

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2015/1243/P	John Whittaker	52 Gloucester Avenue	01/05/2015 21:55:22	COMMNT	Dear Mr Cassidy

Planning application 2015/1243/P: 44-44a Gloucester Avenue London NW1 8JD

I am pleased that the old property at 44-44a Gloucester Avenue is due for refurbishment and redevelopment, and the approved application 2015/0462/P providing for 17 dwellings appeared to do this in a sympathetic and satisfactory way.

However, this new application with 40 new dwellings is of a different order and it is excessive. In particular, it is hard to see how the proposed building in the North West corner of the site – with 6 storeys and a new penthouse in the sky overlooking all our properties – can be considered to be in keeping with the local area.

These are not ‘minor amendments’ as claimed by Montagu Evans, the developer in his letter to me, and I regret that I must register my strong objection.

Yours sincerely

John Whittaker  
1st floor  
52 Gloucester Avenue  
London NW 18JD

---

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2015/1243/P	edward williams	57 princess road regents park NW1 8JS NW1 8JS	30/04/2015 12:59:24	OBJ	<p>I WISH TO OBJECT TO THIS APPLICATION FOR THE PRIMARY REASON OF OVER DEVELOPMENT.</p> <p>TO INCREASE THE CURRENTLY APPROVED RESIDENTIAL UNITS FROM 17 TO 40 IS NOTHING SHORT OF EXCESSIVE DEVELOPER GREED.</p> <p>THE EXTRA 23 UNITS WILL GENERATE UNACCEPTABLE TRAFFIC - IF NOT FROM THE RESIDENTS THEMSELVES THEN FROM VISITORS TO THEM.</p> <p>THE LOSS OF B1 SPACE IS ALSO NOT ACCEPTBLE.</p> <p>THE INCREASE IN HEIGHT IN THE NORTHWEST CORNER IS NOT APPROPRIATE AND I BELIEVE THIS HAS BEEN REJECTED IN ONE OF THE MANY PREVIOUS APPLICATIONS FOR THIS SITE.</p> <p>THE LAYOUT OF THE PARKING SPACES AT GROUND FLOOR LEVEL APPEARS TO BE EXCESSIVELY TIGHT WITH CAR SPACES CRAMMED IN WITH DANGEROUS POTENTIAL WHEN CARS NEED TO REVERSE OUT.</p> <p>THE SUNLIGHT STUDIES ARE NOT ADEQUATE.</p> <p>THE AGENTS FOR THE DEVELOPERS, MONTAGUE EVANS, SENT A LETTER TO LOCAL RESIDENTS ON THE 13 FEBRUARY 2015 ADVISING THAT AN APPLICATION TO INCREASE THE RESIDENTIAL UNIT COUNT TO 40. THEY SENT THIS LETTER AT THE TIME AN APPLICATION WAS CURRENTLY WITH THE COUNCIL FOR 17 UNITS. I REQUESTED THAT THEY ISSUE PLANS AND ELEVATION SO THAT THE SCHEME NOTED IN THIS COULD BE REVIEWED BY THE LOCAL RESIDENTS AS A LETTER ONLY IS NOT SUFFICIENT. DESPITE MANY EMAIL REQUESTS THE DID NOT ISSUE ANY PLANS. I WOULD LIKE THE PLANNING COMMITTEE TO TAKE A VIEW OF THIS PRACTICE. WHY ISSUE A LETTER TO LOCALS REFERRING TO CURRENT PLANS WITH THE COUNCIL BUT ADVISING THAT A NEW APPLICATION WAS TO BE ISSUED.</p> <p>I HAVE SENT COPIES OF MY CORRESPONDENCE WITH MONTAGUE EVANS TO MICHAEL CASSIDY VIA EMAILS.</p> <p>THE CURRENTLY APPROVED SCHEME IS NOT A BAD DESIGN AND MAKES USE OF A UNDERUSED BUILDING. THE PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT IS SADLY A REFLECTION OF THE GREED OF DEVELOPERS IN CAMDEN AND INDEED THE REST OF LONDON.</p> <p>PLEASE DO THE RIGHT THING AND REJECT THIS APPLICATION.</p>

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2015/1243/P	Phil Cowan	Flat One 2 Albert Terrace London NW1 7SU NW1 7SU	30/04/2015 12:23:26	COMMNT	<p>I would like to object to this application on the following grounds:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"><li>1. The proposed development would see a reduction of B1 office space compared with the previous consent which would impact local employment and adversely affect the surrounding local economy.</li><li>2. The increase in height to the building in the NW corner of the site is excessive and does not relate to the general scale of the rest of the conservation area. There would be serious loss of light issues for the houses in Sunny Mews should this be allowed.</li><li>3. Plans for parts of the basement to be used as residential accomodation are unacceptable due to the lack of daylight which should not be seen to be fit for habitable space.</li><li>4. The previous application allowed for affordable housing to be included on the site. This new application appears to have dispensed with it. This is wholly unacceptable in a development of this scale in a mixed urban community.</li></ol> <p>For these reasons I would urge that this application is refused.</p>

