 1930s Art Deco architecture in the vicinity. The proposal will not be in keeping with the surrounding area; with the current height of Hylde Court standing at 14m approx, St. Alban's Villas at 14m approx., number 7 at 12m approx. and numbers 9 and 11 at 13m approx. This is a residential area and the extensive proposal will affect residents negatively with increased noise and activity over a prolonged period. The demolition of garages will mean reduced storage space for residents who currently have a garage. The demolition of the Caretaker's Lodge, which is currently occupied, will result in a tenant losing their home, something which the government is currently claiming to combat during a cost of living crisis and a housing crisis. It is highly improbable that the resident(s) in question will be substantially compensated or paid market rate for their home. It is also highly unlikely that the proposal will deliver affordable housing in the area, something which is stated in the 2021 London Plan under section GG4. It is also not conducive to building strong and inclusive communities, also a goal of the London Plan 2021 section GG1, as residents are priced out of their areas leading to displacement. The proposal lies within the Dartmouth Park Conservation Area, a listed heritage asset, therefore any proposal must take this strongly into consideration. The company that manages Hylde Court, Bankway Properties owned by the William Pears Group, has a history of poor treatment of residents going back as far as 1998. Their property estate manager Nick Stanley is on record for having said at the time "We're not social landlords or a council housing department or a housing association. The idea is to maximise the income from the building." (Source: https://www.independent.co.uk/news/britain-s-fifth-richest-woman-turns-screw-on-her-tenants-1159034.html) Therefore the William Pears Group has shown a 'profit before people' attitude in the management of the building and have openly stated their disregard for the welfare of tenants. The William Pears Group also failed to consult the residents of their plans before their application was submitted, again highlighting their poor code of conduct. (Source: https://www.hamhigh.co.uk/news/24672502.hylde-court-dartmouth-park-tenants-oppose-penthouses-plan/) I urge the relevant officers dealing with this case to strongly consider the points raised in this objection. Kindest regards, Andrei Townsley</p>

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2024/4134/P	Lucinda Stock	27/10/2024 23:37:41	OBJ	27 October 2024

To whom it may concern

Objection to proposed development of Hylda Court, 3-5 St. Alban's Road, NW5 1RE

Application number: 2024/4134/P

This development proposal does not seem sensitive to the local conservation area and does not fully take into consideration the wellbeing of the current occupiers, who it seems have not been properly consulted on the works and noise that will affect their day to day enjoyment of their properties for many months and on that basis should be rejected.

The proposed dwellings on the small area of land and garages to the rear of the property a will be in very close proximity with only a few metres between Hylda Court and the edge of the proposed building. As a former resident I can tell you what made Hylda Court unique was the original architects use of light, the flat always felt bright and airy in all rooms even on the gloomiest of winter days, sitting on the balcony watching the seasons change with the surrounding trees will no longer be possible for any of the flats to the rear of the property due to the loss of privacy.

The proposed addition of a penthouse floor is unnecessary, and will alter the proportions and character of this beautiful art deco building and do not believe this is in line with Camden Local Plan for the area.

There has been inadequate consultation with current residents.

From my personal experience of living at Hylda Court through almost a year of building works to the interior of each flat, it is apparent that any external noise will be amplified and reverberate throughout the lightwell/courtyard making noise levels unbearable for all residents.

The proposed extension of the lift shaft will also cause issues for those with small children or are less able to manage the stairs.

Hylda court is a relatively small block of flats and the greatest thing about the property is sense of community between residents. I fear that the over development and building luxury penthouses will remove this unique feature and future residents will not experience the building in the way in which it intentioned. After 7 happy years at Hylda Court I am saddened to learn that current resident's homes are at risk (they will become unliveable due to noise and disruption) and that their needs and wellbeing have been overlooked in the planning process so far.

Thank you for taking my comments into consideration.

