

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2014/5900/P	Kate Gordon	4A castle road	13/10/2014 17:45:56	OBJ	<p>I am a local resident and wish to register my objection to the proposal to redevelop the Castle pub.</p> <p>I welcome the change of use and my objection relates to the disproportionate scale and height of the proposal and unsympathetic design.</p> <p>The Castle is a valued local historic landmark, a building of character which contributes significantly to the area's unique charm, character and sense of place. The addition of a further floor above the Castle, new side extension into the existing curtilage, and four storey building to replace the existing one/two storey extension and pub garden I feel constitutes overdevelopment and detracts from the character and appearance of the local area.</p> <p>The element of the scheme which would replace the existing extension and pub garden predominates, is out of scale and overbearing with regard to the Castle pub and neighbouring properties nos 3 and 5 Castle Road. In order to be sympathetic this part of the scheme needs to be modest in size and lower in height.</p> <p>I live opposite the pub garden. During the 25 years I have lived here, I have benefited from a good level of daylight and sunlight throughout the day into my home. Sunlight is solely via south facing windows opposite this site. Were this proposal to go ahead I would lose all morning sun into my home for most months of the year, and would lose a significant amount of daylight, since the proposal would entail building four storeys on what is currently a garden and single storey extension. My immediate neighbours are also likely to experience a loss of daylight and sunlight into their homes.</p> <p>The proposal due to its height would significantly harm the public realm, overshadowing and darkening the street, exacerbating the cold and damp in winter. Some homes on the lower floors of the mansions in Royal College Street may lose late afternoon sun due to the increase in height and extent of the built up area. Loss of sunlight will increase heating bills and lead to poorer health. In my view the site is unsuitable for a taller building, since to work well tall buildings need a generous curtilage otherwise they cause overshadowing and a darkening of the public realm.</p> <p>National Policy</p> <p>The proposal is contrary to the National Planning Framework (NPPF). First, the scheme would fail to deliver sustainable development since it would give rise to significant harmful social and environmental effects, described above. Second, as the NPPF states (paragraph 126) heritage assets are an irreplaceable resource. Ringley's current proposal gives insufficient regard to the contribution the Castle makes to the area's special character and distinctiveness.</p>

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2014/5900/P	Paul Seviour	6 Raglan Street London NW5 3DA	07/10/2014 15:48:47	OBJ	<p>I am writing to object to this application on the following grounds.</p> <p>The third floor extension is of poor quality and has little architectural merit to commend it. It is out of keeping with the grain of the two retained facades. Its design makes it "stand out" rather than blend in from the existing facades. This is important because the applicant has stated that the retention of the two facades meets its obligation to reinstate the building by the Planning Inspector. Because the proposed third floor is so out of keeping with the two retained facades, it undermines the wishes of the Planning Inspector that the "existing building" be reinstated.</p> <p>The third floor extension breaks the roof line with the adjoining building at Kentish Town Road even allowing for the proposed extension to that adjoining building. In this regard, it will appear obtrusive and out of keeping with the context in which it will sit.</p> <p>The design of the first and second floor proposed side elevation at Castle Road is out context with the grain of the retained façade. For example, the proposed windows on the second floor are out of alignment with those of the existing façade and give the impression of the extension being "tacked on" to the existing building. The use of plain brick is also incongruous when compared to the render effect of the existing façade.</p> <p>The window surrounds of the first and second floors of the Castle Road elevation are also out of keeping with the existing façade and the front elevation creating an overall impression of disharmony between the facades of the existing building.</p> <p>I would like to see a scheme brought forward that addressed these concerns.</p> <p>I don't know how much "weight" is given to the applicant's Statement of Community Involvement" prepared by Planning Potential but I would make the following observations on this aspect of the application. I consider that the "consultation" has been half hearted at best. At the meeting I attended, the people representing the applicant didn't appear to have any understanding of the issues or what people wanted to see. Even when proposals did come forward, they were based upon keeping ALL of the existing building and not just two facades. To say that the current application has been broadly approved by local people and groups is to say the least, disingenuous.</p> <p>I think that with appropriate changes, a workable scheme could be found to create a building of real architectural merit, but in my view, this application fails in that regard and should be refused. If it is refused, I suggest that the applicant sits down with local groups and local people so that a mutually acceptable scheme can be found (an object lesson in how an applicant can work with and listen to local people was the recent Pizza Express application which was eventually strongly supported and approved by the planning committee).</p>
2014/5900/P	Ian Douglas	19 Jeffrey's St	01/10/2014 20:32:11	COMMNT	I'd like to comment but can't see the drawings, the links only go to an error page. Could they be added as soon as possible please?

