

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2014/7683/P	John Chamberlain	11 Grove Terrace London NW5 1PH	31/01/2015 10:38:16	OBJ	<p>I would like to add my support to all the objections raised by the Grove Terrace Residents Association, especially their objection to the unprecedented plans for construction on the historical open space between the existing buildings and the road.</p> <p>Further, I am appalled by the totally inadequate CERS (cycling) study. Ludicrously, it uses the same origin points as the PERS (pedestrian) study, i.e. local tube and railway stations, in spite of the fact that such journeys are very unlikely given that you can't put your bike on the Northern line at any time nor on the overground at peak times. Instead, routes from local catchment areas should have been used. Additionally, the following are major flaws:</p> <p>No mention of time of day that survey was done but photos show very low (atypical) motor traffic flow.</p> <p>High emphasis on presence of ASLs at junctions but apparently no consideration of traffic volumes or junction safety.</p> <p>High emphasis on 20 mph limits but no traffic speed measurements.</p> <p>High emphasis on surface quality and gradient of roads (!)</p> <p>Residential streets with low traffic flows downgraded due to limited carriageway width.</p> <p>This matters because apparently it will feed into the planned Transport Plan. Instead of CERS, which is biased towards infrastructure rather than actual cycling conditions, consultants should be encouraged to use a better methodology such as TfL's CLOS criteria, and evaluate routes that correspond to where pupils live (this information readily available from Camden's Travel Planning officers).</p>

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2014/7683/P	Helen Harrison	26 Grove Terrace London NW5 1PL	30/01/2015 19:05:09	OBJEMAIL	<p>I am in favour of improvements to the schools in principle but I very strongly object to these proposals for a number of reasons. The architectural design is not attractive. The design and building materials are inappropriate and not sympathetic to their context. The proposed buildings sit badly within the environment. It will have negative impact on the residents of Lissenden Gardens and on the views along Highgate Road and across from Dartmouth Park. It sets a dangerous precedent for building on the historic Greens. The plans put the wishes of a small part of the community - the school - who are not there 24/7 above the wishes of residents who are there all the time and will have to live with the consequences. The consultation process was flawed and demonstrated no real desire to listen to and work with the residents. There must be a better compromise than these plans.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The building of the LAS building on the tennis courts should not be allowed. This is land that has NEVER been built on and forms part of a breathtakingly beautiful and historic green corridor that runs in a continuous line from Gordon House Road to Parliament Hill Fields on the westerly side, and from the railway bridge to the top end of Grade 2* listed Grove Terrace on the easterly side. All of the other buildings, including the Morant Building, along the roads on both sides sit back from the road forming a building line behind the green corridor. This is a very busy road with families, residents, tourists and visitors coming by train, on three bus routes, by car and on foot at all hours of the day and night. The enjoyment of the views will be ruined by any building encroaching on the green space. All of these people form part of the community and they cannot be ignored in this way. It is also ironic given the emphasis placed in the proposal on "sustainability" that historic green land should be destroyed in this way. It must not be allowed to happen. 2. The size and scale of the LAS building is excessive and blocks the views of the rather handsome Morant Building. It is only sunk by 2 feet and remains a huge building and will dominate the only green space left in front of PHS. 3. The LAS Building will have a negative impact on the Grade 2* Listed Grove Terrace and the wider Dartmouth Park Conservation Area. 4. I am concerned about light pollution from the LAS building. The lights in the car park are already a problem and the new buildings will only add to this. 5. The location of the LAS building so close to the bus stops and renowned trouble spots on Highgate Road is misguided. It is bound to result in anti-social behaviour spilling out into Highgate Road. The school has a poor track record in dealing with students anti-social behaviour outside the school gates so there is no confidence that they would be able to deal with it in future. 6. I object to the trees being chopped down to accommodate the LAS building. There needs to be a proper plan for replanting. There needs to be more landscaping along Highgate Road and the budget for landscaping needs to be guaranteed. 7. The proposed car parking for PHS is excessive and seems contrary to Camden's low car use policies.

