

[REDACTED]

From: Martin Jourdan [REDACTED]
Sent: 31 July 2013 12:41
To: Planning
Subject: All Hallows Church Application No 2013/4184/P
Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Orange

Comments from Martin Jourdan [REDACTED]

I live immediately opposite All Hallows Church and I would make the following comments about the application.

1. At present there is an ugly high wooden structure with scaffolding blocking the south side of the church and anything will be an improvement on this. However I remain to be convinced that any extension to this historic church is necessary and that the provision of disabled access and toilet facilities cannot be arranged in a more friendly way.
2. The plans as submitted would seem to substantially reduce the light to the back extension and garden of my neighbours, Mr and Mrs Thomas Meere, who live immediately opposite and would be most affected by any development.
3. There does not seem to be any provision made for parking with this new facility. Even at present I dare not move my car when concerts are held in the church for fear that I will not be able to park on return. I presume that the church would seek to extend usage with this new facility.
4. At the moment following a church concert there is a great deal of noise as chairs and other furniture are removed, sometimes going on till one o'clock in the morning. I do not see that the proposed extension provides facilities that will change this.
5. I presume that the church still owns All Hallows Hall, a two storey building immediately beside the church on Courthope Road. At present this is let to a private primary school. Could it not be reclaimed by the church and used to provide the community facilities and toilets with disabled access that the church desires.
6. My personal preference would be for the church to landscape the southern aspect between Shirlock and Courthope Roads and so improve the environment of the area. At the same time they could look at other methods of developing the facilities that they need.

[REDACTED]

From: Keith Kendrick [REDACTED]
Sent: 31 July 2013 13:24
To: Planning
Cc: [REDACTED]
Subject: All Hallows Church - Planning Application no: 2013/4184/P
Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Orange

Dear Sir/Madam @ Camden Council Planning,

I would like to add my voice to the below email from local residents re: All Hallows Church - Planning Application no: 2013/4184/P.

I object to the proposals because of all the issues raised by Mr Ferraro and would be grateful if you would add my protest when considering the planning application.

Yours,

Keith Kendrick
[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]
To: planning@camden.gov.uk

Subject: All Hallows Church - Planning Application no: 2013/4184/P

Date: Mon, 29 Jul 2013 10:49:29 +0100

To: Camden Council

Ref: Comments on a Planning Application - Consultation Period to 2nd August 2013

Planning Officer: Ms Angela Ryan

From: Richard Ferraro BA(Hons) DipArch ARB RIBA FRSA - 29 Sherlock Road,
London NW3 2HR

**Ref: Planning Application no: 2013/4184/P - All Hallows Church,
Savernake Road, London NW3**

Dear Sir /Madam

I am a local resident living close to the above application site. I am also an Architect with specialist experience of Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas gained over 35 years of professional practice. I write to lodge significant objections to the Planning Application, details above, as follows:

1. Design / Architecture / Setting / Mansfield Conservation Area / Listed Building Status

- I object to the proposed new building in its entirety.

- The design is insensitive to its local context in the Mansfield Conservation Area, in which importance is given to the existing Victorian and Edwardian buildings, their traditional forms and materials, and to the existing layout of buildings in the area.
- The proposed new building will have a deleterious effect on this architecturally important church building, All Hallows Church, which is a Grade II* Listed Building designed by Giles Gilbert Scott, completed c.1914.
- Importantly, the church is a free-standing building in its original condition, without any modifications or additions. Its quality and uniqueness rely in part on the fact that the church is a strong, imposing, separate form. It is surrounded by residential streets on three sides, and there is an empty strip of land along its south side, providing important separation between the church and the neighbouring residential buildings of lower height to the south, in Shirlock Road and Courthope Road. (Part of this strip of land forms the site of the proposal.)
- The proposed new building will be attached to the existing church building and will fill up the important space of separation on the south side of the church. The proposed new building will therefore spoil the elegance, composition and architectural strength of this important free-standing structure.
- Like the other three façades, the south façade of the church is of very high quality, with vertical buttresses coming to the ground, all built of modelled stone with accentuated joints and other high quality detailing. The original materials are all in tact and in good condition. The regular full height elements of the south façade need to be viewed in an uninterrupted way, full height, in order to appreciate the fine quality of the building as a separate entity, as intended by the Architect.
- The proposed new building also forms a visual extension to the church's important west façade (its 'front'), facing onto Shirlock Road. The new building would substantially change the visual character of the west façade in an inappropriate manner, from an architectural point of view. Currently the west façade is symmetrical and makes a powerful architectural statement, with its very fine high level circular stained glass window, set in stone surround with stone mullions and articulations. This unusual feature, together with the central doors located below it on the east-west central axis of the building, form a strong central composition in this symmetrical west facade.
- The proposed new building would unbalance the important symmetry of this façade, and the proposed new entrance at the SW corner of the church would detract from the importance of the original central entrance. These effects are very undesirable regarding the integrity and quality of this significant well preserved historic church, which is a fine example of work by this eminent Architect.
- The proposed new building will have a deleterious affect on the 'setting' of the Listed church building on the south side. The proposed new building would eliminate the possibility of access to the base of the south façade, which should be enjoyed and viewed from ground level in its entirety without obstruction, in particular because it is the only façade of the church that does not front onto a street.
- There is a strong case for removing the existing ugly wooden fence at the SW corner of the church, fronting onto Shirlock Road, perhaps to be replaced by railings of appropriate design, to better view and appreciate the south façade obliquely from Shirlock Road.