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2014/5900/P	Daisy Durham	132 Kentish Town Road	16/10/2014 23:44:25	OBJ	This building is part of Kentish Towns History and It would be very upsetting to see it go.
2014/5900/P	Lewis Durham	3 Evangelist Road NW5 1UA	16/10/2014 23:17:20	OBJ	<p>To whom this may concern,</p> <p>I object to the planning"s on several grounds.</p> <p>Firstly is the historical factor. Kentish Town is beautiful and our beautiful streets and architecture should not be turned into something which does not suit this proudly untouched area. As Im sure you are aware, this is the site of the oldest public house in Kentish Town. It would be such a shame for it to go and be turned into a "modern" tasteless office.</p> <p>I also object on the grounds that this building was wrecked by its owners with out permission and were told to restore is and did not comply. They cheekily try"d to cover up their work by shrouding the building whilst knocking out its historical mouldings. They also tried the "taking the roof off trick" to let the building rot. This is very disrespectful of the area and too its residents. I know this personally as I went in when the builders were there and they said they were going to demolish it, this was before they were stopped.</p> <p>When they were told to restore it and they didn"t, they"re excuse was that they couldn"t source the materials like sand and cement, lime, London stock bricks and plaster... which are all standard building materials. I find this very disrespectful of them.</p> <p>I think the building of subject could be made into a great social place. Perhaps a restaurant or a pub again. A music venue would also be great but I understand there could be complications there. The Castle used to be a great buzzing place before it was sold. There is a trend in Kentish Town now of great pubs and restaurants popping up, the Castle could easily join them.</p> <p>Regardless of the past. I feel the proposed building will be unsightly and the tallness of the building will block light. That stretch of Kentish town is relatively low rise which is a rarity these days. I also feel, as many other locals, as the building is on the high street, it should be interactive with the public on a street level. Turning a public place into an office is not good for our, or any community.</p> <p>I hope my comments will be taken into consideration.</p> <p>Kind regards, Lewis Durham</p>
2014/5900/P	Kitty Durham	132 Kentish Town Rd NW1 9QB	16/10/2014 23:27:35	OBJ	<p>Please don't demolish this lovely building, it would be a devastating loss to our community and our history. We don't need another huge monstrosity in Kentish Town.</p> <p>Thank you</p>

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2014/5900/P	Amanda Williams & Les Hearn	1 Prince of Wales Rd flat 49 London NW5 3LW	15/10/2014 21:26:09	NOOBJEMP ER	The plans are a distinct improvement on previous refused applications, particularly stepping back the top storey from the parapet. The look from Castle Road will depend a lot for acceptability on what materials are used. We have some concerns still, given Ringley's history of trying to demolish this building without permission, and wrecking the front with no sign yet of reparation, that without careful monitoring, permission may be abused. We would like the PV panels and green roof to be required if permission is granted.
2014/5900/P	I Weiss	3	16/10/2014 21:26:48	OBJ	I am objecting to this application. The proposed development is too high and too bulky for this site. Also, as developers, the applicants are not to be trusted considering their past history of flouting regulations. They are currently, I believe, breaching the order to reinstate the roof and frontage which they demolished without consent.
2014/5900/P	Daisy Durham	132 Kentish Town Road	16/10/2014 23:44:22	OBJ	This building is part of Kentish Towns History and It would be very upsetting to see it go.
2014/5900/P	Mark Harwood	78 Bartholomew Road London NW5 2AL	16/10/2014 22:22:19	OBJ	In my view the proposed change of use is inappropriate. the site has been a pub for a very long period of time and was the original gateway to Kentish Town. Whilst the use of the site as an entertainment venue was inappropriate, it should be preserved as a drinking and dining establishment - as it was originally when it was a tea room on the banks of the River Fleet. This is an important part of Kentish Town's history and should be preserved and restored The behaviour of Ringley in failing to adhere to orders to restore and preserve the facade have been ignored and it is being deliberately left to deteriorate day by day The size and bulk of the building is inappropriate for the location The building is on the list of Camden's heritage buildings and sites and should be preserved as is Ringley have not acquitted themselves well over this project and have failed to engaged honestly and openly with the local community

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2014/5900/P	Peter Clapp	12 Jeffreys Place London NW1 9PP	12/10/2014 15:03:01	COMMEMP ER	I have no objection to scale and massing of the proposals as they now stand. At the last public meeting, there were alternative elevational treatments shown. I would prefer the retained Castle elevation to be contrasted with a modern treatment to the remainder of the block along Castle Road. The current proposals attempt to repeat the Castle elevation, producing a weird bastard treatment, which could easily be improved.
2014/5900/P	Mr M Connell	20 College Lane NW5 1BJ	03/10/2014 12:51:50	OBJ	I strongly disagree with the demolition of the Pub even if they do keep the façade. The developers were given clear and strict guidelines to keep the whole building intact, they wilfully disregarded this. To allow developers to get away with this sets a very bad precedent and would make the council look at best weak and at worst complicit. They should restore the building to its former state.