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
				Yours faithfully, Lucinda Stock
2024/4134/P	Peter Bennett	25/10/2024 15:19:36	OBJ	I object This building is of significant historical importance. To build on rooftop would change appearance and may jeopardise the existing structure. It would also compromise direct sunlight in my garden in the summer months
2024/4134/P	Laurence Daley	27/10/2024 23:03:17	OBJ	<p>As a resident of Hylda Court, I strongly object to the proposed development of a penthouse level on top of the existing block and three new townhouses at the rear, as it would introduce significant detriments to our community and environment. The design would elevate the building well beyond the height of other structures in the Dartmouth Park Conservation Area, compromising the art deco character that defines this neighbourhood. Additionally, the proposed construction would severely impact the privacy, light, and visual experience of current residents. The penthouse balconies and townhouse windows would overlook gardens and living spaces, increasing the potential for privacy invasion and diminishing our enjoyment of our own homes.</p> <p>The addition of three townhouses and the penthouse level would bring noise pollution and higher traffic levels, disrupting the peace valued by residents, many of whom require quiet for shift work, including essential NHS staff. Increased traffic and limited parking would also heighten safety risks for children and other residents, particularly as the project proposes to remove existing parking spaces, worsening an already congested area.</p> <p>During construction, the anticipated noise, dust, and general disturbance would further reduce our quality of life, with little planning to mitigate these impacts. We have grave concerns that access to driveways and essential pathways, particularly for residents with disabilities, could be restricted, infringing on their right to accessible transport. The lack of a comprehensive construction management plan is highly troubling, as it shows limited consideration for the community.</p> <p>The proposed development also poses an environmental threat, with a considerable reduction in green spaces and the likely removal of mature trees that contribute to the area's semi-rural character. Given the area's conservation status, such alterations would mar its natural aesthetics and diminish the green views that benefit both residents and wildlife. The existing proposal does not adequately address the requirement for urban greening, thereby failing to meet established conservation objectives.</p> <p>Lastly, communication from the developer has been minimal, with many tenants, including long-standing residents, left uninformed about this proposal and its potential implications. This lack of consultation adds to the impression that the proposal prioritises profit over community well-being and heritage preservation. The applicant's failure to provide vital assessments, such as a noise and vibration report, further demonstrates a disregard for the long-term impact on local residents.</p> <p>For these reasons, I respectfully urge the Council to reject this application in order to protect the conservation area, preserve the quality of life for current residents, and maintain the integrity of this historic neighbourhood. Thank you for your consideration.</p>

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

2024/4134/P Sophie G 27/10/2024 19:08:53 OBJ

Response:

19th October 2024
SUBJECT: Objection to planning permission

APPLICATION NUMBER 2024/4134/P
APPLICATION TYPE FULL PLANNING PERMISSION
ADDRESS HYLDA COURT, 3-5 ST ALBANS ROAD, NW5
1RE
DEVELOPOMENT TYPES NEW RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT

To whom it may concern,

I am objecting to the planning permission regarding the proposals at Hylde Court, St Albans road, NW5 1RE (referred above).

Along with the residents, and the community neighbours, I object to both planning proposals:

- Demolition of garages and resident home to erect three dwellings
- Roof extension of the main building to erect three dwellings and associated hard and soft landscaping

Hylde Court is part of the Dartmouth Park conservation area, and according to the Camden the council document: Dartmouth Park Conservation Area, Appraisal and Management Statement, the building is being referred to as 'an Art Deco period piece' by Pevsner' (p.38).

The building therefore ought to be protected and any alteration thoroughly considered. As the document specifies: 'Development proposals will be expected to preserve or enhance the character or appearance of the Dartmouth Park Conservation Area.' (p.53).

I am arguing that these proposals do not meet these expectations, and that instead they will impact negatively on the conservation area as well as the residents and the nature of the building itself (not to mention the quality of homes).

Beyond its recognised aesthetic value, the architectural Art Deco design of Hylde Court serves a carefully considered functional purpose with in mind to enhance the quality of life of its residents:

1. CONSIDERATION OF LIGHT

The Height of the building meets healthy standard and follows regulations for quality housing.

The flats are arranged in a circular way, to optimise exposure: all rooms have windows, and the living rooms and bedrooms are all on the outer side, provided with large featured corner windows to optimise the light intake.

The centre of the building is a well of light, feeding light to the inner circle rooms (bathrooms and kitchens). There is no blockage of light as it is now.

However, a roof extension will alter the height and the light will be obstructed in the well. This means that the residents of the ground, 1st and 2nd floor will lose the light originally channelled by the well.

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

2. CONSIDERATION OF PRIVACY AND VIEW

The building flats are all carefully orientated as to allow full light intake with large bay window, whilst also offering a view on the outside.

All balconies and windows have an open view on either the street, back yard or the school ground and all are orientated in respect to the resident's privacy with no overlooking.

However, the plan refers to flats being erected at the back of the building, with a 6m length from the existing flats.

This will result in the loss of view and privacy. The residents' view (over the open school ground, Croftdown road character houses and trees) will disappear, and instead will overlook into the new flats (which will also overlook onto existing flats). There will be no more privacy, 6m is a large room length.

The proposals are not considering, nor respecting, the integrity of the building.

So I am questioning the motivation for such plan: how is it improving the Conservation area or the life of the residents? (Not to mention that it involves the loss of a resident's home).

According to the Camden Appraisal and Management Statement,

'The planning authority is required by current English Heritage guidance to review its conservation areas on a regular basis'(p.50-Monitoring and review) and states the importance of '[ensuring] that professional officers from the Conservation and Urban Design Team and Development Control can advise on all aspects of development which could affect the conservation area.' (p.51).

The document is very clear about alterations that will not serve the conservation area, see specification points * and ** below.

I therefore urge a thorough review of these proposals bearing the points above in mind.

Thank you for your time and consideration,
Kind regards.

