

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2018/1528/P	Mr Carl Deathe / Miss Joanna Pacholec	16/05/2018 16:17:23	OBJLETTE R	<p>We object to the proposed development.</p> <p>It is our strong belief that this land should be returned to public use, and re-instated to it's previous condition of public greenspace, and not re-developed.</p> <p>As noted by Camden Council in previous planning applications, the site "falls within existing Historic Open Space"</p> <p>Specific to the proposed development:</p> <p>It our my strong view that materials used should be in keeping with the local building landscape. The design should either be whole sympathetic to neighbouring properties or significantly different with strong modern architectural merit to enrich the Dartmouth Park conservation area.</p> <p>The proposed design is neither sympathetic or worthy of architectural merit. It fails to preserve the character and appearance of the Dartmouth Park Conservation Area, or the setting of the listed buildings which overlook the Grove Terrace Squares", specifically:</p> <p>East side of Highgate Road:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Denyer House (1940's) - Grove End House (1860's) - Grove View Apartments (Converted Baptist Church) (1860's) <p>West Side:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Victorian properties on the west side (1880-1910's) <p>Further, the proposal in design and materials (dark red brick) seeks to echo the railway bridge crossing Highgate Road. This is misplaced being perpendicular to, and displaced from the bridge itself. In effect it presents an undesirable folly.</p> <p>We encourage the planning authority to reject the proposed designs, and request design changes which will enhance the Dartmouth Park conservation area.</p> <p>We believe the proposal fails under the current Camden Local Plan Policy (July 3, 2017), including: https://www.camden.gov.uk/ccm/cms-service/stream/asset/?asset_id=3655163&</p> <p>Under Policy Policy D1 Design, the proposal fails to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> * Respect local context and character; * Preserves or enhances the historic environment and heritage assets in ?accordance with Policy D2 Heritage; * comprise details and materials that are of high quality and complement ?the I

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2018/1528/P	John Chamberlain	16/05/2018 18:52:00	OBJ	<p>I have a number of objections to the proposed development:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The design is very incongruous, looks incomplete and seems to reference a railway viaduct in a position and orientation that is quite impossible. 2. The green roof is likely to suffer from lack of maintenance. 3. The cycle storage seems to be inaccessible except down several flights of narrow internal stairs and through the living room. In other words, a useless and rather cynical sop to the planning requirements.
2018/1528/P	Nick Bradfield	16/05/2018 18:04:35	COMMEMP ER	<p>The size and massing of the development is acceptable although others have commented on the design.</p> <p>However it is essential that the "grass verge" is transferred as part of the deal to public open space in perpetuity. Maintenance costs to Camden should be minimal as it would only entail a few minutes more of mowing</p>
2018/1528/P	S Whyte	16/05/2018 16:31:14	OBJ	I object to the proposed building which is too dense for the area of land and not in keeping with the area
2018/1528/P	Nicholas Haag	16/05/2018 12:03:04	OBJBOBXI	<p>I share the concerns expressed by several residents as to the design of the proposed development. It appears to be bizarrely truncated in design as though looking like a wartime bomb-damaged street that has lost a longer stretch of buildings at either end. It sits oddly in its site. The abrupt southern edge of the block appears to be an odd visual 'finish' to the structure and presents a rather random view of the green roof. As mentioned by others, the colour of the brick is of some concern being very light in the context of nearby buildings and will appear rather stark vs 'blended in'. Whilst the concept of 'echoing' arches from the railway bridge is a good idea in principle these arches do not at all achieve this effect. As Co-Chairman of the Grove Terrace Association (writing in a personal capacity) I regret that the green space is not being made available for the wider public to enjoy. I would also like to express concern that the planners and design review panel appear to have given an in principle green light to the building before the wider consultation was undertaken. This is something that will need to be reviewed in terms of due process and good governance. Overall, it seems to be a shame that the welcome and long-awaited demolition of the ASF garage has not encouraged a more visually sympathetic design structure and I would hope for refinements and above all no 'creep' in the scale of the development.</p>

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2018/1528/P	Ben Castell	15/05/2018 22:32:08	OBJ	Dartmouth Park Neighbourhood Forum was established under the Localism Act 2011 to draw up a Neighbourhood Plan for the Dartmouth Park area. We have recently issued a Reg. 14 consultation draft of the Dartmouth Park Neighbourhood Plan. The referenced site falls within the Dartmouth Park Neighbourhood Area and is identified in the Plan as a 'Specific Neighbourhood Site' meriting detailed consideration.