- The strip of land along the south side of the church could/should be landscaped appropriately, eg as a garden, not ugly concrete as it is now. This approach would better enhance the existing south façade of the church, and could enable controlled public access to appreciate this important façade of the building, currently obscured by the ugly fence.
- In addition, the proposed new building is intrusive and insensitive regarding no. 56 Sherlock Road and in particular its rear extension, which was built many years ago. This is an established residential property with ground and first floor windows facing onto the site of the proposed new building (on the boundary). The new building would result in unacceptable loss of amenity and privacy to this residential property.

2. Use / Intensification of Use / Commercial Use / Impact on Local Residents and Community

- Currently the building is a church, and I understand this use has been continuous since it was constructed. There is a more recent privately run nursery school in the crypt of the church at lower ground level, with external playground, accessed from the east side in Courthope Road. (NB: I'm not aware if the use of the crypt as a nursery school has Planning Permission.)
- From time to time evening concerts of classical music are held in the church, for which tickets can be purchased and, on the whole, these events are both tolerated and enjoyed by the local residents and community, because they are pleasant to attend, and infrequent.
- However, when the concerts take place, there is considerable disruption and disturbance to the local residents over a two day period, normally a weekend. This is due to the need for trucks to unload seating, scaffolding to support seating, sound and other equipment for the concert - followed by its removal. There is also parking chaos in the area on these occasions due to a large influx of cars of both staff and attendees of the concerts. This into an area already suffering from lack of parking capacity for residents, and parking stress.
- Particular problems exist at present due to the removal process of equipment after a concert, often taking place after the concert finishes, carrying on noisily into the early hours of the following morning (commonly a Sunday). This involves truck movements and the like. This is unreasonable and unacceptable to local residents, particularly those facing the church in Savernake Road and Sherlock Road.
- On one occasion that I know of in the past (some years ago), the church building was rented out to a commercial recording company for a period of one (or perhaps two?) weeks of continuous use. During this period the church was not accessible and there was no public performance. Extreme parking chaos resulted in the area for the whole period, and there was a great deal of late night disturbance. I was one of several people who objected most strongly about this to Father Holding at the church, and to my knowledge this type of blatant commercial activity has not been repeated on that scale.
- However, there is a great deal of concern locally that the current Planning Application, if approved, will result in an intensification of use of current "non-church" activities (eg more frequent concerts) - resulting in additional unacceptable disruption, disturbance, late night activity and parking chaos. This

is because the proposed new building would enhance the facilities of the church, including additional toilets, catering facilities, etc.

- Further, I'm concerned that the church will view an approval of the Planning Application as an opportunity to rent the building out on a fully commercial basis (even though intermittent) to recording companies or other commercial organisations. This outcome would be intolerable to local residents and the local community for all the above mentioned reasons, and would not be compatible with the use of the church primarily as a place of worship. In my view, commercial use of this type must not be permitted.
- In conclusion, my first position is to object to the new building as a whole (see 1 above). However, if the Council did see fit to grant any sort of Planning Permission for additional facilities at the church, it's important that the CURRENT "non-church" activities be defined and restricted to no more than is currently the case, ie concerts of classical music at current frequency (perhaps 2 or 3 a year). This should be done via a specific Condition in any Notice of Approval - to include the definition of what is an acceptable event, plus restrictions about frequency and hours of operation, car parking, truck movements, and a ban on late night working and disruption.
- AND I request the addition of a further Condition in a Notice of Approval, should any Planning Permission be granted, to wholly exclude the use of the church as a commercial recording studio or for any other commercial use, or for any other activity (apart from concerts as mentioned above) that would generate unacceptable disruption, disturbance and additional parking stress.

3. Access and Toilets for People with Disabilities

- I am not against the church providing improved access to the main building for people with disabilities, and access for people with disabilities to the existing toilets in the crypt; and/or installing one or two new toilets at ground level for people with disabilities.
- However, these objectives do not require either the new building as proposed, or probably any new building. A more modest and discreet approach would suffice.
- For example, if improved access is required to the main church, it would be appropriate and easy to construct a suitably designed low gradient ramp from the main paved entrance area in front of the west façade leading to the south side of the church, to make use of an existing doorway there, as an alternative access point to the church. This ramp and access could form the basis of a new landscaped approach to the strip of land on the south side of the church, to improve amenity and to open up the view of the south façade of the church from Shirlock Road.
- Such a landscaping scheme could also address the requirements for security, privacy and amenity of no. 56 Shirlock Road.
- Regarding access for disabled people to toilets, it may simply be a case of installing a platform lift from the main church down to the crypt, of appropriate design and subject to the required consents.
- However, if meeting the requirements for disability access did result in the need for a new building, this could be small (ie minimum size necessary) and must be carefully considered from a design point of view.

- In my view, any small new building must be set well back from the west façade of the church in Shirlock Road. And great care must be taken regarding design and impact on the Grade II* Listed church building, and its setting.

In conclusion, I object to the current proposals in their entirety and strongly request that the Council refuses Planning Permission.