---

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2015/1243/P	Peter Darley, Camden Railway Heritage Trust	21 Oppidans Road NW3 3AG NW3 3AG	10/05/2015 07:32:15	OBJ	<p>The previous planning application approved at appeal did not address the question of contaminated land, maintaining:</p> <p>The industrial buildings were used as warehouse and office accommodation for the business (Heritage Statement, 2010/6627/P).</p> <p>This is as far as the investigation of the industrial activities carried out at the site has gone.</p> <p>I would like to set the stage by quoting from my book “Camden Goods Station Through Time”: In 1846 the Electric and International Telegraph Company, which owned the Cooke and Wheatstone patents, was incorporated for public telegraphic communications using railway routes as corridors for the overhead lines. Their Gloucester Road works, built in 1858, housed an extensive factory carrying out a great variety of skilled operations. The company was nationalised and taken over by the Post Office in 1870. The single storey building facing Gloucester Road was replaced by the present three-storey building in c1871.</p> <p>There is more information on the factory operations in the Scudamore Report of 1871, which describes reorganisation post nationalisation. I have previously attached the two pages of this report that relate directly to the site in subject.</p> <p>The applicant now considers:</p> <p>The planning application that was previously submitted and approved at appeal under application reference: APP/X5210/A/11/2161885 did not include a Contamination Desktop Report and therefore it is not considered that a report will be required in this instance as it was agreed not to be a material issue in the determination of the appeal (Cover Letter to 2015/0462/P).</p> <p>No attempt appears to have been made by the applicant to obtain information on the industrial processes undertaken on site either before nationalisation, as documented in the Scudamore Report, or post nationalisation. It is merely declared that the 20th century processes that have been documented do not give cause for concern. In the absence of better information, a precautionary stance should be taken. We already know about battery manufacture and the repair of old batteries from the Scudamore Report. There must be a strong possibility that a number of other processes would have involved noxious substances.</p> <p>Unless and until it is reasonably proven otherwise, Camden Railway Heritage Trust objects to the new application (2015/1243/P) because of the potential hazard of contaminated land.</p> <p>In regard to the heritage issues, there has never been any mention in the series of planning applications submitted by the developer of the Grade II* listed stationary winding engine vaults. These are closer to the site than either the Engineer or Primrose Hill School. The applicant will have been alerted to their existence by the responses of Network Rail and CRHT, and by the Discussion Paper “Restoration of the Stationary Winding Vaults”, June 2014, which was handed to the developer at a meeting on 11 July</p>

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

**Comment:**    **Response:**

2014. It is clear that the applicant believes that permitted development orders allow him/her to almost entirely ignore this remarkable feature of Camden's rich railway heritage.

The vaults are of international importance for their historical and technological significance. They were listed at Grade II in June 1990 and raised to Grade II\* in April 2010 following a successful application by Camden Railway Heritage Trust. They are a survivor of the London and Birmingham Railway (L&BR), the first of all modern main line railways with a London terminus. The L&BR opened to Boxmoor from Euston on 20 July 1837 and to Birmingham on 17 September 1838. The winding engine vaults represent, as one of the very last uses of rope haulage on a public railway, a relatively brief transitional stage in the technological development of railway transportation. Their architectural interest lies in the grand scale and unique design of their underground brick construction.

The most important issue to be addressed is the safeguarding of the means of access/escape to the winding vaults, and thereby the safeguarding of the potential for restoration and reuse of this exceptional structure. In this respect, the historic former electric telegraph works at 44-44A Gloucester Avenue provide the last opportunity to safeguard a service/escape route to the winding vaults on their western side. This would be through the building at the south-eastern end of the Courtyard, adjacent to No. 42 Gloucester Avenue and backing onto the rail side. It is shown in the current application (2015/1243/P) as a single storey with basement, providing a means of escape from the vaults via a narrow corridor, one metre wide. Even if this were sufficient to meet health and safety requirements, we believe that for an access/escape route two basement floors, a staircase and a lift should be incorporated.

The utilities to be provided for any restoration of the vaults would include potable water, wastewater, electricity, and communications. It is envisaged that all of these services would be routed from Gloucester Avenue, and combined with the escape route from the vaults. This route could also be used for servicing the vaults, using the lift in the access shaft for movement of heavier loads.

Whatever the permitted development rights under current government legislation, it must be in Camden's interest to safeguard the potential of such a valuable heritage asset. If the planning authority fails in this, it will deprive future residents and visitors of a unique opportunity. We call on the parties involved, developer, Network Rail and LBC, to show some imagination so that all parties may benefit.

---

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2015/1243/P	Mrs Linda Seward	47 Kingstown Street London NW1 8JP	08/05/2015 13:45:29	OBJLETTE R	<p>I would like to comment on this proposal for one of the last large mixed residential and work sites in our area in a Victorian building. If more business space is lost in Primrose Hill by the success of this application, then Primrose Hill may soon become a different sort of place in which to live.</p> <p>I object to an increase in the height of the building in the northwest corner of the site, as well as putting balconies and lightwells in the inner courtyard.</p> <p>Please do not reduce the number of employment space uses (B1) as compared to the previous permission and do not increase the number of residential units as compared to the previous permission. Do not enlarge the staircore in the southern building on the site.</p> <p>I would like the pitched roof be retained and not have a flat roof in the eastern corner of the site.</p> <p>Most importantly, it is important to retain affordable housing onsite as compared to the previous permission and to treat this traditional industrial building in the conservation more sensitively than the current plans do.</p>

---