We wish to OBJECT to the present application. Our reasons are set out below.

1 We appreciate that the impact on the residents of Denyer House is significantly less negative than the rejected application because of the lower height. However, the strong preference expressed by residents in the area, according to the community engagement that has taken place to inform the draft Neighbourhood Plan (see, for example, <https://www.dpnf.org.uk/wp-content/uploads/2016/03/DPNF-Report-Final-Version.pdf>, particularly page 33) is for the ASF Garage site to be returned to public open space, as it was before the construction of the garage. That objective is reflected in section 9.4.5 of the emerging Neighbourhood Plan. It was also supported by the planning inspector in respect of the previous planning application for the site. We acknowledge that the current proposal includes a strip of green fronting Highgate Road, which goes some way towards re-creating the appearance of a green connection between the public green spaces on either side of the site. However, the DAS para 8.6 states that that green strip will be fenced off and will not be open to the public, but will be reserved as private amenity space for the residents of the development. It therefore does not meet the fundamental requirement of neighbours that the space be publicly accessible. The value of the green space in offsetting the negative impacts of the development is very much reduced if the space is not open to the public. It may be possible or necessary to achieve the objective of making this open space through a section 106 agreement.

2 The draft Neighbourhood Plan sets out a procedure (in Policy SNS1) that we would like to see followed in respect of the development of any of the Specific Neighbourhood Sites, including the ASF Garage site. This states that applicants are encouraged to produce a development plan jointly with the community before submitting a planning application. By contrast, there were extensive discussions with and strong guidance in respect of this development from both Camden Council planning officers and a design review panel, before there were any discussions with residents. We believe it is important that there be genuine discussion with residents about their wishes for the site before addressing the design. Although the applicants held a short drop-in session, the information provided and, in particular, the questionnaire were extremely superficial. For example, a question about whether people welcome affordable homes is at best misleading in respect of a development that does not include any affordable homes. In addition, although the applicant's architects attended a meeting with the DPNF committee, the applicant has failed to address any of the comments we made on the design and has sought in the DAS simply to rebut every point we made. This is not effective engagement.

3 Policy DC3 of the emerging Neighbourhood Plan requires all developments 'to demonstrate good quality design, responding to and integrating with local surroundings and landscape context'. In respect of the ASF Garage site specifically, it states in section 9.4.5 that 'any development on this prominent site should be of outstanding architectural merit and should respond positively to its architectural and historic context'. We believe the current proposal falls far short of that standard. The Heritage Statement submitted by the applicant describes the development (para 5.2) as 'a modern reinterpretation of a traditional London terrace'. We disagree with that assessment: the strongest reference by the development is to the railway to the south. A reference to railway arches is completely misplaced in the context of the Neo-Georgian architecture of

Application No: Consultees Name: Received:

Comment: Response:

Denyer House behind the site and the Georgian architecture of the wider context. Contrary to the applicant's assertion in the DAS, we are not suggesting a 'mock Georgian pastiche'. However, an industrial reference in this location is completely out of place. It does not reflect, and does nothing to enhance, the local context.

