

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2015/3076/P	Mary Garland	47 Ascot House Redhill Street London NW1 4DB	30/06/2015 11:55:43	COMMNT	I have found it difficult to locate details of buildings in place of the Victory Public House and the Dick Collins Hall, which are closest to me. I am very concerned about the effect on parking in this part of our residents' parking area. It is already really difficult to find anywhere to park in Redhill Street and Cumberland Market. I am a senior citizen and have to drive to my husband's nursing home every day. It is difficult to use public transport for that particular journey and I have to carry quite a lot, which is difficult for me. It is even more difficult if I have to park some way away from my home. I should like to know what arrangements are being made for parking when the new homes come on stream. Thank you.
2015/3076/P	Ursula Brown	89 Woodhall Robert Street London NW1 3JT	29/06/2015 17:15:52	OBJNOT	<p>I object to the application for the following reasons:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) Loss of green spaces 2) Loss of trees 3) Distress caused to residents by building work 4) This work would go ahead even if HS2 doesn't materialise. <p>1. There needs to be a major rethink on the proposals to infill the Regents Park Estate with additional housing on the green spaces. These spaces were originally planned to make the high density housing tolerable and healthy. Once built on these spaces would be lost for ever dealing a damaging and irreversible blow to the health and wellbeing of all residents and the whole peaceful environment of the Regents Park would be destroyed. While supporting the provision of replacement housing locally for people whose homes will be destroyed by HS2, solutions other than building on the green spaces need to be found and there are other options, even on the estate.</p> <p>2. The proposals involve the loss of some 53 trees and 6 groups of trees. The trees on the Estate are equally important to the wellbeing of residents and the visual environment of the Estate. It is stated that "up to" 40 new trees would be replaced - which could mean no trees at all! At best the net loss would be 13 trees and 6 groups of trees. We have already lost dozens of trees from the Netley site and yet more trees are under threat from HS2. Taken together with the loss of green spaces this would turn the Estate from a pleasant leafy environment to a concrete desert, further detracting from the health and wellbeing of residents and reducing the air quality which is already poor.</p> <p>3. At Woodhall we have already suffered from three years of building works below our windows (and the loss of our communal garden) and are faced with the prospect of 20 years of HS2 construction works/traffic. The construction of these buildings would mean there is no respite for residents between these two major works and would be intolerable.</p> <p>4. The proposal states that "... no part of the proposal in this application is in any way directly reliant on the HS2 scheme being permitted and constructed." So we could have all this misery and depredation even if the replacement housing is no longer needed! Whilst it is important that people who would lose their homes due to HS2 can stay in the area, if HS2 is cancelled or doesn't come in to Euston any planning permission granted for this application must be cancelled.</p>

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2015/3076/P	margaret nadin	2 troutbeck albany street london nw1 4eg	01/07/2015 09:36:09	COMMNT	<p>I object strongly to the above plans.</p> <p>I bought my flat as it looks now not all hemmed in with people and unsightly flats. The space is not big enough for the amount of properties u want to build.</p> <p>There would be a big issue with the refuse room, it cant cope with the amount of rubbish now, it is not only taking the rubbish from troutbeck, it also takes rubbish from the Albany gym and also Clarence gardens use it rather than their own. The rubbish already overflows onto the pavement. With 116 extra properties it would be much worse and we would be overrun by mice and rats. Also if you are putting parking spaces in front of it, how are the dustmen going to empty the bins, they need to be able to back right up to it.</p> <p>At the moment we are able to walf across the service road to get to refuse room or Clarence gardens, if you build there, we would have to walf along the balcony, which would be a huge problem if you have bulky rubbish. plus residents often block the balcony with bicycles and pushchairs.</p> <p>We would only have one access road into the block.</p> <p>Also if we have to put up with this upheavel are we gpoiong to get a reduction on our service charge.</p> <p>I wanted to sell my property, these new properties will devalue it.</p>