Yours sincerely
Richard Ferraro

Regeneration and Planning Development Management

London Borough of Camden

Town Hall

Judd Street

London WC1H 8ND

29th July 2013

Attention: Angela Ryan

Dear Angela,

All Hallows Church, Savernake Road NW3 2LD

Application Ref: 2013/4184/P

I object to the proposed new building in its entirety as it will have a deleterious effect on my parental family property no.56 Shirlock Road.

The proposed new building is intrusive and insensitive regarding no. 56 Shirlock Road and in particular regarding the height and width of the proposed extension, which will adversely affect the daylight and sunlight to no. 56 Shirlock Roads ground floor kitchen, bedroom and WC windows (the bedroom and WC windows are not shown on the plans and the ground floor is incorrectly noted as 'basement' on the section). The owners of no 56 Shirlock Road have a statutory right to light and on this basis the proposed new building is unacceptable as it inhibits their right to daylight and sunlight and will have a deleterious effect on their home environment. No. 56 Shirlock Roads extension was built over 20 years ago with permission agreed it is an established residential property with windows facing onto the site of the proposed building. The new building would overlook 56 Shirlock Road and result in unacceptable loss of amenity, loss of privacy and have a deleterious effect to the property no.56 Shirlock Road.

The proposed nature of the light well is generally a concern. The width is noted as 1 meter from the proposed extension to no 56. windows, which in reality less than a meter from face to face wall. This is not acceptable as it will have an impact on daylight and sunlight to no. 56 property.

The light well also poses a security problem for the residents of 56 Shirlock Road and during the meeting of the 28th July 2013 Geoffrey a member of the church council was very critical regarding the residents of 56 Shirlock Road claiming that the security problem would be theirs along with the cleaning of the light well. Therefore this proposed new building is not in the best interest of the residents. Any new building should not be at the detriment of others i.e the loss of security, loss of privacy and loss of amenity of longstanding residents of 36 years i.e. the owners of no.56 Shirlock Road.

No details of toilet and kitchen venting arrangements are shown on the application drawings. It should be clearly denoted that soil and extract vents are directed up the south wall of the church and discharged at high parapet level to avoid noise and smells close to no. 56 Shirlock Road boundary windows. The location of the final discharge point for rainwater run-off from the proposed flat roof is also unclear. This extensive roof should drain away from no. 56 boundary, to the east of the roof. This new building proposal does not

consider the impact on its neighbour's property and in light of this and with respect the council should refuse this application for planning permission.

I truly believe the extension will eventually operate as a commercial venue All Hallows is listed in Time Out and also has its own website to hire out the church or the crypt and from past experience, when a third party rents space in All Hallows Church, the Church does not take responsibility for overseeing any noise and disruption, particularly at night in what is in entirety a residential area. There is a great deal of concern locally that the current Planning Application, if approved, will result in an intensification of use of current "non-church" activities (eg more frequent concerts) - resulting in additional unacceptable disruption, disturbance, late night activity and parking chaos. This is because the proposed new building would enhance the facilities of the church, including additional toilets, catering facilities, etc.

Furthermore I am seriously concerned that the church will view an approval to the Planning Application as an opportunity to rent the building out on a fully commercial basis to recording companies or other organisations. Currently on the Church website people can be a good steward by giving charitable donations to ensure the upkeep of the Grade II listed building. However I feel that if the Planning Application was approved the Church would be rented out on a commercial basis to ensure this financial opportunity was exploited. This outcome would be intolerable to local residents and the local community, and should not be permitted.

The car parking proposal remains unacceptable, and the application does not address the concerns voiced by local residents. The proposed side extension is designed for a greater number of events at a larger scale and this will increase the car parking numbers, particularly as the Church does not have a dedicated loading bay for off-street parking. These additional cars will reduce the number of car parking spaces available for residents and as a consequence cause locals added stress; create more noise and disruption and will have a significant negative impact on a quiet residential area.

In conclusion, I would ask the council to refuse Planning Permission in its entirety, however if the Council did grant any sort of Planning Permission for additional facilities at the church, it needs to wholeheartedly support the necessary concerns of the residents of 56 Sherlock Road i.e. address the issues of loss of security, loss of privacy and loss of amenities including daylight and sunlight and its deleterious effect on their property.

I fully support Richard Ferraro's letter objecting to planning permission for the new build in particular I think it is important that the CURRENT "non-church" activities be defined and restricted to no more than is currently the case, ie infrequent concerts. This should be done via a specific Condition in any Notice of Approval - also to include restrictions about hours of operation, truck movements, and a ban on late night working and disruption this would protect residents from the 'creep' effect etc.

AND I support Richard Ferraro's request for the addition of a further Condition in any Notice of Approval, should any Planning Permission be granted, to wholly exclude the blatant use of the church as a commercial recording studio or for any other commercial use, or for any other activity that would generate unacceptable disruption and disturbance to the local residents and surrounding community.

Finally, I support the church in their wish to improve access to the existing toilets in the crypt, and/or installing one or two new toilets at ground level, for use by people with disabilities. However I do not see the need for this proposed new building or any new building. It has been suggested that installing a platform lift from the main church down to the crypt would be suffice. If it did require a new building to achieve this objective, this could be small (ie minimum size necessary) and could be properly set well back

from the west façade in Shirlock Road to ensure no.56 security, privacy and amenities including their right to daylight and sunlight was protected.

In conclusion, I strongly object to the proposals in their entirety and I request that the Council refuses Planning Permission.