*(p.55) Roof alterations and extensions

The conservation area retains its clear historic rooflines, which it is important to preserve. Additional storeys, fundamental changes to the roofline, insensitive alterations, poor materials, intrusive dormers or inappropriate windows can harm the historic character of the roofscape and will be resisted.

[...]

Roof alterations or additions are likely to be unacceptable where a building forms part of a complete terrace or group of buildings which have a roof line that is largely unimpaired by alterations or extensions, or where its architectural style would be undermined by any addition.

The rear roof is in some cases as important as the front where these are visible in views from other streets.

Proposals for additional storeys will generally be resisted.

** (p.46/47) Appendix 5 - Issues affecting the whole of the CA

Application No: **Consultees Name:** **Received:**

Comment:

Response:

- Alterations to roofscape – re-roofing in unsympathetic materials or additions such as rooflights on prominent slopes where there is pressure to extend a property. Due to the topography of the area the rear slopes are often as important as the front slopes as views are available from neighbouring streets and buildings.

- Unsympathetic rear and side extensions (including inappropriate roof terraces)–sometimes these can alter the harmony and balance of a property or group of buildings.

- Backland development – some parts of the conservation area have large plots of open green land where there is pressure for development. Such development can reduce the visual and ecological quality of the area.

Reference: Camden council document - Dartmouth Park Conservation Area Appraisal and Management Statement.

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2024/4134/P	Kat Miller	25/10/2024 19:34:40	OBJ	<p>I am writing on behalf of La Sainte Union Catholic School to object to the planning application as currently written. The building that is proposed to be demolished and replaced with a new building forms the boundary with the school. We are surprised and disappointed not to have been consulted about these plans. There is no reference in the planning application to any intention to carry out meaningful consultation with the school as part of the next phase in the event that the application is granted. We only became aware of these plans because a neighbour contacted us to alert us to them. The response to question 11 about consultation does not mention the school at all.</p> <p>The plans refer to three trees on our site, and proposes to carry out works to two of them. Again, there has been no approach to us to discuss this. It states that there was limited survey access – something that could have been remedied had we been approached for access to our site. We would obviously want to understand and agree to any works to these trees.</p> <p>The plans are silent on the fact that the building forms the boundary with the school. It is not clear how/where the temporary boundary hoarding will be, despite the fact that it seems likely that the expectation is that it will be within the school grounds. As a result of this, and the lack of intent to consult with the school as a significantly affected direct neighbour, we are not reassured that those making the application have any understanding of the impact on the safeguarding and health and safety of the students on our school site.</p> <p>There is no consideration within the application of the impact of the noise of the building works on the school, which will be significant due to the proximity to the school's classrooms. There are different dates within the application about when the works will take place, but in one place it suggests they will be ongoing for a year from March 2025 to March 2026, which is highly concerning, and will impact a full year of lessons and exams.</p> <p>We also share the view of our neighbours that the works will have a detrimental impact on the look of the iconic 1930s modernist design of this building of note.</p> <p>We ask that these plans are not approved and that any future intention for this site is discussed with the school in advance.</p>

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2024/4134/P	Kat Miller	25/10/2024 19:34:47	OBJ	<p>I am writing on behalf of La Sainte Union Catholic School to object to the planning application as currently written. The building that is proposed to be demolished and replaced with a new building forms the boundary with the school. We are surprised and disappointed not to have been consulted about these plans. There is no reference in the planning application to any intention to carry out meaningful consultation with the school as part of the next phase in the event that the application is granted. We only became aware of these plans because a neighbour contacted us to alert us to them. The response to question 11 about consultation does not mention the school at all.</p> <p>The plans refer to three trees on our site, and proposes to carry out works to two of them. Again, there has been no approach to us to discuss this. It states that there was limited survey access – something that could have been remedied had we been approached for access to our site. We would obviously want to understand and agree to any works to these trees.</p> <p>The plans are silent on the fact that the building forms the boundary with the school. It is not clear how/where the temporary boundary hoarding will be, despite the fact that it seems likely that the expectation is that it will be within the school grounds. As a result of this, and the lack of intent to consult with the school as a significantly affected direct neighbour, we are not reassured that those making the application have any understanding of the impact on the safeguarding and health and safety of the students on our school site.</p> <p>There is no consideration within the application of the impact of the noise of the building works on the school, which will be significant due to the proximity to the school's classrooms. There are different dates within the application about when the works will take place, but in one place it suggests they will be ongoing for a year from March 2025 to March 2026, which is highly concerning, and will impact a full year of lessons and exams.</p> <p>We also share the view of our neighbours that the works will have a detrimental impact on the look of the iconic 1930s modernist design of this building of note.</p> <p>We ask that these plans are not approved and that any future intention for this site is discussed with the school in advance.</p>

