

[REDACTED]

From: iris ansell [REDACTED]
Sent: 28 August 2015 10:04
To: Planning
Subject: carob tree swains lane new plans

I am vehemently opposed to any further extension of Carob Tree restaurant which entails refuse and cycles in the front of the restaurant, not at all welcome in this neighbourhood.

Please exercise the Council's responsibility and refuse these plans and, if carried ahead illegally as in the past, overturn any work.

Thank you for your diligence.

Iris Ansell
2 Court View
Swains Lane
N66HA



Conservation Area Advisory Committee

Advisory Committee

Application ref 2015/4362/P
Address 15 Highgate Road London NW5 1QX
Planning Officer Jonathan McClue
Comments by 3 September 2015
Proposal Bin and cycle storage along with landscaping scheme for the residential flats

Observations

Documents attached

No details entered

Documents attached

[Letter Carob Tree 15-08-28](#)
[Objection to Application 2015/4362/P](#)

About this form

Issued by Contact Camden
5 Pancras Square
London N1C 4AG

Form reference 10210868

Data Protection

No personal information you have given us will be passed on to third parties for commercial purposes. The Council's policy is that all information will be shared among officers and other agencies where the legal framework allows it, if this will help to improve the service you receive and to develop other services. If you do not wish certain information about you to be exchanged within the Council, you can request that this does not happen.

27 Swain's Lane
London N6 6QL
28 August 2015

Mr. Jonathan McClue
Planning Officer
London Borough of Camden
Town Hall
London WC1 8ND

Dear Mr. McClue:

Re: **Carob Tree Applications 2015/4362/P**

I am writing as I have for the past four years regarding the Carob Tree to express my opposition its latest application. Despite the fact that similar applications have been previously submitted and twice rejected by the Development Committee of the Camden Council, they are once again submitting yet another iteration in an effort to bulldoze their way through the system the desires of the developer with total disregard for the community and those elected to represent it.

I urge you to reject **2015/4362/P** for the following reasons:

- We are part of a conservation area, adjacent to Hampstead Heath, and yet the application seeks to place rubbish and recycling on Highgate Road with the minimum of camouflage to hide its appearance.
- The position of the bins creates problems of collection as it is adjacent to a bus stop and there is no place for the refuse truck to stop that is convenient without creating a hazard and blocking traffic.
- The refuse will be sited adjacent to the restaurant's outdoor eating area creating health and safety concerns.
- The "landscaping" generates a natural hiding place for potential robbers / muggers to lurk at night and attack unsuspecting passengers waiting for a bus
- The cycle racks are virtually unusable (given their positioning and size), less than the "minimum four cycles" of Condition 10 and it is apparent that they are being provided merely to pay lip service to the original s106 requirements (and not for the convenience and use of the tenants.)

This new application is fundamentally identical to the previous applications (which were rejected) with the addition of some greenery and a modified cycle rack.

Once again the applicant has proposed being held accountable for the planting and maintenance of the greenery (in perpetuity) as an s106 amendment when, in actual fact, the owner has ignored or skirted all previous s106 requirements (to the point where a warning letter had to be issued by the enforcement officer) and which led us to this current situation.

These revisions do nothing to improve or enhance their surroundings. The end result of this (and previous applications such as the restaurant extension) is contrary to the intention of the refusal to the original application: Reasons for refusal of application 2010/2274/P:

1. The proposed extensions to the building, by reason of their scale, bulk, height and design would result in a dominant and overbearing form of development on this prominent corner site and *would fail to respond positively to the surrounding context, harmful to the character, appearance and setting of the host building, the wider Dartmouth Park Conservation Area, and*

the adjacent Holly Lodge and Highgate Village Conservation Areas.