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2015/3076/P	Richard Portes and Helene Rey	5 Redhill Place 1-3 Redhill Street NW1 4BG	30/06/2015 17:06:03	COMMNT	<p>We comment on planning application 2015/3076/P, with limited but important objections.</p> <p>We own and live in no. 5 Redhill Place, 1-3 Redhill Street, which faces directly on the site of the current Dick Collins Hall.</p> <p>We are of course sympathetic to the Council's need to provide replacement housing for those displaced by HS2, should it go forward. But we must object to the current plans because:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The proposed new building would be too high. 2. The proposed balconies would create a noise problem and would directly overlook Redhill Place at a relatively short distance. <p>1. Building height</p> <p>It is important to maintain the sensitive approach that was adopted in the Regent's Park Estate development around 40 years ago. The key is scale, especially with respect to the Grade II* St George's Cathedral, the Crown Estate buildings (Ascot and Windsor Houses), and Redhill Place, a fine 1912 Art Nouveau building, which should indeed be listed. It is in a Conservation Area. All buildings preserved emphasis on the cathedral, and development respected the original market square layout. Both Redhill Place and the remains of the adjacent chapel buildings are at a domestic scale, consonant with the area.</p> <p>Unfortunately, the proposed scheme on the Dick Collins Hall site does not take that sensitive approach, especially in building height. Moreover, the excess height retains the blocky profile of the lower Rothay House, rather than considering mansard roofs to reduce scale, as used on Windsor and Ascot Houses.</p> <p>West elevation shows that the building dominates Windsor House, with the bulk rising above the mansard roof. South elevation shows the top floor of the new building extending above the line of the existing Rothay House, which from this drawing is evidently designed to remain within the profile of the bulk of St George's Cathedral, so that the tower remains visible and dominant. The proposals ignore this important point.</p> <p>The taller building would adversely affect the Conservation Area in another way. If built as currently proposed, it would conclusively obliterate the original and intentional link between the church and the market, a loss of historical townscape significance (see Heritage Statement).</p> <p>We fully support setting the new building back, so as to retain the mature trees and limit the impact on the special local character of the cobbled area around Redhill Street. Even so, a building with the proposed height and profile would dominate the much smaller and much more attractive early buildings, including Ascot and Windsor Houses.</p> <p>We therefore suggest that the proposed new building for the Dick Collins Hall site is inappropriate and damages the setting of the Conservation Area and the Grade II* St George's Cathedral. Much of the harm could be remedied simply by removing the upper story of the building, so as to make it the same height as Rothay. This would lose two flats, but it would greatly mitigate the adverse effects on the Conservation Area. Without this amendment, we must oppose this proposed building and request that planning permission be denied.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 2. Noise and overlooking <p>The flats as planned have very little living space, so although the balconies would face north, they would probably be used intensively. Again, this would affect the character of the local area, as well as</p>

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
					<p>creating a nuisance for those of us living opposite. We therefore request that the Council consider devoting the area currently shown as north-facing balconies to interior living space with windows, or at least providing some form of soundproofing barrier on the balconies.</p> <p>We are well aware of the housing pressures on the Council. And in such a big scheme, the impact on Redhill Place and the surroundings may seem unimportant. But any officer who knows the area will recognise that the streetscape here really is special and significant and so deserves the level of protection the Council has accorded to it in the past. We therefore hope that the scheme will be revised to take account of our objections. Richard Portes and Helene Rey</p>

2015/3076/P	Jason Field	41 Ascot House	01/07/2015 06:04:18	OBJ	<p>Myself and many other key workers such as police officers , nurses , fire fighters and railworkers live on the peabody estate .And have bedrooms facing the dick collins hall . and we all frequently work night shifts. How would we get any sleep while lorries are thundering by ,and drilling is going on , shouting builders and all other building related loud noises going on literally right outside our bedroom windows while we are trying to sleep after a stressful night shift . This will cause severe sleep depravation and all other insomnia related illnesses that go along with that .If this was to go ahead we would be forced to move . I and many others are opposed to this going ahead. As it will have severe effects on our health and wellbeing.</p>
-------------	-------------	----------------	---------------------	-----	--