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2024/4134/P	L C	27/10/2024 17:46:22	OBJ	<p>I am writing to object to the planning application submitted under application no. 2024/4134/P. Please carefully consider these objections and those listed by the numerous other objectors from the local community when deciding this application:</p> <p>Structure and Existing Building Condition: The proposed rooftop development does not align with the building's existing structural grid and no evidence has been provided as to the structural strategy with this application. As there are significant on going damp issues within much of the building, and multiple visible structural cracks (neither of which the landlord has resolved) there is a significant risk that these new works will exacerbate ongoing issues. There has also been no evidence provided of consideration in regards to required new services penetrations within the existing slab.</p> <p>At this stage as Hylda Court is a building of significant historic importance and a valuable contribution to the local Conservation Area the applicant must provide a detailed structural strategy detailing all proposed structural works to the existing building in order to protect existing fabric and prevent permanent damage to the character of this key building in the local skyline.</p> <p>Design: As Hylda Court is considered a "building of note" within the local area and the local conservation area there has not been enough evidence provided in the application of the materiality of the proposed scheme. The proposed mews houses are not in keeping with the existing character and the brief study of the existing Hylda Court entrance as justification for the facade design of these dwellings does not warrant ample design development for a proposal of this significance. The dwellings bay windows and large single glazed elements are not in keeping with any of the design vernacular of the local area and are completely inappropriate for the built site context. In order for this application to be decided, further information of material choices and design details must be provided for both the works to the roof and proposed dwellings on the garage footprint, as without so the existing quality of the both Hylda Court and the surrounding area is at risk.</p> <p>Consultation: It is included in the application that only 2 members of the Dartmouth Park neighbourhood forum were in attendance at the consultation, and there has been no communication with existing residents or any notice of this consultation taking place. As a result there was no attendance of conservation area advisory committee nor residents to this meeting on 17th April 2024. This as well as the fact that only 1 site notice was shown for an application of this significance which will effect such a large number of people in the local community is evidence of the fact that these proposals have been produced without adequate consultation. This lack of consultation is inexcusable for an application of this scale and relating to a building with an entirely rented occupancy, and alone should require Camden Council to refuse the application.</p> <p>Privacy and Right to Light: The proposal for 3 new dwellings on the site of the existing garages will have an enormous impact on the privacy and light of the existing properties to the rear of Hylda Court. Some of these dwellings are only 5.5m from Hylda Court and therefore are not in line with Camden Council's guidelines on new dwellings. The studies shown in the D&A of the views from the proposed extensive glazing and bay windows directly facing existing flats are not sufficient, and are deceptive of the level of overlooking existing residents will experience from the windows of both the ground and first floor of the proposed new dwellings. As well as this there is no consideration of the loss of privacy during the construction and inhabitation phases of these dwellings with the</p>

Application No: Consultees Name: Received:

Comment:

Response:

ongoing damp problems within many of the flats (which the landlord continuously fails to solve) natural ventilation is the only possible mitigation existing tenants are able to utilise. During both the construction period and inhabitation of these proposed dwellings this ventilation approach will be significantly impacted, further exacerbating this already significant issue.

The application disregards the significance of existing balconies to residents which are the only outdoor space for flats above ground floor, and would become completely overlooked, significantly impacting the quality of life of both residents in Hylde Court and any new dwellings. As well as the fact that the rear of Hylde Court is also currently a privileged dark zone, benefiting both inhabitants with this southerly aspect (in Hylde Court and surrounding properties) as well as the large array of wildlife in the area which concentrate largely on the grounds of La Sainte Union Catholic School. If the proposal is able to go ahead this will be significantly impacted by the light pollution emitted by the new proposed dwellings.

Additional points:

- There is also no evidence of any consideration of the impact of the works to the roof to the light in the central atrium of the building. Many flats have rooms with single aspect windows into this atrium, which already dark will have their natural lighting even further reduced by the works to the roof.
- The side access to the east of Hylde Court is continuously used by all residents for access to the bins and bike shed, during the construction period access to these facilities have not been addressed nor the safety risks to residents.

In conclusion Camden Council must refuse this application, the supporting evidence for this application is severely flawed, and the inefficient consultation prevents any decision other than refusal to be made.

In addition as a general observation, Camden Council are failing to safeguard commenters on this application, by failing to efficiently redact private information - please address this immediately as personal information shared by others (on this application and any others) should not be available on a public website.