2. The proposed development, in the absence of a legal agreement for car-free housing, would be likely to result in increased parking stress and congestion in the surrounding area, *to the detriment of highway and pedestrian safety.*

While objections were repeatedly raised and efforts made by community representatives to work together with the developer (as was done so successfully with the Lord Listowel site across the road,) the overtures were ignored (as were the provisions of the resulting s106 agreement) and the contractor forced his way through to secure everything that was originally rejected by the Development Committee.

Virtually all major resident organisations and community representatives have been opposed to this development from the beginning. Among those are:

Superintendent of Hampstead Heath on behalf of the city of London
Dartmouth Park CAAC
Holly Lodge Estate CAAC
Highgate CAAC
Brookfield Park Residents' Association
Crorftdown Residents' Association
Grove Terrace Association
Highgate Society
St. Alban's Villas & Oak Court Tenants and Residents' Association
and the Swains Lane Residents' and Neighbourhood Watch Association

And yet it continues: tenants are already occupying the premises and work proceeding on the applications before they have been reviewed. In essence, these applications make a travesty of the entire planning process. They have enabled the slow devolution from a neighbourhood pub and community landmark that the local residents acted together to save after the war to a drab, unattractive building (and restaurant) that has become a source of profit as the developer moves to complete construction and most likely sell.



At the end of the day, the constant chipping away of the community's objections (though erosion by numerous applications or sheer disregard for the provisions made by the Camden Council development Committee and Planning and Enforcement Officers) has enabled the owners to secure everything in the original application.



It has reduced a once elegant and historic landmark (and an Asset of Community Value before such a 'label' even existed) to an eyesore that has produced overflowing rubbish, noxious smells, traffic congestion and untold problems for its neighbours and the visitors to Swain's Lane.

I urge you to not let this continue. There is a practical solution in storing the cycles and rubbish bins in the area adjacent to the restaurant (now approved for an extension). It is time that someone had the good sense to see the situation as it truly exists and not as the developer would want it to be. It's time for the wishes of the residents and the needs of the community, consistent with precepts of the conservation area to be recognised. It's time to reject these proposals and send a clear message to those who believe they can have whatever they want.

Sincerely,

Robert J. Schoenbeck
Chairman: Swain's Lane Development Committee

27 Swain's Lane
London N6 6QL
28 August 2015

Mr. Jonathan McClue
Planning Officer
London Borough of Camden
Town Hall
London WC1 8ND

Dear Mr. McClue:

Re: **Carob Tree Applications 2015/4362/P**

I am writing as I have for the past four years regarding the Carob Tree to express my opposition its latest application. Despite the fact that similar applications have been previously submitted and twice rejected by the Development Committee of the Camden Council, they are once again submitting yet another iteration in an effort to bulldoze their way through the system the desires of the developer with total disregard for the community and those elected to represent it.

I urge you to reject **2015/4362/P** for the following reasons:

- We are part of a conservation area, adjacent to Hampstead Heath, and yet the application seeks to place rubbish and recycling on Highgate Road with the minimum of camouflage to hide its appearance.
- The position of the bins creates problems of collection as it is adjacent to a bus stop and there is no place for the refuse truck to stop that is convenient without creating a hazard and blocking traffic.
- The refuse will be sited adjacent to the restaurant's outdoor eating area creating health and safety concerns.
- The "landscaping" generates a natural hiding place for potential robbers / muggers to lurk at night and attack unsuspecting passengers waiting for a bus
- The cycle racks are virtually unusable (given their positioning and size), less than the "minimum four cycles" of Condition 10 and it is apparent that they are being provided merely to pay lip service to the original s106 requirements (and not for the convenience and use of the tenants.)

This new application is fundamentally identical to the previous applications (which were rejected) with the addition of some greenery and a modified cycle rack.

Once again the applicant has proposed being held accountable for the planting and maintenance of the greenery (in perpetuity) as an s106 amendment when, in actual fact, the owner has ignored or skirted all previous s106 requirements (to the point where a warning letter had to be issued by the enforcement officer) and which led us to this current situation.