Yours sincerely

Sinead Whelan-Meere

From: annie aberdeen [REDACTED]
Sent: 31 July 2013 15:55
To: Planning
Subject: All Hallows Church, Planning Application Ref: 2013/4184/P
Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Orange

**Subject: FW: All Hallows Church,
Planning Application Ref: 2013/4184/P**

**To: Camden Council
Planning Officer: Ms Angela Ryan
From: Ms Anne Aberdeen**

**Ref: Planning Application no: 2013/4184/P -
All Hallows Church, Savernake Road,
London NW3**

The following comments reflect my views concerning the proposed planning application for All Hallows Church:

Objections about Design

- I object to the proposed new building because the design is inappropriate for the location.
- The design is insensitive to the requirements of The Mansfield Conservation Area, where importance is given to preserving the existing Victorian and Edwardian buildings, and the resulting local environment.
- The proposed new building will have a deleterious effect on this important church building, which is a Grade II* Listed Building.
- The church is a free-standing building, without any modifications or additions. It is a strong, imposing, separate building, and this should not be

compromised. The proposed new building will be attached to the existing building and will fill up the important space on the south side of the church. The proposed new building will therefore spoil this important free-standing structure.

- The south façade of the church is of high quality, with vertical buttresses built of stone. The south façade needs to be viewed uninterrupted to appreciate the fine quality of the building. The new building will remove this possibility.
- The proposed new building will also spoil the church's west façade facing onto Shirlock Road. The new building would change the visual character of this in an inappropriate way. Currently the west façade is symmetrical. The unusual circular stained glass feature, together with the central doors below it on the central axis of the building, form a strong composition to enhance the symmetry. The proposed new building would unbalance this important symmetry.
- The proposed new entrance at the SW corner of the church would also detract from the importance of the original central entrance on the west side. This is undesirable.
- The proposed new building will have a deleterious affect on the 'setting' of the Listed church building on the south side because the proposed new building would remove the possibility of access to the base of the south façade, which should be enjoyed and viewed from ground level.
- The strip of land along the south side of the church should be landscaped as a garden to improve

- the setting of the Listed Building.
- In addition, the proposed new building is insensitive regarding the residential property at no. 56 Sherlock Road and in particular its rear extension. The new building would result in unacceptable loss of amenity and privacy.

Objections about Use

- The building is a church, primarily used for worship. It has been a church since it was built in c.1914.
- From time to time evening concerts of classical music are held in the church, for which tickets can be purchased. These events are tolerated and enjoyed by the local residents and community, but only because they are infrequent.
- NB: I do not object to the continuation of the concerts on the current basis at current frequency.
- However, particular problems exist at present due to the removal of equipment following a concert, often taking place just after the concert finishes, carrying on noisily into the early hours of the following morning. This aspect is unacceptable.
- However, there is a great deal of concern locally that the current Planning Application, if approved, will result in an intensification of use of current "non-church" activities (eg more frequent concerts) - resulting in additional unacceptable disruption, disturbance, late night activity and parking chaos. This is because the proposed new building contains additional facilities and numerous toilets.
- Further, I'm concerned that the church will view an approval of the Planning Application as an

opportunity to rent the building out on a fully commercial basis (even though intermittent) to recording companies or other commercial organisations. This outcome would be unacceptable to local residents due to increased levels of disruption, and would not be compatible with the use of the church as a place of worship. Commercial use of this type must not be permitted.

- In conclusion, I object to the new building as a whole. However, if the Council did see fit to grant any sort of Planning Permission for additional facilities at the church, it's important that the current "non-church" activities be defined (ie concerts of classical music) and restricted to the current frequency. This should be done via a Condition in any Notice of Approval.
- I also request the addition of a further Condition in any Notice of Approval, should a Planning Permission be granted, to wholly exclude the use of the church as a commercial recording studio or for any other commercial use or for large gatherings not related to worship.

People with Disabilities

- I am not against the church providing improved access to the main building for people with disabilities, and/or installing one or two new toilets at ground level for people with disabilities. All subject to appropriate design.
- Meeting these objectives does not require either the new building as proposed, or any new building.
- To provide access for disabled people to toilets, it may simply be a

case of installing a platform lift from the main church down to the crypt, subject to the required consents.

- However, if meeting the requirements for disability access and toilets did result in the need for a new building, this should be of minimum size for this purpose.
- Any small new building must be set well back from the west façade of the church in Shirlock Road. And great care must be taken regarding design and impact on the Grade II* Listed church building, its setting, and the amenity of no. 56 Shirlock Road.

In conclusion, I object to the current proposals and strongly request that the Council refuses Planning Permission.

Yours sincerely
Anne Aberdeen,



From: Ryan, Angela
Sent: 01 August 2013 09:17
To: Planning
Subject: FW: Objections to planning application 2013/4184/P - FAO Angela Ryan
Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Orange

Hi,
Please redact and upload onto idox.

