					Printed on: 25/03/2015 09:05:20
Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2015/0921/P	Alison Hardenberg	1 F Crogsland Road	23/03/2015 19:36:51	COMMNT	COMMENTS on 2015/0921/P New Charlie Ratchford
	Tallacinoeig	London NW1 8AY			Design: the proposed building is too bulky and high for the street. The bulk of the building will reduce the amount of light currently enjoyed by the residents of 11 Crogsland Road. The street is being overdeveloped as there are other major proposed developments in the street Impact on new uses: the proposed use does not re-provide the facilities currently provided by the Charlie Ratchford Centre. There is no provision for space in the new building for pottery, art classes, ballroom dancing and other activities currently available at the Charlie Ratchford Centre for the 60 plus residents in the area.
					There is already crowding on the pavements at the corner of Crogsland Road and Haverstck Hill from the Enterprise Pub, the Hotel and the coffee shop. If there are 32 more bed units (currently none) plus an additional basement cinema, restaurant and bar the use and crowding on Crogsland Road itself and on the pavements will increase to possibly dangerous levels
					Road Safety: There is already crowding on the pavements at the corner of Crogsland Road and Haverstock Hill from the Enterprise Pub, the Hotel and the coffee shop. The provision of 38 new housing units will inevitably lead to an increase in the traffic. This will be aggravated by the other proposed developments in the street. The number of people using the Charlie Ratchford site together with the people using the pub, flats, restaurant, cinema, bar hotel and coffee shop is likely to compromise road safety especially as the site is next to the entrance to Haverstock Hill School where, during term time, children arrive and leave the school and many are delivered and collected by adults using cars.
2015/0921/P	Alison Hardenberg	1 F Crogsland Road London NW1 8AY	23/03/2015 19:36:50	COMMNT	
2015/0921/P	Alison Hardenberg	1 F Crogsland Road London NW1 8AY	23/03/2015 19:36:50	COMMNT	

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Printed on: 24/03/2015 09:05:21 Response:
2015/0921/P	Stelios Voutsadakis	1f Crogsland Road	23/03/2015 19:55:30		I am of the opinion that this planning application should be rejected for the following reasons (figures in brackets refer to the 'planning statement submitted as part of the planning application):
					(1.3 & 5.3) The proposals are misleading. The facilities provided at the new location are not comparable to the existing facilities in terms of size, variety and quality. The design team claims that the new building would re-provide the existing Charlie Ratchford Centre facilities. This is incorrect as regards the accommodation provision in terms of area and location. There is no space in the proposed accommodation for pottery, ballroom dancing and art classes currently enjoyed by the over 60s in the area. Most importantly the limited facilities provided will be perceived as belonging to the residence of the building and not available to all in the neighborhood. This is their building the present Charlie Rachford Centre belongs to all of us.
					(1.6) The proposals do not comply with the Councils core strategy Camden Core Strategy policies CS6'Providing Quality Homes' and CS10 'Supporting Community facilities' Camden Development Management Policies DP7 'Sheltered Housing and Care Homes for Older People
					(1.7) The proposed development is of inappropriate scale and design and it would not contribute positively to the street scene. The potential impact of the scheme on the residential amenity of surrounding properties has been totally ignored and the scheme designed disregards the residents in order to maximize the accommodation provided. Recent developments along Chalk Farm Road were limited in height to 4 storeys over ground floor shops. The width of Chalk farm Road is more than twice the width of Crogsland road. To allow 6 stories or more for the following on developments is perverse.
					32 housing units have been the optimum number in the provision of this type of accommodation for years. The proposed scheme is for 38 units. Reducing the proposed building to 5 stories (31-32 apartments) will be an improvement not only architecturally terms but also will provide better care to the residents for a set number of staff.
					The design team claims that the proposed building has been designed to the highest standards of sustainable design and incorporates energy efficiency measures in accordance with planning policy. They conveniently ignore the destruction of the embodied energy at the original Charlie Ratchford

The design of the building is a competent piece of architecture. It is unfortunate it was designed before the Denton Estate was refurbished from dark brick building to a white modern Mediterranean villas on grass! Perhaps the architects should be given an opportunity to revisit the brick specification, even the stone cladding. The major issue is the bulk and height of the proposed scheme, which together with the lack of a master plan for the area and the proposed development to the other two sites opposite the site in question and the extension of the hotel will turn Crogsland Road into a sunless wind swept canyon.

House, or the energy for demolishing a recently refurbish building and the energy of transporting and

disposing off the ruble of the demolition.

Printed on: 24/03/2015 09:05:21

Application No: Consultees Name: Consultees Addr: Received: Comment:

Response:

The South block (3) of the proposed development is not appropriate to the scale of the road. It assigns 'civic' status to what is in the end a modest housing development.

Is amenity of open space adequate for an inner London area?

9.2 The pre-application exhibition was a polished PR exercise, but I think consultation is a misnomer. All suggestion and criticisms were ignored, for example the bulk and height of the building was criticized by several participants. The lack of certain facilities that are available at the present Charlie Ratchford building are not on offer in the new building. Transport safety and congestion concerns were ignored. Daylight and sunlight is a major issue in my opinion and not as presented by the applicants.