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2015/3076/P	Robyn Pender	No.4 Redhill Place 1-3 Redhill Street London NW1 4BG	30/06/2015 07:46:36	OBJ	<p>I write in response to your letter of 2 June 2015 inviting comment on the planning application (reference 2015/3076/P), and thank you for the opportunity to comment.</p> <p>As the owners and residents of No.4 Redhill Place, 1-3 Redhill Street (directly on the opposite side of the road), we are specifically interested in proposed replacement building on the site of the current Dick Collins Hall, and do not comment on any of the other development sites.</p> <p>As nearest neighbours to Dick Collins Hall, and the people most likely to be directly affected by its replacement, we are forced to OBJECT to the current plans on the following grounds:</p> <p>a) the new building is one storey too tall; and</p> <p>b) the open balconies will create a noise problem, as well as exacerbating potential issues of overlooking.</p> <p>A) BUILDING HEIGHT</p> <p>We understand and appreciate the aspirations of the Council to provide housing, and the proposals for replacing the Dick Collins Hall are equally an opportunity to improve on this later scheme (c.1970), which formed the last part of the Regent Park Estate development. Nevertheless, it is vital to appreciate the sensitive approach that had been taken in that as in all other past developments in terms of scale and massing, particularly in relation to the significant St George's Cathedral, the handsome Crown Estate buildings (Ascot House and Windsor House), and Redhill Place (a very fine Art Nouveau building, albeit not yet listed). The architecture is diverse and eclectic, but all buildings to date have been scaled to ensure that the emphasis has remained on the Grade II* St. George's Cathedral, and development has also been respectful of the earlier market square layout. Both Redhill Place and the remains of the adjacent chapel buildings are at a 'domestic scale', which is respectful of the area as a whole.</p> <p>It is in our view that the proposed scheme on the Dick Collins Hall site fails to acknowledge and respect that sensitive approach, most specifically in the height being proposed. What is more, this excess height retains the blocky profile of the lower Rothay House, rather than considering the use of mansard roofs to reduce scale as has been adopted on Windsor and Ascot House.</p> <p>The impact is clearly visible in the elevations and sections provided:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - West elevation (1328-1328-P5-304) clearly reveals that the building dominates against Windsor House, with the bulk rising above the mansard roof; - South elevation ((1328-1328-P5-304) is worrying: it shows that the top floor of the new building extends above the line of the existing Rothay House, which from this drawing can be seen to have been designed to remain within the profile of the bulk of St George's Cathedral, allowing the entirety of the church tower to rise above and remain visible and dominant. This important point is completely ignored and lost by the new scheme. <p>The taller building would have another adverse impact on the Conservation Area. As the Heritage Statement notes; "Since Nash's ophthalmic hospital on the other side of Redhill Street was relatively</p>

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

Comment: **Response:**

low, [St George's] spire was previously visible from Cumberland Market, although the view is now largely blocked by Rothay House... and by trees next to the Dick Collins Hall." If the replacement to the Dick Collins Hall were built as currently proposed, then this original and intentional link between the church and the market would conclusively be lost, to the detriment of historical and townscape significance.

We are in full support of the decision to set the new building back, which will certainly help to preserve the unusual and special local character of the cobbled area around Redhill Street (and will retain the mature trees); but even set back, a building constructed to the proposed profile and height would still dominate the much smaller and much more attractive early buildings, including Ascot House and Windsor House, which by comparison would suddenly look small.

We would therefore suggest that as currently proposed the new building for the Dick Collins Hall site is not appropriate, is harmful to the setting of the conservation area and equally harmful to the significance of the grade II* St George's Cathedral. To make the redevelopment a positive good, we would like the Council to remove the upper story of the building, making it the same height as Rothay. This would be at the cost of two flats, but it would make an enormous improvement the adverse impact on the Conservation Area. Without this amendment to the design, we must oppose this building, and request that it be refused planning permission.

b) NOISE IMPACT AND OVERLOOKING

The flats as planned have very little "living" space, so although the balconies are north-facing (shady and cold), they would be likely to be intensively used. Again, this will affect the character of the local area, as well as creating a nuisance for those of us unfortunate enough to live opposite.

We would therefore ask that consideration be given to returning the area devoted to north-facing balconies to interior living space with windows; otherwise, that some form of soundproofing barrier be installed on the balconies.

We are well aware of the pressures the council is facing with housing, and would applaud the holistic approach being taken to this very large planning project. But we would also hope that our objections are taken into full account: in such a big scheme, it can be easy to lose sight of small corners such as this one, but as any officer who has visited will attest, the streetscape here really is special and significant, and well deserves the level of protection given to it by Camden Council in the past.

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2015/3076/P	Chintal & Sameet Bathia	3 Redhill Place 1-3 Redhill Street London NW1 4BG	30/06/2015 22:30:07	OBJ	I would like to support the views of my neighbours Robyn Pender and Richard Portes stated prior. We object to the councils replacement housing plans for those displaced by HS2. Our opinion is that: 1. the proposed new building would be too high 2. The proposed balconies would directly overlook Redhill Place. These points have been outlined in our neighbours comments in detail and we fully support their views.