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2024/4134/P	Joanne Boehler	25/10/2024 14:59:56	OBJ	<p>The impact of the proposed development to Hylda Court raises many concerns which will have multiple affects on a residential road in the Dartmouth park Conservation area.</p> <p>What I find astounding is the total lack of communication with the residents of St Albans Road and the wider community. The speed at which the developer is trying to push this through without consulting the tenants is totally unacceptable.</p> <p>It is very difficult to understand how the construction of the town houses can be achieved without irreversible damage to the mature trees that resides on the property of LSU. A large part of one of the trees would have to have most of its branches removed for the construction.</p> <p>The architects drawings and description of a "Communal Garden" for all of the residents is a generous one, on one side there will be a path with a gate and the bins. There will be some green spaces in front of the townhouses but given the gap between the back of the existing building and the new houses is only 6m, I cannot imagine the people in the houses or the flats will want to sit in what is effectively the front garden of the townhouses.</p> <p>There will be a loss of light not only to the current residents of Hylda Court but to the green spaces behind St Alban Villas, the gardens of the adjacent properties and also number 8 St Albans Road which is directly opposite and is not mentioned at all in the proposal.</p> <p>St Albans Road is a tree lined residential road that during the months where the leaves are on the trees one can still see Hylda Court as it currently stands, if the penthouse floor is allowed to go ahead it will have a detrimental impact on the general view of St Albans Road for all living there but most of all for the people living in the surrounding houses and flats. It will be overbearing and an eyesore from the road.</p> <p>There are currently 5 parking spaces at the front of Hylda Court plus however many of the garages are used for parking. Parking in St Albans Road is already incredibly difficult particularly during the summer months. There are limited parking spaces as it stands and Camden have just removed two more for Electric vehicle charging points. The new properties will increase demand for what is already an overcrowded street. I would petition for the new residents not to be allowed parking permits.</p> <p>The developer describes the caretakers cottage as not used, this is a blatant lie as the resident Anna Hawes has lived there for 11 years. What happens to her? She is a valued member of the community and runs numerous programmes supporting the local people. Will she even be able to afford the rent on one of the townhouses? This brings me to my final point of affordable housing in the Dartmouth Park Conservation area. Are we to believe that the penthouses and the townhouses will be affordable to all? Is this the kind of housing that St Albans Road really needs? If this development is allowed to go ahead could it set a precedent for other properties in the road in particular St Albans Villas which currently still has less floors than Hylda Court.</p> <p>Many thanks</p>

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2024/4134/P	Jonathan Davies	27/10/2024 19:52:24	OBJ	<p>Dear Camden Council Planning Department,</p> <p>I am writing to formally object to planning application 2024/4134/P for Hylda Court. As new tenants who recently signed a 12-month lease and are expecting a baby in April 2024, we were dismayed to learn of these development plans from fellow residents just days after moving in. The proposed construction presents severe concerns for our family's wellbeing, particularly during our transition to parenthood. My objections center on these critical issues:</p> <p>Severe Construction Impact While construction noise alone may not warrant objection, the combination of prolonged noise, dust, and disruption would create an untenable living environment, particularly critical for our expected newborn. We strongly urge implementation of strict construction hour limitations to protect resident wellbeing.</p> <p>Deterioration of Living Standards The proposed expansion would severely compromise living conditions through:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Significant reduction in natural light for lower units - Increased density and potential for overcrowding - Additional strain on already limited local amenities and parking - Compromised living space quality for existing residents <p>Critical Health Risks</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The development poses serious health hazards through: - Prolonged exposure to construction dust and pollutants - Compromised air quality in residential units - Particular risks for vulnerable residents (newborns, pregnant women, elderly) - Limited ventilation options during construction for existing residents during the 1+ year construction timeframe proposed <p>Failure in Resident Communication The complete absence of tenant consultation is deeply concerning. Neither current nor prospective residents were informed of these significant development plans, despite their profound impact on our living conditions. This lack of transparency contradicts Camden Council's emphasis on community engagement and must be addressed before any approval is considered.</p> <p>Community Fabric Damage The planned removal of the caretaker's flat would displace Anna Hawes, a decade-long resident and vital community contributor, particularly through her volunteer work at Parliament Hill Lido. This loss would significantly damage local community cohesion.</p> <p>Conservation Area Integrity The modern penthouse additions would severely compromise Hylda Court's distinctive Art Deco character, undermining the architectural integrity of the Dartmouth Park conservation area. This inappropriate design modification threatens to erode the very features these preservation guidelines aim to protect.</p>

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
				<p>Privacy and Daylight Violations The development would significantly impact:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">- Natural light access for adjacent properties- Privacy of neighboring residents- Quality of life for ground-floor occupants- The current daylight assessment lacks credibility due to the absence of site visits and actual measurements. <p>The cumulative impact of these issues - on resident health, community wellbeing, historical preservation, and living standards - represents an unacceptable burden on current residents and the broader neighborhood. I strongly urge the Council to either reject this application or impose comprehensive conditions that effectively address these serious concerns.</p> <p>Yours sincerely, Jonathan Davies 21 Hylda Court London NW5 1RE 27/10/2024</p>

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2024/4134/P	Caro Simon	25/10/2024 19:47:31	INT	

Re: Objection to Planning Application [2024/4134/P]

Proposed Construction of three Penthouses and Townhouses at the back of Hylda Court, 3–5 St. Albans Rd, NW5 1RE, London, UK.