Thanks

Angela Ryan
Planning Officer (East Area Team)

Telephone: 020 7974 3236

From: Deb Williams [REDACTED]
Sent: 01 August 2013 08:55
To: Ryan, Angela
Subject: Fw: Objections to planning application 2013/4184/P - FAO Angela Ryan

Dear Ms Ryan,
As I haven't received any receipt/acknowledgment of the comments I posted on the Camden planning application website or my email to the general planning email address, and given tomorrow's deadline for objecting to this application, I am now forwarding my email to you direct. I hope that is okay.
Thanks,
Debbie

From: Deborah Williams [REDACTED]
Date: Tue, 30 Jul 2013 17:05:57 +0100
To: <planning@camden.gov.uk>
Cc: [REDACTED]
Subject: Objections to planning application 2013/4184/P - FAO Angela Ryan

I tried to leave our objections to this planning application made by the church two doors down from us on the Camden planning application website but it wouldn't allow me to do so in one go, so I had to send as three separate submissions, which may not be very user-friendly for you. Accordingly, I set out our objections in full below.

Our main concern is the very significant increase in noise that this proposed development would bring to what is otherwise a very quiet residential conservation area.

We believe that this application is less concerned with the 50 people (max) who worship at the church and more about the extra income that could be generated by hosting even more large commercial concerts at the church.

This is a massive concern to us, as the concerts that take place there are already a significant nuisance. 600 odd people arriving and then leaving at once is very noisy and totally inappropriate in

this quiet residential area. Worse still is the incredible amount of noise generated before and after these concerts, when the stages and choir tribune etc arrive and are erected at the start of the day and then when they are taken down and removed after the concerts. This is the same noise as scaffolding being put up and is very, very noisy.

At the last large concert held at the church just a few weeks ago, we were woken at around 8 am on the Saturday morning as all this metal staging/tribune was delivered and noisily assembled - it creates a very loud clanking, disturbing noise. Then the dismantling and removal of all the staging etc went on until gone 2 am on the Sunday morning. However, the dismantling wasn't completed even by 2 am: so later that Sunday, after the church service ended at midday, they continued to take down the seating - this went on until about 4 pm. This meant that, whilst the concert itself may have lasted just a couple of hours, we had terrible noise from the church for virtually the whole weekend. This also disproves their claim in the application that they have addressed neighbours' complaints following the 2012 Highgate Choral Concert in more recent concerts with regard to the noise. They clearly have not.

We note from the application that the proposed hours of usage may be until 9 pm on Saturdays and until mid-afternoon on Sundays - and that the church don't even limit themselves to that. This suggests that they think this is acceptable in a quiet residential area and will become something of a norm. It is not acceptable and we also suspect that these "hours of usage" do not in their minds include setting up and dismantling time.

These very large concerts already seem to be happening more and more often and seem to be getting louder and louder, with less consideration being given for nearby residents. Not only does this create an enormous racket but obviously means the roads are busy with traffic all day and parking for residents (who pay for this privilege) becomes impossible.

At page 2 of the "Consultation Statement", the church says it would accept a limit to very large events as a condition of approval if needed. Given all of the above, we think this condition is essential and actually believe that, given that this is such an otherwise quiet area, a total ban on such large events should be imposed as a condition of any planning permission.

Despite what the application states, concerts are NOT consistent with the use of a church. Surely its use should be limited to quiet worship - it shouldn't be setting itself up as a rival to the O2 Centre!

Concerts aside, this proposal would also lead to a lot more pedestrians accessing what is being called the "main entrance" in the application every day of the week - please note that this entrance is actually rarely ever used at the moment and, on those occasions when it is, makes a lot more noise than the use of the other entrance and disturbs us.

Likewise, we're concerned that if the proposed annex doors are left open (such as in nice weather etc), we will hear a lot of noise from those sitting at tables near to the entrance or in the tea area. As it is so quiet around here, which people enjoy as it is a residential area, sound travels a long way and we hear people near the church when we are indoors (through our windows) and when we are on our roof terrace, which is directly opposite where the proposed annex would be.

At the very least, we think limited hours of use should be imposed on the proposed annex to avoid early and late usage, especially at the weekends.

We are also concerned about the effect on local parking of more people using the church at all times and at the prospect of more rubbish collecting around the site.

Finally, we would just like to add that we feel this application should have been notified to more than just the two neighbours identified online, as this affects all nearby houses given the noise and

traffic issues affect all those nearby.

Many thanks,

Deborah Williams and Adrian Tempany



[REDACTED]

From: John Peter McNulty [REDACTED]
Sent: 01 August 2013 12:42
To: Planning
Subject: Objections to All Hallows Church extension, Savernake Road NW3 2LD. Ref. 2013/4184/P
Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Orange
Application Ref. No. 2013/4184/P

Attention: Case Officer, Camden Planning

Dear Sir/Madam,

I write to formally lodge my objections to the proposed extension to the All Hallows Church, Savernake Rd.

I live along Savernake Rd from the church, have viewed the plans and am aware that the Parish presented the plans for discussion with local residents. **I object to the proposed extension in its entirety.**

My objections are;

Historical / architectural.

All Hallows is the single most important piece of architectural heritage in the Mansfield Conservation Area. It is Grade II* listed for good reason and it's national importance well-documented. I do not believe the proposed building to be sensitive or complimentary in design or scale to the existing Church. It is definitely not an enhancement to the building or the Conservation Area.

The Church is designed as a free standing building. The Conservation Area policy is to protect the gaps between buildings. This extension causes permanent irreparable damage to the south facade, and to the context of the building on Shirlock Road. It detracts from the Church architecture in its entirety as a single free-standing building. The fact that the Church has erected an ugly oversized timber fence to close off the gap is no reason to replace it with a (permanent) extension!

