

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2014/7683/P	Charles de Greeff	c/o 13 College Lane London NW5 1BJ	05/01/2015 15:12:36	OBJEMAIL	<p>I am the owner of 3 Highcroft. 170 Highgate Road, NW5 1EJ which is let.</p> <p>I start by commenting that it is plainly unreasonable (certainly in terms of the "man on the Clapham omnibus" test - but actually, however viewed) to put forward a formal consultation that is timed so as to run from 17 December (date of letter from Camden to residents) to 6 January following. It is no way to treat Council tax payers.</p> <p>My objections to the plans are neatly encapsulated in the objection from Mr Gazzard of 4 Grove Terrace : 29.12.14). In short:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The scale and extent of the buildings will dominate the Highgate Road approach to the Heath. The proposals are unsympathetic and out of keeping in the context of the existing scales and styles of surrounding buildings. <p>I am particularly concerned about aspects of the Draft Construction Management Plan "CMP"). Notably:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - There is currently no indication of either the likely construction period or the number of vehicular movements through the various access points (see Draft CMP 1.2). These figures are fundamental to any appreciation by local residents as to how they will be affected by the proposed works over many months. <p>Residents of Highcroft will object if any steps are taken to revert to traffic calming measures in Highgate Road of the sort which caused the block of flats to vibrate when buses passed by, leading to the transfer of the zebra crossing some metres to the north.</p> <p>As a matter of generality, I am concerned as to Camden's capacity for "policing" the CMP, once finalised. I cite the current works in College Lane (former Rail Club site) where Camden undertook to remove the old setts and reconstruct the road, relaying the setts on completion. That has not happened and plainly is not now going to.</p>

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2014/7683/P	Jacqueline Alke	Flat 8 Highcroft 170 Highgate Road London NW% 1EJ	05/01/2015 17:41:21	COMMNT	<p>I am the owner of Flat 8. 170 Highgate Rd, NW5 1EJ.</p> <p>I start by commenting that it is plainly unreasonable to put forward a formal consultation that is timed so as to run from 17 December (date of letter from Camden to residents) to 6 January following. It is no way to treat Council tax payers.</p> <p>My objections to the plans are neatly encapsulated in the objection from Mr. Gazzard of 4 Grove Terrace(29.12.14). In short: The scale and extent of the buildings will dominate the Highgate Road approach to the Heath. The proposals are unsympathetic and out of keeping in the context of existing scales and styles of surrounding buildings.</p> <p>I am particularly concerned about aspects of the Draft Construction Management Plan (CMP). Notably: There is currently no indication of either the likely construction period or the number of vehicular movements through the various access points (see Draft CMP 1.2) These figures are fundamental to any appreciation by local residents as to how they will be affected by the proposed works over many months.</p> <p>Residents of Highcroft will object if any steps are taken to revert to traffic calming measures in Highgate Road of the sort which caused the block of flats to vibrate when buses passed by, leading to the transfer of the zebra crossing some metres to the north.</p>

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2014/7683/P	Veronica & Steven Day	Flat 1 Highcroft 170 Highgate Road London NW5 1EJ	05/01/2015 22:44:40	OBJEMAIL	<p>Dear Sir/Madam,</p> <p>We are the owners of Flat 1, Highcroft, 170 Highgate Road, London, NW5 1EJ.</p> <p>We wish to raise our objections with regard to the proposed building works at the schools on Highgate Road and Croftdown Road.</p> <p>We have had insufficient time to fully read through the more than 100 documents supplied, as we were only made aware of these building plans just after Christmas. We feel this is wholly unacceptable and a ridiculously short time span in which to expect local residents to raise objections.</p> <p>Our initial reactions are as follows:</p> <p>1. Road Safety would be compromised: Transport assessment Part 1: 5.7 Based on the accident analysis presented above, of the junctions within close proximity of the site, the junction of Croftdown Road and Highgate Road was identified as having the highest number of recorded accidents. All incidents involved vehicles travelling along Highgate Road with none recorded as involving any turning manoeuvres into the WES access or Croftdown Road. An inspection of the junction has not identified any deficiencies in forward visibility along Highgate Road and the junction is clearly identifiable from a distance with suitable road markings and a 20mph speed restriction operating in the vicinity of this junction. Furthermore, the junction is well served by pedestrian facilities on Highgate Road owing to the provision of a zebra crossing to the north of the junction and a pedestrian refuge island with tactile paving and dropped kerbs to the south of the junction. Given that the redevelopment of the site does not propose any increase or intensification of pedestrian movements, it is considered that the proposed development would not contribute to any existing adverse road safety conditions at this junction or in the vicinity of the site. PARLIAMENT HILL AND WILLIAM ELLIS SCHOOLS, CAMDEN 13-255 Transport Statement December 2014 AMF/amf This states that, although the junction outside the schools recorded the most accidents in the area over 3 years, the huge increase in works traffic would not cause any additional road safety problems. This clearly is a preposterous conclusion to make.</p> <p>2. A vast increase in the number of HGVs at the junction: Construction Management Plan 5.8 Given the project is still in the design phase and no contractor has been appointed it is difficult to accurately quantify the volume of materials to be delivered and removed from the site and the exact methods/ vehicles used.</p>

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

Comment: **Response:**

It is however reasonably assumed that the maximum number of heavy vehicles would not exceed 10 HGVs per day during the peak periods of the construction phase. These vehicles would include tipper-type vehicles, delivery and concrete mixer trucks. The number of heavy vehicles accessing the site is expected to be considerably less during the demolition and fit out phase. We feel the estimate of 10 HGVs per day is very low, and would expect the actual number of site vehicles to be much higher.

3. We feel that the effect of the HGVs will be detrimental to the structure of the Highcroft building, which suffered badly from vibration when the zebra crossing was situated outside Highcroft. The zebra crossing was subsequently moved further up Highgate Road to alleviate this situation.

4. The damage to the road surfaces from the vast increase in HGV traffic movements.

5. There are 3 main bus routes passing right outside the proposed site every 5-8 minutes. We feel the chaos from numerous HGVs, delivery vehicles and general site traffic will impact greatly on the running of these services.

6. "There is the intention to increase the communal use of the new facilities in the evenings and weekends 4-10pm Mon-Fri, 10-6pm Saturdays "(email from P. Hebbard to Z. Trower). This will have a direct impact on the residents of Highcroft, who will suffer from the extra noise and parking.

7. We notice that a Bat Report was completed on 1 October 2014 to assess the impact on the local bat population. We feel it would have made more sense to commission an earlier report on the impact on the local HUMAN population rather than leaving it until Christmas!

Yours,

Veronica & Steven Day