We are writing to object to the planning application for the construction of three penthouses on top of Hylda Court and three townhouses at the rear of Hylda Court.

We have significant concerns about the severe negative impact that this development would have on the (approx. 100) residents at Hylda Court (including families, children, elderly people, and people with special needs) as well as the wider community. Below are the key reasons for our objection:

1. Noise and Dust Pollution

The construction of penthouses and townhouses would generate excessive noise and dust over a prolonged period of time, expected to last at least one year. This disruption would particularly affect children, elderly residents, and those with special needs, who are more vulnerable to the physical and mental health effects of constant noise and dust exposure.

Flexible working arrangements have become increasingly common in the modern world. The level of noise and pollution caused by the construction work would make it impossible to work from home, causing a significant degree of disruption in life balance, childcare arrangements, and other key aspects of everyday life. In addition, it would disrupt the arrangements with many employers, since many of them no longer have the capacity to provide their employees with office space five days a week.

2. Negative Impact on Residents' Quality of Life

The project would drastically affect the residents' (i.e. approx. 100 residents') quality of life, depriving them of peace and quiet throughout the lengthy and highly disruptive construction period. With residents already facing serious structural issues in an ageing building, the significant disruption caused by such a large-scale project would be unfair and unreasonable.

3. Decrease in Natural Light

The construction of three penthouses would reduce natural light to many flats in Hylda Court. Furthermore, the proximity of the proposed townhouses – which would be located only six meters from the main building – would cast additional shadows, depriving numerous residents (esp. those living on the lower floors) of natural light, making their living spaces significantly darker and less habitable.

Application No: Consultees Name: Received:

Comment: Response:

4. Proximity to a School

The building is situated right next to a major school (i.e. La Sainte Union Catholic School). The proposed works raise serious issues regarding the potential disruption of the school's learning environment. The increased noise, dust, and traffic during construction would affect pupils, staff, and parents, creating safety risks and compromising the school's educational activities.

5. Traffic Disruption

The proposed construction would increase traffic around Hylda Court, including heavy vehicles for material deliveries and construction equipment. This would further congest roads, disrupt bus route C11, and interfere with vital services (such as Royal Mail, delivery services, and rubbish collection).

The increased traffic would exacerbate existing issues in the area, posing safety risks for pedestrians and other road users, especially children attending the nearby school.

6. Fire Safety and Blocked Escape Routes

The works would obstruct proper access to fire escape routes, posing serious safety risks for residents. Ensuring easy and unrestricted access to fire escapes is critical in a building as large (and with as many residents) as Hylda Court.

The proposed development at the back of the building comprises a no-car access to the back of the building. It is a concern that, in case of an emergency, access to the back of the building for fire services would be severely compromised.

Blocking or restricting access to these essential escape routes would pose a serious risk to residents' safety and would be particularly concerning in a building with such a large number of residents.

7. Scaffolding Obstructing Light and Access

The necessary scaffolding for this construction project would obstruct parts of the building and block natural light from reaching many flats for the duration of the work (i.e. at least for one year). This would further exacerbate the loss of natural light, in addition to causing noticeable obstruction for residents seeking to access their homes. The decrease in daylight would negatively affect residents' quality of life, making flats darker and significantly less health-and-safety-compliant. This would have a serious impact on their physical and mental health as well as on their general well-being.

8. Lack of Consultation with Residents

Application No: Consultees Name: Received:

Comment: Response:

The residents of Hylda Court have not been adequately informed, consulted, or notified about this proposed development. A project of this scale, which affects a significant number of people, should involve proper communication with sincere consideration of, and unanimous agreement from residents. Unfortunately, this has not been the case.

9. Demolition of Currently Used Garages and Caretaker's Home

The demolition of garages currently used by residents would eliminate essential parking and storage space, creating a significant degree of inconvenience. Moreover, the demolition of the so-called caretaker's home (one of the tenant's homes) raises serious concerns about the displacement of an existing resident. The lack of communication and information regarding this matter seems questionable.

10. Deteriorated State of the Building and Neglected Repairs

The building is already in a state of disrepair, with the owner neglecting to carry out necessary maintenance and repair works. It is concerning that a large new project is being proposed, despite the fact that basic maintenance issues (which have been widely documented over the past years) have still not been properly addressed. The strain of additional construction on an ageing building would exacerbate existing problems.

11. Recent Disruption from Previous Works

Only six years ago, Hylda Court experienced a year of major disruption from works that were relatively minor, compared to what is now being proposed. Residents suffered considerable inconvenience during that time. Repeating such a scenario, on a larger scale, would have even more damaging consequences.

12. Impact on Biodiversity and Nearby Trees

The proposed development poses a threat to local biodiversity and several old trees located near the building, including those on the neighbouring properties. The loss of mature trees would negatively affect not only the character of the neighbourhood but also the natural environment (including the life of squirrels, birds, insects, between others).