I cannot see any substantial revisions of the exhibited scheme to that submitted for planning approval.

The development would give rise to further transport congestion. The majority of the shopping will be over the Internet with a great number of delivery vehicles arriving at all times. Minibuses, taxis, and delivery vehicles will be used to service the needs of the new buildings. Probably executing a 3-point turn due to the fact that Crogsland Road is not an entry road from Chalk Farm Road. The applicants transport statement fails to state this in the transport statement. (2.4.4 Crogsland Road is a two-way road)

Congestion of Pedestrians;

The junction of Crogsland Road to Chalk Farm Road is already very congested most of the time and, irrespective of weather, due to the Enterprise Pub's popularity, the indoor smoking restrictions and the convenience of tables and benches placed on the pavement. It is safe to assume that tables and chairs will be placed on the pavement by the operators of the new restaurant restricting movement along the pavement forcing pedestrians on the road as per Enterprise Pub.

The additional visitors to the new restaurants, cafes and cinemas will make the walk from the Tube station to the homes at Crogsland and Prince of Wales Road an adventure.

Crogsland Cul-de-sak

The solution to the congestion at the junction of Crogsland Road to Chalk Farm Road is the stopping of access to Chalk Farm Road from Crogsland Road for vehicles and cycles. Paving the area from the Chalk Farm Road to the entrance of the Camden Lock Hotel will create a safe 'over-spill' area for visitors to the corner café, hotel, pub new flats and pupils to the School. The 'school rear entrance' is used extensively by the school children in the mornings and afternoons. Crogsland Road is crowded and unsafe in the mornings due to the 'school run'. A non-through Crogsland road will lessen these problems.

A master Plan for Crogsland Road

The redevelopment that has taken place to date and it is proposed in the near future will change the lives of the existing residence and the appearance and use of Crogsland Road beyond recognition. Camden Planning Department has produced detail plans for areas that are subject to less development than Crogsland Road.

Newly build or under construction development in the immediate area:

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
					158 Prince of Wales Road
					176 Zabludowicz Collection
					159-167 Prince of Wales Road
					Haverstock School
					Round House
					210-202 Regents Park Road
					Stockholm Apartments and shops
					The Chalk House and Shops
					Belmond Street Redevelopment
					Proposed new Development or Under Construction
					62 Haverstock Hill
					Marine Ices site
					Charlie Ratchford Extra Care Scheme
					Charlie Ratchford Resource Centre site
					Fish processing factory site
					Camden Lock Hotel
					Round House
					100 Chalk Farm Road 100 Chalk Farm Road and probably a few more in the pipeline.
					What is required is a master plan for the area to establish the character of the area and the adequacy of the services for the population explosion due to the new development. Is there capacity in the local primary care facilities? Can Haverstock School expand to accommodate the new pupil numbers? Are the existing transport facilities adequate? Can the road capacity cope with the additional number of delivery vehicles? Will there be compensation to the existing residence for living in a building sit the next 5-7 years?
					Development control planners are limited by their terms of reference. They can only consider the particular application against the 'generalist' Council Planning policies as opposed to the specific requirements that would be established by the master plan of the area/road.

Printed on: 24/03/2015

09:05:21

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Printed on: 25/03/2015 09:05:20 Response:
2015/0921/P	Diane Goodkind	3a Crogsland Rd NW1 8AY	24/03/2015 23:10:35	OBJ	I object to the current proposal on the following grounds 1. Due process has not been followed - no consultation with surrounding residents. Proposals were put on display in December 14. Despite there being various comments by local residents, not one single change or amendment has been made. By any stretch of the imagination this is not consultation, this is just a presentation. 2. The drawings are not sufficiently clear enough to establish whether the "25 degree sight rule" is being followed. The currently belief is that this is to disguise the fact that the proposed height of the building is above that which is legally acceptable. 3. The drawings do not accurately reflect the exact proposal. Some show the new building directly adjoining 11 Crogsland Road, others show a separation. It"s unclear exactly what the correct plans are. 4. 1-11 Crogsland Road was nominated for the "local heritage list" meaning it is clearly considered a building of local historical interest. It is one the last remaining buildings of its type in the borough. The current proposals give no consideration to the historical importance of this building potentially damaging it for future generations. 5. No shadow analysis diagrams have been produced or light meter readings taken. Current proposals are likely to result in an unacceptable loss of natural light for 1-11 Crogsland Road. 6. The current proposals cut right across Camden Councils commitment to maintaining green space within the borough. The proposed building will damage the natural environment of the current green space and gardens around the vacant land, specifically those adjacent and opposite. 7. The size of the proposed building, both height and width is based purely on what makes the building financially viable and not what is appropriate for potential residents. The building had to contain 40 residential units to be viable. Is it really appropriate for potential residents. The building had to contain 40 residential units to be viable. Is it really appropriate for pote