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
					8. The scale and location of the Ribbon Building are inappropriate. It is far too close to Clevedon Mansions and will have a devastating impact on their quality of life.
2014/7683/P	Rob Nesbitt	24 twisden road	31/01/2015 18:25:16	SUPPRT	I support the proposals and I hope they go through, although I also hope they can be tweaked to address concerns of direct neighbours in Lissenden Gardens in terms of proximity of the buildings / noise and disturbance. In terms of overall effect on the area coming from the other side of Highgate Road, I believe it will be positive for the Dartmouth Park community to have fit for purpose modern schooling.
2014/7683/P	Jane Hives	24 Grove Terrace	31/01/2015 17:16:19	OBJ	<p>I am writing to object strongly to these proposals.</p> <p>There has been virtually no consultation with the local community, save for a completely ineffective meeting only just before the planning application was submitted. This is totally unacceptable and even more so when the planning documents indicate that significant local opposition was expected. This opposition is not nimbysism. It is because the plans for the Ribbon, Sports Hall and La Swap buildings are all defective:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The location of the Ribbon building is far too close to Clevedon Mansions and, together with the Sports Hall, will surround this block oppressively and intrude into the residents' lives. • The architecture of the Sports Hall does not have merit, especially as it is facing a Grade 11* listed terrace in a Conservation Area. Indeed the plans effectively admit this as it is to be hidden behind 'green walls'. The latter are not a solution for poor design and are maintenance intensive, requiring frequent attention and renewal, eating into tight school budgets. • The architecture of the La Swap building fails on the same basis, but even worse is its location. Planning policies have been overridden in bringing the building line forward and disrupting the biodiversity corridor, without proper justification. It is unbelievable that this building, surrounded by seating areas etc is positioned on Highgate Road with its constant heavy traffic and polluting exhaust fumes. This defect is not even mentioned in the pros and cons of the alternative locations for the La Swap building. Surely the health and welfare of the La Swap students should be the highest priority? Thus any of the other locations must be superior. • A number of mature trees are to be removed from the frontage on Highgate Road, partly as a result of the positioning of the La Swap building, which conflicts with the stated aim of creating a 'strong green frontage'. It is noted that new trees are to be added, but these are shown to be immature and thus have much less impact. • The construction management plan is incomplete and this is of major concern to residents of Grove Terrace as we already feel the impact of Highgate Road traffic, especially from the speed bump. Steps should be taken to minimise impact. We also expect condition surveys prior to work starting to ensure that its impact can be gauged and remedied as part of the building project. <p>For all of the above reasons, the application as it now stands, should be refused.</p>
2014/7683/P	V Zarifis	Cressy Road	30/01/2015 14:26:45	SUPPRT	<p>I would like to register my strong support to the planning application for buildings at Parliament Hill School.</p> <p>As a parent of a child in Parliament Hill School I am aware of the urgent need to upgrade the building provisions of the School to allow accommodation of the infrastructure required for today's demanding education environment of a secondary school.</p>

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2014/7683/P	Claude Franklin	Flat 6 Highcroft 170 Highgate Road London NW5 1EJ	31/01/2015 11:28:02	OBJ	<p>Two main objections:</p> <p>1) The new one story building along the Highgate road breaks the otherwise fairly elegant symmetry of the old red bricks facade, a pity in what is meant to be a conservation area. The character of the building does not seem to present any architectural merit of its own.</p> <p>2)The proposition of moving the zebra crossing and speed bump back to a previous position gives rise to SERIOUS CONCERNS regarding the threat to the STRUCTURAL CONDITION of the building called Highcroft. This crossing was moved by the Council in recent years due to this very problem.</p>
2014/7683/P	Adrian Besley	Adrian Besley	30/01/2015 15:20:35	SUPPRT	<p>As a parent I see this redevelopment as urgently necessary to maintain the high quality education the school provides.</p> <p>As a local resident I find the proposals reasonable and sensitive to the impact on the immediate environment.</p>

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2014/7683/P	Michael Lilley	24 Grove Terrace	31/01/2015 17:15:00	OBJ	<p>I am writing to strongly object to these proposals for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ? The proposed location of the La Swap (LAS) building would: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ? have a detrimental impact on historic views up Highgate Road; ? cause substantial harm to the character of the Dartmouth Park Conservation Area; ? cause substantial harm to the setting of the Grade II* listed Grove Terrace; and ? violate recent government advice against building schools close to main roads with high emissions. ? The developer's options appraisal in respect of the location of the LAS building is self-serving, one-sided, incomplete, inaccurate and fatally flawed, and there was no meaningful consultation with the community in respect of the analysis. ? Approval of the proposed location of the LAS building would set a precedent for further development in the open spaces in front of PHS. ? The proposed materials for the LAS building are inappropriate and not sympathetic to their context. ? The proposed design and materials for the Sports Hall are inappropriate and not sympathetic to their context. ? The amount of car parking proposed for PHS is excessive. ? The landscaping along Highgate Road should be increased, and the budget for landscaping should be ringfenced. ? The scale, massing and location of the Ribbon Building are inappropriate. ? The proposed design for the new WES building is inappropriate and not sympathetic to its context. ? The draft Construction Management Plan is insufficient and incomplete. ? The proposed construction traffic routing is unacceptable. ? Approval of the final Construction Management Plan should be a condition to any planning permission, and residents should be consulted and given a formal opportunity to comment on the plan prior to finalisation. <p>Thus the planning application should be refused.</p>