13. Impact on Local Services and Utilities

The construction works are likely to disrupt vital services – including gas, electricity, and water supply. The operation of the lift would also be affected, since it would require an extension. This is particularly concerning for families with young children, people with mobility issues, and elderly residents, all of whom rely on the elevator for access to their homes. Prolonged disruption of these services would severely affect residents' daily lives.

Application No: Consultees Name: Received:

Comment: Response:

14. Duration of Project

The expected (best-case scenario) one-year duration of the construction would cause severe disruption – due to the constant noise, dust, traffic issues, and limited access to the building. In our view, this is an unacceptable burden to place on residents, who already face serious challenges living in an ageing building.

15. Overcrowding and Proximity Issues

The construction of new units would increase the density of the building, leading to overcrowding and reducing the space available for residents. Furthermore, the close proximity of the new construction would result in a considerable loss of privacy, with overlooking windows from the penthouses potentially compromising residents' private spaces.

16. Loss of Privacy

The construction of additional penthouses would elevate the building, allowing new residents to overlook neighbouring properties, especially those in close proximity (notably the lower flats at Hylda Court and both number 7 and number 17 St. Albans Road). This increase in height and visibility would reduce privacy for these residents, as their gardens, windows, and outdoor spaces could be overlooked by the new penthouses.

17. Demolition of an Existing Tenant's Home

One of the tenants would be displaced as a result of the planned demolition of their home to make way for the development. This raises serious concerns about the impact on the tenant's rights, housing security, and the stability of the building's community.

Summary

Given the multiple and significant adverse effects on residents' quality of life, the safety concerns, the environmental impact, and the lack of consultation, we strongly urge the planning committee to reject this application. In our view, the proposed development does not provide sufficient mitigation for the negative impact it would have on Hylda Court's residents, their neighbours, the neighbourhood in general, and – more broadly – the surrounding community.

The construction of luxury apartments and expensive townhouses would not serve those members of the Camden community, who – in accordance with the government's policies – need to be provided with affordable accommodation.

Thank you for taking the time to consider these objections. We very much hope that, when reaching a decision concerning this matter, the planning authorities will prioritise the welfare and interests of the members

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
				of the Camden community.

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2024/4134/P	Phoebe C	27/10/2024 23:13:49	OBJ	<p>Objection to planned development of 3-5 Hylde Court, Saint Albans Road 2024/4134/P</p> <p>I write to you as a resident of Hylde Court to put forward my strong objection to the proposed development of Hylde Court of additional dwellings (penthouses on top of building and townhouses behind building) for a number of reasons outlined below.</p> <p>Reduced privacy: The size and layout of this development will invade the privacy of nearby homes. More foot traffic and increased visibility from windows, balconies, and outdoor spaces will reduce the comfort of peoples homes, particularly an issue at the back of the property, where there isn't enough space for multi-story townhouses.</p> <p>Demolition of caretakers cottage: The plans include removing garages and a so called caretaker's flat but this isn't accurate and in fact the application fails to mention that the flat has been the home of a long time resident of over 10 years (who knew nothing about these plans). This development means they would lose their home in the middle of a housing crisis, which is particularly concerning. If these plans are approved it would be devastating for her and all residents of Hylde are appalled by this.</p> <p>Potential to block bus route: Saint Albans Road is on the C11 bus route. I am concerned that ongoing building works, plant equipment and delivery trucks would be blocking and delaying this route on a daily basis. I saw this happen multiple times with a house being renovated opposite Hylde Court, for example a delivery lorry blocked the road for almost 30 minutes - with a back log of 4 C11 buses being held at gridlock. This will not only cause traffic issues on Saint Albans Road, there will be a further ripple affect on surrounding roads.</p> <p>Inadequate Communication: No residents of Hylde Court have had any meaningful communication or consultation prior to these plans from Bankways and/or Hamways. When this matter was first brought to our attention, we were both surprised and alarmed. This is completely unacceptable and immoral behaviour towards those who live there.</p> <p>Fire safety: There is nothing in the application concerning the fire safety for the proposed penthouses, or for current residents during construction period. If the access path on side of building is used for construction vehicles, the existing fire escape will be obstructed. This would compromise resident safety.</p> <p>Lift access: Building the penthouses will mean extending the lift to a further floor - therefore lift engineering works will be taking place and there is a strong probability the lift will be out of access for extended periods of time. This is an accessibility issues for wheelchair users, and for those who rely on the lift for other reasons, such as families using prams.</p> <p>Impact of noise: The noise from the construction will be unbearable, particularly for those living in Hylde Court and local residents in close proximity. Our tenancy agreement states that the 'enjoyment of our property may not be disrupted by the landlord'. The impact of noise from plant equipment will be significantly disruptive and ongoing all day, five days a week. No sufficient noise report has been undertaken to understand how detrimental this will be to residents.</p> <p>Traffic/access management of construction vehicles accessing back of property: It will be nigh on impossible for large vehicles/trucks/lorry's to access the back of building for construction. How will this be managed by</p>