4 Particular features of concern in the design include:

(a) the truncated southern edge of the block, which leaves the building looking unfinished and ungainly. Far from softening the overall mass, as the applicant asserts (DAS para 11), it simply looks messy. The applicant has shown an alternative approach with a squared off corner in the Materials and Façades section of the DAS (Option 3 with full parapet and concealed green roof) which would be far preferable, but does not explain why this approach has not been adopted;

(b) the large, blank windows in the Highgate Road façade, which are completely at odds with the multi-pane windows of both Denyer House and the local Georgian architecture. The applicant's response that the windows have similar proportions to Denyer House and Grove Terrace simply misses the point. The nature of those windows means that they do not present a blank façade to the road;

(c) the cut-out north-west corner of the building, which again leaves it looking unfinished and unbalanced;

(d) the colour of the bricks. While we agree that London stock bricks are appropriate, the colour of the bricks will be an important consideration in determining the appropriateness of the design, and the decision on this should not be left until after consent is granted. DPNF has a preference for darker rather than lighter bricks for the current design; Option 1 or 2 shown in the DAS might be appropriate, although it is difficult to assess from the renderings provided. White is completely unacceptable for this design;

(e) the scale and materials of the retaining wall at the north end of the development. A lower and lighter effect would be welcomed. The applicant has presented design options in the DAS, but the public should know what option is to be adopted so that we can comment appropriately. DPNF would prefer Option 3 of those shown in the DAS;

(f) maintenance of the green roof. We believe there should be a robust and funded maintenance plan for any green roof or walls.

5 We are extremely disappointed that no affordable housing is included in the development. Although constrained by Camden's own policies on affordable housing, the emerging Neighbourhood Plan in Policy H2 places a strong emphasis on maximising affordable housing. A contribution to affordable housing elsewhere in Camden would not help to maintain the social mix of the Dartmouth Park area.

6 We welcome the proposal to make the development car free. However, any proposal to locate a disabled parking space in or off Highgate Road should be rejected, given the volume of traffic at the junction of Highgate, Chetwynd and Gordon House Roads. The effect this would have on the green strip is also unclear.

7 Any planning consent should be conditioned so that there could be no further building on the site or extensions of the building, in order to protect the green strip.

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2018/1528/P	Caroline Bloch	17/05/2018 20:14:28	OBJ	8 The removal of the petrol tanks will need to be very carefully managed, in light of the recent tragic accident at the Swain's Lane development. A detailed procedure for this should be provided prior to any planning consent.
				I object most strongly to this development of what should be public open space. The garage should be demolished and the greens restored to their original state. Beyond that, the design of the building is very ugly and intrusive.

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2018/1528/P	Mr Carl Deathe / Miss Joanna Pacholec	16/05/2018 16:18:57	OBJLETTE R	<p>Planning - ASF Garage DEADLINE: 16th MAY</p> <p>“Demolition 138-140 Highgate Road and erection of a three story terrace building.”</p> <p>138-140 Highgate Road, NW5 1PB Application Number: 2018/1528/P</p> <p>We object to the proposed development.</p> <p>It is our strong belief that this land should be returned to public use, and re-instated to it’s previous condition of public greenspace, and not re-developed.</p> <p>As noted by Camden Council in previous planning applications, the site “falls within existing Historic Open Space”</p> <p>Specific to the proposed development:</p> <p>It our my strong view that materials used should be in keeping with the local building landscape. The design should either be whole sympathetic to neighbouring properties or significantly different with strong modern architectural merit to enrich the Dartmouth Park conservation area.</p> <p>The proposed design is neither sympathetic or worthy of architectural merit. It fails to preserve the character and appearance of the Dartmouth Park Conservation Area, or the setting of the listed buildings which overlook the Grove Terrace Squares”, specifically:</p> <p>East side of Highgate Road:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ? Denyer House (1940’s) ? Grove End House (1860’s) ? Grove View Apartments (Converted Baptist Church) (1860’s) <p>West Side:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ? Victorian properties on the west side (1880-1910’s) <p>Further, the proposal in design and materials (dark red brick) seeks to echo the railway bridge crossing Highgate Road. This is misplaced being perpendicular to, and displaced from the bridge itself. In effect it presents an undesirable folly.</p> <p>We encourage the planning authority to reject the proposed designs, and request design changes which will enhance the Dartmouth Park conservation area.</p> <p>We believe the proposal fails under the current Camden Local Plan Policy (July 3, 2017), including: https://www.camden.gov.uk/ccm/cms-service/stream/asset/?asset_id=3655163&</p> <p>Under Policy Policy D1 Design, the proposal fails to:</p>

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2018/1528/P	jim beggs	17/05/2018 06:42:52	COMMNT	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li data-bbox="927 129 1245 153">• Respect local context and following my comments on this application sent by email yesterday, 16 May 2018, i would like to speak at the committee.