On a more detailed level, the proposed building would damage the existing amenity of the adjoining residential property, No. 56 Shirlock Road.

Commercial use.

Mostly the few concerts the church hosts are relatively small, but on the occasions when larger events are held, the intrusion, noise and parking pressure these place upon us as local residents is extreme.

In particular, the late evening/early morning removal of seating, musical instruments, etc is very disturbing and unacceptable.

I am very concerned that, if the current planning proposal is approved, this will lead to an intensification of these events. This is not acceptable at any level as the increased disruption would have a very negative impact upon our living standards and amenity.

Should approval of these plans, in any form, go forward I would further request conditions to be placed upon the approval, restricting the commercial use of the church and further implementing conditions on timing, removals, and frequency of use for any events of scale being held there.

Disabled toilets/access

I have no objection in principle to improving the access for the disabled. It is not necessary however to construct a building of this scale in order to satisfy these needs (as is claimed). Particularly I believe that 6 new toilets are envisaged - this is a large number that would only be necessary for very much larger events, giving rise to the suspicion that intensification of use is being considered - or certainly would become more possible and therefore likely.

Other internal options exist and they should be explored. If an extension is deemed necessary as a solution, a much reduced option would be possible without destroying the amenity of the area, and without destroying the beauty of the current southern and western aspects.

In summary, I object to the proposed plan in its entirety and request that Council refuse permission for planning.

Yours Sincerely,

John & Sophie McNulty

[REDACTED]

From: Matthew Lewin [REDACTED]
Sent: 01 August 2013 18:54
To: Planning
Subject: Planning Application no: 2013/4184/P
Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Orange

Ref: Planning Application no: 2013/4184/P - All Hallows Church, Savernake Road, London NW3

I live at 24 Estelle Road, NW3 2JY, and I write on behalf of a number of residents of Estelle Road to object strongly to this application. They include Victoria Bridge, Arthur Bridge, Florence Bridge and Mathilda Bridge all of 15 Estelle Road, and Vivienne Lewin of 24 Estelle Road.

Despite the severe disruption, congestion and inconvenience caused to local residents when various events, such as concerts, are held in the Church itself, these are occasional and we are all prepared to accept the temporary chaos that ensues.

But this proposal is of a different order altogether, and will constantly generate a great deal of traffic, congestion and disruption to what is a residential area in a conservation area. To give planning permission for this commercial development would be to make a mockery of the spirit of declaring conservation areas in the first place.

The council has a history of ignoring the objections of residents of this area to commercially motivated developments. One example is the disgraceful decision to allow No 8 Estelle Road to be converted into a HMO to house 17 people! This decision did not even go to the planning committee but was taken by officers under delegated powers and the whole thing stinks to high heaven!

I hope, therefore, that you will study carefully the following detailed objections which, I know, have also been sent to you by other people in the area.

Objections about Design

- I object to the proposed new building because the design is inappropriate for the location.
- The design is insensitive to the requirements of The Mansfield Conservation Area, where importance is given to preserving the existing Victorian and Edwardian buildings, and the resulting local environment.
- The proposed new building will have a deleterious effect on this important church building, which is a Grade II* Listed Building.

- The church is a free-standing building, without any modifications or additions. It is a strong, imposing, separate building, and this should not be compromised. The proposed new building will be attached to the existing building and will fill up the important space on the south side of the church. The proposed new building will therefore spoil this important free-standing structure.
- The south façade of the church is of high quality, with vertical buttresses built of stone. The south façade needs to be viewed uninterrupted to appreciate the fine quality of the building. The new building will remove this possibility.
- The proposed new building will also spoil the church's west façade facing onto Shirlock Road. The new building would change the visual character of this in an inappropriate way. Currently the west façade is symmetrical. The unusual circular stained glass feature, together with the central doors below it on the central axis of the building, form a strong composition to enhance the symmetry. The proposed new building would unbalance this important symmetry.
- The proposed new entrance at the SW corner of the church would also detract from the importance of the original central entrance on the west side. This is undesirable.
- The proposed new building will have a deleterious affect on the 'setting' of the Listed church building on the south side because the proposed new building would remove the possibility of access to the base of the south façade, which should be enjoyed and viewed from ground level.
- The strip of land along the south side of the church should be landscaped as a garden to improve the setting of the Listed Building.
- In addition, the proposed new building is insensitive regarding the residential property at no. 56 Shirlock Road and in particular its rear extension. The new building would result in unacceptable loss of amenity and privacy.

Objections about Use

- The building is a church, primarily used for worship. It has been a church since it was built in c.1914.
- From time to time evening concerts of classical music are held in the church, for which tickets can be purchased. These events are tolerated and enjoyed by the local residents and community, but only because they are infrequent.
- NB: I do not object to the continuation of the concerts on the current basis at current frequency.
- However, particular problems exist at present due to the removal of equipment following a concert, often taking place just after the concert finishes, carrying on noisily into the early hours of the following morning.

This aspect is unacceptable.