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
				<p>Bankways/construction workers, in a way that respects current tenants rights to peacefully enjoy their homes? Example: I have previously witnessed scaffolders attempt to drive down the access path to the left of Hylda Court in order to put scaffolding up. It was impossible; their truck could not make it through columns on both sides of the entranceway to main front drive and the construction workers had a blatant disregard of how much noise they were making.</p> <p>Historical significance of building: Hylda Court is a notable and historically significant Art Deco building. The proposed modern penthouses above Hylda Court building are not designed with this in mind. Further, they will negatively impact the overall character of the local area. This building has recently had an application put in to be listed, until a decision is made, no further decision or application should be made for this development.</p> <p>Current building issues: Hylda Court has a serious damp problem, affecting almost all flats. We (multiple residents) have reported severe mould issues several times to Hamways. Although specialists have come to assess the situation, the underlying cause hasn't been resolved. The walls are simply scraped or cleaned and repainted. We are advised to keep the windows open, which during winter is simply not possible. We are all concerned that adding another floor to the building will only make the situation worse.</p> <p>Structural impact of works: The reports do not assess how the new roof extension will affect Hylda Court's structure. The design does not fit the current support system, with walls resting directly on the slab. The building has issues from past bomb damage and more weight will likely make these problems worse.</p> <p>To conclude, I strongly object to this planning application and urge Camden Council to reject this proposal due to all reasons outlined above.</p>
2024/4134/P	Caitlin Massie	27/10/2024 21:14:49	OBJ	<p>As a current tenant of Hylda Court, I am shocked to see a planning application further development rather than improvements or maintenance of a historic building.</p> <p>Adding an additional floor to the building not only impacting the existing tenants of the building in terms of significant noise and disruption during construction, the penthouse floor would raise the building well above the tallest building currently in this conservation area. The additional story will not only affect the light for neighbouring properties, with an added element of overlooking onto a number of neighbours, but existing levels of Hylda Court with loss of light during construction and upon completion.</p> <p>The addition of the dwellings where the existing garages lie, also creating a higher degree of thoroughfare on a secluded and quiet area, not only during construction, but also once completed. Not to mention, the demolishing of an existing tenants flat, of which she has been a long serving tenant.</p> <p>Ultimately, the lack of communication and acknowledgment of impact upon existing tenants and neighbours has been overlooked, with no consultation.</p>

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2024/4134/P	G D O'Bryen	25/10/2024 19:56:13	OBJ	<p>I object to this application on the following grounds:</p> <p>-- Detrimental to the character of the conservation area: already the tallest building by far, the addition of a further storey will loom large over neighbours. The proposal is totally out of keeping with the low density, low-rise character of the street.</p> <p>-- Loss of light and risk of glare: the extra storey will reduce light all round, including into my flat, and there is a real risk that the glazing proposed will direct glare into my and other neighbouring homes.</p> <p>-- Out of keeping with the existing building: Hylde Court is not listed but it probably should be. It is a handsome building in a much appreciated Art Deco style and should be cherished as it is, not mucked about with. St Albans Road has varied architecture, but all of the buildings, including the plain but well designed council owned blocks at the Heath end, have a cohesion and dignity about them. Let's keep it that way.</p> <p>-- Density: Hylde Court already has by far the highest occupation density of any building on the street, with dozens of flats crammed into an area barely large enough to contain them. The proposal not just adds yet more density, but of course also places even greater pressure on the limited on-street parking spaces available. Where are the extra vehicles going to go?</p> <p>-- Disruption: as someone who suffers chronic lung disease, I am very alarmed by the prospect of having a building site of this scale on my doorstep. Access to the rear of Hylde Court is so narrow that building materials will need to be offloaded on street, while demolition waste will have to be carted back to the street for loading onto lorries. This will greatly prolong the noisiest and dustiest stage of the proposed project, as well as making it even noisier and dustier for everyone. Use of the pavement will have to be restricted through both demolition and construction phases. And how are the 214 buses going to get past while all this is going on?</p> <p>-- I am not a resident of Hylde Court, but if this proposal is allowed, their lives will be made temporarily intolerable, and for those who live in the lower floors at the back, permanently so.</p> <p>I live in a semi-detached house, the other half of which has been the subject of a recently completed year-long building project; from the rear, I can see and hear the two current building projects on Swain's Lane. These are not pleasant things to endure, but I accept that some building work needs to happen and I did not object to any of these projects. However, the chutzpah of this current proposal is astonishing: to suggest that the largest, most densely occupied and most hard-to-access building on the street should be enlarged further (with a charming and much loved Art Deco facade wilfully defaced in the process) is a very bad idea indeed and should be thrown out while wasting as little time and money on it as possible.</p>