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2018/1528/P	james beggs	16/05/2018 15:16:19	OBJ	

COMMENT - REJECT Application 2018/1528/P

Statements which require a specific response

1.6 This statement is supported by the following documents
'Energy and Code for Sustainable Homes Assessment'
Response
Not the same as the full sustainability report required by LBC

2.2 ...the site is adjacent to Grove Terrace Squares public open space
Response
The site lies within the land designated as Open Space

2.5 The site sits directly to the front of Denyer House (six storey), which is noted as making a positive contribution to the Conservation Area.

Response

Through accident and neglect, Denyer House currently represents a location often characterised as hosting unsociable behaviour

3.2 The planning history of the site ...After the Second World War it was known as Maradon Garage, but by 1967 it had become Parliament Hill Service Station. In that year planning permission was granted for the erection, and retention for a limited period, of a single-storey workshop, repair and office building

Response

A failure by bLBC to enforce 'for a limited period'

3.5 ..., to promote a balanced development proposal having regard to the prevailing planning policy context.

Response

Policy designates site as 'Open Space' no viable justification for proposed change of use

4.5 Camden's Design Review Panel commented on the inspired subterranean design approach.

The DRP's did not support the design approach

Response

Comments equally apply to application scheme

... Planning Officers subsequently confirmed that the DRP observations are confidential to the applicant. Moreover their comments do not represent the Planning Department's but will be taken into account by the Design Officer in giving design observations.

Response

Confidentiality terminates on registration of planning application. An oversight by LBC who published 3 weeks late

4.7 On 13 November 2017 WYLLP wrote to the project architect with a revised client development brief

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2018/1528/P	Fiona Cartwright	16/05/2018 11:52:06	NOBJ	<p>stating... In t</p> <p>I write in support of the application. I consider the design to be attractive and in keeping with the ambience of the area, as well as contributing to the safety of the community and residential atmosphere. The site, as it is now, is dark at night, unsafe for pedestrians and attracts antisocial behaviour. The development of the site, together with proper lighting and the provision of sensible security measures can only be enhancing. I note the concerns for the plane trees registered on this site, and would add that though beautiful, the trees contribute to the 'shadowy' nature of the area at night, allowing youths to lurk in the shadows. Development of this site, together with proper lighting, can only help these matters, I have seen nothing that would suggest that the developers have any intention of damaging the trees. I wholeheartedly support this development.</p>
2018/1528/P	Joanne O'Brien	17/05/2018 16:04:50	OBJ	<p>I object strongly to this application:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1.The land on which this garage is presently built is a heritage green space. The land should be returned to public use. See the London Squares Act 1931. 2. Also it appears from the boundary line that the plan is to annex even more public space for private use. 3. Highgate Road is a very busy and polluted environment. We need as much green space as possible to ameliorate air pollution levels that are extremely unhealthy and exceed Camden's own guidelines. 4. Despite the fact that parking is not being granted, there will be increased pressure on parking in the evenings and at weekends.

