

<b>Application No:</b>	<b>Consultees Name:</b>	<b>Received:</b>	<b>Comment:</b>	<b>Response:</b>
2018/5461/P	Natalie van Maaren	14/12/2018 18:48:32	OBJ	The proposed development is completely out of keeping with the scale and architectural style of Falkland Place and moreover will destroy a part of the historic fabric of Kentish Town. I object very strongly to the application on both these grounds.

---

<b>Application No:</b>	<b>Consultees Name:</b>	<b>Received:</b>	<b>Comment:</b>	<b>Response:</b>
2018/5461/P	James William Burton	15/12/2018 00:33:21	OBJ	I object to this proposal, principally for the following reasons:

(1) Disproportionate bulk, height, scale and massing in its context.

To explain, the townscape here at Falkland Place is small scale, fine grain and remarkably intimate - that is what makes this area distinctive and these are all positive qualities (as opposed to merely being locally distinctive). The area is a pleasure to be in, particularly for the many, many young families, older children and dog owners that use the playgrounds and dog walking area. This large, bulky proposal is plainly not informed by the context, nor does it respect it, and would damage and possibly destroy altogether what makes the area distinctive and appreciated. Nor is this an example of truly exceptional architecture that might somehow justify destruction of the existing positive local distinctiveness;

(2) Harm to the significance of the adjacent conservation area (a designated heritage asset) through harm to its setting, not (remotely) outweighed by any planning benefits.

By way of explanation, Falkland Place is an important part of the conservation area, and one of the oldest elements. The appeal site immediately adjacent to the conservation area forms an important part of its setting - and, frankly, it is a little surprising that it is not included within the conservation area as the low scale and interesting juxtaposition of the buildings here compliment and add interest to the small terrace run on the eastern side of Falkland Place. NPPF para.196 is on point (as is s.72 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 - and note the Secretary of State has tended to interpret "character and appearance" as including setting). The proposal will cause harm to the character and appearance/significance of the conservation area, through harm to its setting, and the "considerable importance and weight" to the given to that harm, and the strong presumption against permission it raises (per Sullivan LJ in the Barnwell Manor case)/the "great weight" to be given to that harm (NPPF) is not (remotely) outweighed by any benefit;

(3) Overdevelopment of the site (again contrary to the existing character.

To explain, this will appear as a remarkably cramped, overbearing jarring new element in the townscape.

I also suspect that the proposal would have unacceptable impacts on the amenity of immediate neighbours, but the plans and drawings are genuinely difficult to follow in that regard due to the amount of detail overlaid on each.

From what I have seen it also appears that the application has failed to analyse the significance of the conservation area, and in particular that part of it cheek by jowl with the application site. The Design and Access Statement simply states that the application site is not in a conservation area, which falls some way short of what the NPPF requires and suggests that insufficient consideration has been given to the conservation area in the design evolution.

I have seen suggestions that PINS has previously dismissed an appeal for a similar proposal, but have not had the opportunity to consider the decision letter or the appeal scheme dismissed so cannot comment on that aspect.

Please refuse this application.