These revisions do nothing to improve or enhance their surroundings. The end result of this (and previous applications such as the restaurant extension) is contrary to the intention of the refusal to the original application: Reasons for refusal of application 2010/2274/P:

1. The proposed extensions to the building, by reason of their scale, bulk, height and design would result in a dominant and overbearing form of development on this prominent corner site and *would fail to respond positively to the surrounding context, harmful to the character, appearance and setting of the host building, the wider Dartmouth Park Conservation Area, and*

the adjacent Holly Lodge and Highgate Village Conservation Areas.

2. The proposed development, in the absence of a legal agreement for car-free housing, would be likely to result in increased parking stress and congestion in the surrounding area, *to the detriment of highway and pedestrian safety.*

While objections were repeatedly raised and efforts made by community representatives to work together with the developer (as was done so successfully with the Lord Listowel site across the road,) the overtures were ignored (as were the provisions of the resulting s106 agreement) and the contractor forced his way through to secure everything that was originally rejected by the Development Committee.

Virtually all major resident organisations and community representatives have been opposed to this development from the beginning. Among those are:

Superintendent of Hampstead Heath on behalf of the city of London
Dartmouth Park CAAC
Holly Lodge Estate CAAC
Highgate CAAC
Brookfield Park Residents' Association
Crorftdown Residents' Association
Grove Terrace Association
Highgate Society
St. Alban's Villas & Oak Court Tenants and Residents' Association
and the Swains Lane Residents' and Neighbourhood Watch Association

And yet it continues: tenants are already occupying the premises and work proceeding on the applications before they have been reviewed. In essence, these applications make a travesty of the entire planning process. They have enabled the slow devolution from a neighbourhood pub and community landmark that the local residents acted together to save after the war to a drab, unattractive building (and restaurant) that has become a source of profit as the developer moves to complete construction and most likely sell.



At the end of the day, the constant chipping away of the community's objections (though erosion by numerous applications or sheer disregard for the provisions made by the Camden Council development Committee and Planning and Enforcement Officers) has enabled the owners to secure everything in the original application.



It has reduced a once elegant and historic landmark (and an Asset of Community Value before such a 'label' even existed) to an eyesore that has produced overflowing rubbish, noxious smells, traffic congestion and untold problems for its neighbours and the visitors to Swain's Lane.

I urge you to not let this continue. There is a practical solution in storing the cycles and rubbish bins in the area adjacent to the restaurant (now approved for an extension). It is time that someone had the good sense to see the situation as it truly exists and not as the developer would want it to be. It's time for the wishes of the residents and the needs of the community, consistent with precepts of the conservation area to be recognised. It's time to reject these proposals and send a clear message to those who believe they can have whatever they want.

Sincerely,

Robert J. Schoenbeck
Chairman: Swain's Lane Development Committee

[REDACTED]

From: Kate Hobsbawm [REDACTED]
Sent: 29 August 2015 13:49
To: Planning
Subject: Objection to Application 2015/4362/P

Objection to Application 2015/4362/P

1. the front of No 15 is very visible as it is right by a main entrance to the heath. It is vitally important that refuse and cycles not being placed on this forecourt.

2. the owners have not complied with many of the conditions set out by the planning committee. why has this not been enforced??

3. The proposals set out in this application also fail in a number of respects:

a. It would be TERRIBLE to have cycles and refuse in front, next to the dining tables!

b. Replacement of Trees: In 2009, a significant mature tree at the front of the premises was illegally cut down. The Council required new trees to be planted. It was agreed that suitable trees would be planted on the site. These trees are not shown in the plans of the present proposals. This is absolutely UNACCEPTABLE!!!

c. Application 2014/3461P has recently been implemented to provide an acceptable scheme for the storage of refuse and cycles. There is, therefore, no need for the current intrusive and damaging proposals in the current application.

Therefore, this application should be refused!

Kate and Andy Hobsbawm

45 Swain's Lane
London, N6 6QL