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2018/1528/P	Mr Carl Deathe Miss Joanna Pacholec	16/05/2018 16:26:03	OBJLETTE R	<p>Planning - ASF Garage DEADLINE: 16th MAY</p> <p>“Demolition 138-140 Highgate Road and erection of a three story terrace building.”</p> <p>138-140 Highgate Road, NW5 1PB Application Number: 2018/1528/P</p> <p>We object to the proposed development.</p> <p>It is our strong belief that this land should be returned to public use, and re-instated to it’s previous condition of public greenspace, and not re-developed.</p> <p>As noted by Camden Council in previous planning applications, the site “falls within existing Historic Open Space”</p> <p>Specific to the proposed development:</p> <p>It our my strong view that materials used should be in keeping with the local building landscape. The design should either be whole sympathetic to neighbouring properties or significantly different with strong modern architectural merit to enrich the Dartmouth Park conservation area.</p> <p>The proposed design is neither sympathetic or worthy of architectural merit. It fails to preserve the character and appearance of the Dartmouth Park Conservation Area, or the setting of the listed buildings which overlook the Grove Terrace Squares”, specifically:</p> <p>East side of Highgate Road:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ? Denyer House (1940’s) ? Grove End House (1860’s) ? Grove View Apartments (Converted Baptist Church) (1860’s) <p>West Side:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ? Victorian properties on the west side (1880-1910’s) <p>Further, the proposal in design and materials (dark red brick) seeks to echo the railway bridge crossing Highgate Road. This is misplaced being perpendicular to, and displaced from the bridge itself. In effect it presents an undesirable folly.</p> <p>We encourage the planning authority to reject the proposed designs, and request design changes which will enhance the Dartmouth Park conservation area.</p> <p>We believe the proposal fails under the current Camden Local Plan Policy (July 3, 2017), including: https://www.camden.gov.uk/ccm/cms-service/stream/asset/?asset_id=3655163&</p> <p>Under Policy Policy D1 Design, the proposal fails to:</p>

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2018/1528/P	Mr Carl Deathe / Miss Joanna Pacholec	16/05/2018 16:17:36	OBJLETTE R	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Respect local context and <p>We object to the proposed development.</p> <p>It is our strong belief that this land should be returned to public use, and re-instated to it's previous condition of public greenspace, and not re-developed.</p> <p>As noted by Camden Council in previous planning applications, the site "falls within existing Historic Open Space"</p> <p>Specific to the proposed development:</p> <p>It our my strong view that materials used should be in keeping with the local building landscape. The design should either be whole sympathetic to neighbouring properties or significantly different with strong modern architectural merit to enrich the Dartmouth Park conservation area.</p> <p>The proposed design is neither sympathetic or worthy of architectural merit. It fails to preserve the character and appearance of the Dartmouth Park Conservation Area, or the setting of the listed buildings which overlook the Grove Terrace Squares", specifically:</p> <p>East side of Highgate Road:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Denyer House (1940's) - Grove End House (1860's) - Grove View Apartments (Converted Baptist Church) (1860's) <p>West Side:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Victorian properties on the west side (1880-1910's) <p>Further, the proposal in design and materials (dark red brick) seeks to echo the railway bridge crossing Highgate Road. This is misplaced being perpendicular to, and displaced from the bridge itself. In effect it presents an undesirable folly.</p> <p>We encourage the planning authority to reject the proposed designs, and request design changes which will enhance the Dartmouth Park conservation area.</p> <p>We believe the proposal fails under the current Camden Local Plan Policy (July 3, 2017), including: https://www.camden.gov.uk/ccm/cms-service/stream/asset/?asset_id=3655163&</p> <p>Under Policy Policy D1 Design, the proposal fails to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> * Respect local context and character; * Preserves or enhances the historic environment and heritage assets in ?accordance with Policy D2 Heritage; * comprise details and materials that are of high quality and complement ?the I

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2018/1528/P	jill Lawrence	16/05/2018 13:05:40	OBJ	whilst the green space has been respected and not overfilled with building which is welcome, i do feel that the design falls far short of what could have been achieved for a site such a this. Arched windows to supposedly match the railway arches but don't plus the use of ugly red bricks neither match or complement the surroundings. The result is that the final scheme has no relationship to the surrounding buildings and in fact looks more comical than serious. What a pity that such an opportunity for good design that residents would be proud to occupy has been squandered. Here we had an opportunity for Kentish Town to showcase a good building on a prominent site. This has been an opportunity missed.