- However, there is a great deal of concern locally that the current Planning Application, if approved, will result in an intensification of use of current "non-church" activities (eg more frequent concerts) - resulting in additional unacceptable disruption, disturbance, late night activity and parking chaos. This is because the proposed new building contains additional facilities and numerous toilets.
- Further, I'm concerned that the church will view an approval of the Planning Application as an opportunity to rent the building out on a fully commercial basis (even though intermittent) to recording companies or other commercial organisations. This outcome would be unacceptable to local residents due to increased levels of disruption, and would not be compatible with the use of the church as a place of worship. Commercial use of this type must not be permitted.
- In conclusion, I object to the new building as a whole. However, if the Council did see fit to grant any sort of Planning Permission for additional facilities at the church, it's important that the current "non-church" activities be defined (ie concerts of classical music) and restricted to the current frequency. This should be done via a Condition in any Notice of Approval.
- I also request the addition of a further Condition in any Notice of Approval, should a Planning Permission be granted, to wholly exclude the use of the church as a commercial recording studio or for any other commercial use or for large gatherings not related to worship.

People with Disabilities

- I am not against the church providing improved access to the main building for people with disabilities, and/or installing one or two new toilets at ground level for people with disabilities. All subject to appropriate design.
- Meeting these objectives does not require either the new building as proposed, or any new building.
- To provide access for disabled people to toilets, it may simply be a case of installing a platform lift from the main church down to the crypt, subject to the required consents.
- However, if meeting the requirements for disability access and toilets did result in the need for a new building, this should be of minimum size for this purpose.
- Any small new building must be set well back from the west façade of the church in Shirlock Road. And great care must be taken regarding design and impact on the Grade II* Listed church building, its setting, and the amenity of no. 56 Shirlock Road.

In conclusion, I object to the current proposals and strongly request that the

Council refuses Planning Permission.

Matthew Lewin



From: Robert Dye [REDACTED]
Sent: 01 August 2013 19:25
To: Planning
Subject: All Hallows Church - Planning Application no: 2013/4184/P

Follow Up Flag: Follow up

Flag Status: Orange

Objections to Planning Application no. 2013/4184/P re. All Hallows Church, Savernake Rd, NW3

Consultation Period to 2nd August 2013

Planning Officer: Ms Angela Ryan

From: Robert Dye RIBA , 37 Shirlock Road, London NW3 2HR

Dear Sir / Madam

I am a local resident and Architect and have lived close to the above application site for 15 years. I write to object to the proposed extension and the Application in its entirety, for the following reasons:

A Design, Architecture & Conservation

1. The design is insensitive to its local context in the Mansfield Conservation Area, in which importance is given to the existing Victorian and Edwardian buildings, their traditional forms and materials, and to the pattern of buildings and open-space.
2. The proposed extension and alterations will have a harmful effect on All Hallows, this architecturally and historically significant Grade II* Listed building. Pevsner wrote "One of the noblest churches of its date in England and no doubt Brooks' masterpiece".
3. All Hallows is a free-standing building, without modifications or additions. Its quality and uniqueness rely in part on the fact that the church is a strong, imposing, separate form. It is surrounded by residential streets on three sides, and there is an empty strip of land along its south side, providing important separation between the church and the neighbouring residential buildings of lower height and their gardens to the south, in Shirlock Road and Courthope Road. (Part of this strip of land forms the site of the proposal.)
4. The proposed structure would attach to the existing church building and permanently remove the open-space of separation on the south side of the church. The MCA Appraisal says: "Gaps between buildings represent an important established feature of relief in an otherwise densely developed environment, where the buildings are generally arranged in terraces 3 storeys in height. The Council will resist development in gaps where they are formed...between semi-detached and detached properties". This is specifically the case with this site, no 56 Shirlock Rd being semi-detached and All Hallows being detached, and therefore its infill should be resisted.
5. The proposed new building would therefore spoil the elegance, composition and architectural strength of this historically significant free-standing structure. It will also permanently remove the opportunity for the southern facade stone buttressing to be seen as it meets the ground, which is unique since the north facade is slightly different in this respect.
6. All Hallows Church has its most important facade fronting onto Shirlock Road. The proposed extension, although set-back from the street frontage line, would make a visual extension to this west façade (its 'front'), and therefore would detract significantly from the visual and architectural character of this west façade.
7. The Shirlock Road entrance to the Church is almost always locked. The proposed new 'side' entrance at the SW corner of the church (into the proposed extension) would detract from the importance of the original central entrance. If a 'side' entrance is needed, this would be appropriate at the rear from Courthope Road, not from Shirlock Road, unless though external open space.
8. I would agree that there is a strong case for removing the existing ugly wooden fence at the SW corner of the church fronting onto Shirlock Road, as is proposed in this application. This would

allow a view of the landscape space and large tree behind along the south façade, that could then be seen obliquely from Shirlock Road.

9. The south side of All Hallows could then be a garden, allowing level access if that is required into the south doorway (currently locked) and whose threshold is level with the main Church floor.
10. The proposed extension is insensitive to no. 56 Shirlock Road and in particular its rear extension, which like it or not, was built many years ago and has ground and first floor windows facing onto the Church's land (that we are told they agreed to at the time of their construction. The new building would result in a measurable loss of amenity to no. 56.