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2018/1528/P	Mr Carl Deathe / Miss Joanna Pacholec	16/05/2018 16:18:02	OBJLETTE R	<p>We object to the proposed development.</p> <p>It is our strong belief that this land should be returned to public use, and re-instated to it's previous condition of public greenspace, and not re-developed.</p> <p>As noted by Camden Council in previous planning applications, the site "falls within existing Historic Open Space"</p> <p>Specific to the proposed development:</p> <p>It our my strong view that materials used should be in keeping with the local building landscape. The design should either be whole sympathetic to neighbouring properties or significantly different with strong modern architectural merit to enrich the Dartmouth Park conservation area.</p> <p>The proposed design is neither sympathetic or worthy of architectural merit. It fails to preserve the character and appearance of the Dartmouth Park Conservation Area, or the setting of the listed buildings which overlook the Grove Terrace Squares", specifically:</p> <p>East side of Highgate Road:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Denyer House (1940's) - Grove End House (1860's) - Grove View Apartments (Converted Baptist Church) (1860's) <p>West Side:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Victorian properties on the west side (1880-1910's) <p>Further, the proposal in design and materials (dark red brick) seeks to echo the railway bridge crossing Highgate Road. This is misplaced being perpendicular to, and displaced from the bridge itself. In effect it presents an undesirable folly.</p> <p>We encourage the planning authority to reject the proposed designs, and request design changes which will enhance the Dartmouth Park conservation area.</p> <p>We believe the proposal fails under the current Camden Local Plan Policy (July 3, 2017)</p> <p>Under Policy Policy D1 Design, the proposal fails to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> * Respect local context and character; * Preserves or enhances the historic environment and heritage assets in accordance with Policy D2 Heritage; * comprise details and materials that are of high quality and complement the local character; * consider the wider historic environment and buildings, spaces and f

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2018/1528/P	Astrid and John Sharkey	17/05/2018 12:53:37	SUPC	<p>We are broadly in support of the design for the new development subject to the following points:</p> <p>1)The southern end of the block is somewhat truncated – and may leave untidy views of the green roof</p> <p>2)The choice of brick colour should be part of the planning acceptance process. The wrong colour could turn what in our view is a successful design overall, into an eyesore. Options , 1, 2 or 8 appear to be the most potentially successful. The brick should be dark rather than light using mixed brick colours as are commonplace in the conservation area.</p> <p>3)We are pleased by the inclusion of the green strip to enhance the view of the existing green corridor but this space should be public for the connectivity to work, and for the amenity to be enjoyed as part of the continuing Highgate enclosures.</p>
2018/1528/P	Katie Bourn	14/05/2018 21:36:34	COMMNT	<p>I've heard that the existing garage sits on what was common land and that it was acquired or built on without proper consent. If this is true then it seems the right thing to do with this piece of land is to return it to a public, open space.</p> <p>On the current plans; I like the design of the building, its arches relating to the railway bridge. The way that the third floor is not visible from Highgate Road reduces its impact.</p> <p>Plans to include a large area of lawn in front of the building, rather than private gardens, will improve the experience of passers by. For me, this feature is key and I would not approve of the design without it.</p> <p>Finally, I question whether there is enough demand for luxury housing of this type. 200m away the comparable Wiblin Mews houses are taking a while to sell. Empty houses alongside the empty shops opposite would leave the stretch of road much worse off.</p> <p>Please note that a previous comment of mine has been incorrectly linked to this planning application.</p>
2018/1528/P	Katie Bourn	14/05/2018 21:36:06	COMMNT	<p>I've heard that the existing garage sits on what was common land and that it was acquired or built on without proper consent. If this is true then it seems the right thing to do with this piece of land is to return it to a public, open space.</p> <p>On the current plans; I like the design of the building, its arches relating to the railway bridge. The way that the third floor is not visible from Highgate Road reduces its impact.</p> <p>Plans to include a large area of lawn in front of the building, rather than private gardens, will improve the experience of passers by. For me, this feature is key and I would not approve of the design without it.</p> <p>Finally, I question whether there is enough demand for luxury housing of this type. 200m away the comparable Wiblin Mews houses are taking a while to sell. Empty houses alongside the empty shops opposite would leave the stretch of road much worse off.</p> <p>Please note that a previous comment of mine has been incorrectly linked to this planning application.</p>