B. Disabled Access & Toilets

1. It is accepted that All Hallows must provide improved access to the main building for people with disabilities, and access for people with disabilities to toilet facilities.
2. I believe that 6 new toilets are envisaged - this is a large number that would only be necessary for very much larger events (see below).
3. From the 2008 Metric Handbook, sanitary provision for public entertainment: 1 wc for up to 250 males and 2 for 40 females, yet only 1 unisex wc for as many more people you need to accommodate. In other words, even if they All Hallows has a congregation (or concert audience) of 600, they still only need ONE unisex disabled wc.
4. One of the existing toilets in the crypt or on the rear upper floor (2 steps up from the main Church floor) I understand could be converted for disabled use; and/or installing one or two new toilets at ground level for people with disabilities.
5. A simple platform lift could be installed at the Courthope end of the building to provide access to the Crypt. It is not necessary however to construct a building of this scale in order to satisfy these needs (as is claimed).
6. Therefore, a more modest and discreet approach to disabled access and toilets is possible and would suffice, whilst not detracting from the Listed structure itself.

C. Use & Impact on Local Residents and Community

1. All Hallows is a Church, and on the premises additionally runs a Nursery on Courthope Rd, as well as renting out the building for rehearsals and public concerts. I have been unable to determine the Use Class that All Hallows enjoys and as to whether that allows commercial use for live events in this way. This should be clarified as part of the assessment of this application.
2. From time to time, evening music concerts are held in the church, for which tickets can be purchased and, on the whole, these events are tolerated by the local residents and community as they are modest and infrequent.
3. However, when larger concerts take place, there is considerable disruption and disturbance to the local residents over a two day period, normally a weekend. Then, we suffer with trucks (seating, scaffolding, sound equipment) loading and unloading, usually at ungodly hours in the morning (often Sundays).
4. There is intolerable pressure on road traffic and parking in the area on these occasions due to a large influx of cars of both staff and attendees of the concerts. The area already suffers from lack of parking capacity for residents, and parking stress. In recognition of this, the Church has upon occasion obtained overflow parking at a local school but this arrangement, although helpful, is not permanent and must not be relied upon unless proper long-term legal agreements are made as part of this application.
5. the number of toilets that this application apparently needs to accommodate implies an occupancy potential of many hundreds of people. Let's say one designs for 500 person events (according to their stated disabled wc need, a modest figure) and even a modest proportion of them come by car, where will they park? On narrow streets, with no public parking space provision (except on Mansfield Rd, a block away) and only ResPark on the neighbouring streets, with, for example, only 1 disabled space on Shirlock Rd, used by that resident already, and only 1 Car Club space.
6. Given the stress on the area due to traffic and parking that is already caused by the existing use

of the Church, and in light of the increase in large event use and other intensification that so many toilets must imply, I would have thought the application should be supported by a traffic and parking impact study and report. It is not. Surely this is a matter that should be considered by Camden's Highways Dept?

D. Conclusion

1. it is my considered opinion that on architectural design and conservation grounds the application should be refused. S
2. That the application should be refused on the grounds of intensification of use and detriment to the amenity of residents, at least until the use (current and intended) is clarified with an explanation as to why such an extraordinary provision of disabled access and facilities is needed
3. That this must be supported by a traffic and parking impact statement, with a proposal for an agreement for restriction of commercial use. After all, this is the case for all other commercial live event venues, is it not?

Yours faithfully,
Robert Dye

[REDACTED]

From: Samir Shah ([REDACTED])
Sent: 01 August 2013 21:30
To: Planning
Subject: All Hallows Church - Planning Application no: 2013/4184/P

Follow Up Flag: Follow up

Flag Status: Orange

Objection to planning application no. 2013/4184/P - All Hallows Church, Savernake Road

Planning Officer: Angela Ryan

From: Samir Shah, 42 Roderick Road, NW3

Dear Sirs,

I live in the adjacent road to All Hallows Church, and have lived in the area for over a decade.

I would like to raise my objections to the above planning application, so that they can be taken in to consideration in the process.

It appears to me that the extension is proposed to add a large number of disabled toilets. Clearly, provision of such amenities is important. However, I can not see how the building of an extension to a free standing Victorian church can be the preferred solution.

The provision of such a large number can only mean that the church plans on holding more concerts than it currently does (as surely it can not be for its congregation).

Every time there is such a concert, we find that all the adjacent streets become clogged with cars, and make it even harder for local residents to park in an already difficult parking situation. Furthermore, due to the large number of cars, we find that visitors park dangerously right up to the corners of the tight roads - this causes a lot of safety problems for people crossing the road (especially near the entrance to Hampstead Heath), and also makes access to the narrow roads very difficult which could be very serious for emergency vehicles which would not be able to turn the corners.

Whilst the occasional concert is tolerated by local residents - an increase in the number of these would have a big impact on the amenity to local residents.

I am unclear on whether the church holds appropriate licences to be a concert hall or venue.

Furthermore, I am unclear on why such a large number of disabled toilets is required in a new extension. Surely, the money could be better spent by utilising other spaces within the church to improve access to the lower levels and/or create new toilets on the ground floor. I am sure that regulations do not require such a large number of toilets.

Finally, whilst I am not an architectural expert, it seems to me that the creation of such a visible extension on an otherwise free standing Victorian church within a conservation area can not be considered an enhancement to what is a beautiful building that is much admired by the local residents and visitors alike.

In summary, I object to the application on the following grounds:

- impact on the local residents of more intensive use for concerts (surely the application must be clearer on this point)
- there should be more consideration of alternative proposals to provide disabled toilets that do not involve an extension
- the architectural impact on a beautiful old building

I look forward to hearing the outcome of the deliberations in due course.

Kind regards

Samir Shah

05/08/2013