

| Application No: | Consultees Name: | Received: | Comment: | Response: |
|-----------------|---|---------------------|----------|--|
| 2020/3461/P | Anabel Fernandez / Joost Beunderman | 08/10/2020 21:20:21 | OBJ | <p>Whilst fully supporting the proposed use for this site we write to object to the proposed development for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The site sits within the Dartmouth Park Conservation Area, and immediately adjacent to the St John's Grove Conservation Area (Islington). The design of its architecture is not in keeping with the local conservation areas, both with regards to facade composition (its horizontality is alien to the character of the surroundings) and material (glazed tiles are a small feature in some neighbouring housing entrances only, but brick is consistently used as main material). The aim of the proposed glazed tiles is illogical; it cannot be justified on cost grounds (brick would be cheaper, and can lead to good results see Chester Balmore scheme); the tiles seem to be introduced to hide the lack of articulation, depth and composition of the facade. However, this is a very poor design choice; overall the design of the facades is extremely inappropriate to the context, and can not be considered exemplary architecture (which would be necessary for contemporary new buildings in / near Conservations Areas). - From an urban design point of view, the proposed design seems to neglect the adjacent public spaces. There is absolutely no attempt to address the prominent corner of Chester Road and Dartmouth Park Hill in a positive way, and on the Colva Walk side, the alleyway would be dwarfed by the proposed massing of the building. Equally, whilst ground floor frontages should have a positive contribution to the street, instead, the proposed 'landscaping' is a poor choice, likely to lead to cramped and neglected 'green spaces' cared for by no one and gathering rubbish etc. - The massing is inappropriate. We notice that previous iterations of the proposed massing had taller buildings on the western side of the site, that were subsequently reduced to respond to Chester Road resident's objections during consultation, however, the eastern side was not altered (perhaps because objectors were less vocal on the Dartmouth Park Hill side). The revised massing creates a lopsided building that had previously been consistent across the site. The massing of a building that will exist for 50-100 years should be informed by exemplar, established good urban design principles. The mid terrace jump in height on the eastern elevation is very poor urban design. Exemplar, established good urban design principles would dictate the opposite approach: with the massing rising at prominent junctions and on corners, and not mid terrace. These massing issues may indicate that the proposed density is too high, or that the scheme design is fundamentally unresolved and not yet ready to be approved. <p>Whilst the use of the site is important and welcome, on the whole the serious design issues with this proposed scheme not only seem a wasted opportunity to make a positive contribution to the area, but also set a highly problematic precedent for design of buildings in/near Conservation Areas. Therefore at this stage we object strongly to the scheme in its current design.</p> |

| Application No: | Consultees Name: | Received: | Comment: | Response: |
|------------------------|-------------------------|---------------------|-----------------|---|
| 2020/3461/P | Chris & Tina Craig | 08/10/2020 12:45:36 | OBJ | <p>The Chester Road site is prominently sited at the junction of 2 roads, in a residential area which is included in Conservation Areas both in Camden and the immediately bordering Islington. Any development must therefore respect this sensitive location - the present application totally fails to do this.</p> <p>The site is only 25m from our house. The proposed development will be 4 storeys, twice the height of the present building, and will dominate the mostly 2-storey terraced housing that surrounds it. This is a clear overdevelopment of the site and will be an oppressive and dominating presence for neighbouring residents. Surrounding housing is predominantly 2-storey brick with pitched roofs and gables. The proposed building is wholly out of character, being a flat-roofed structure with a bright green terracotta finish. This totally ignores and detracts from the character of the 2 Conservation Areas, which will also suffer from the loss of mature trees and green space.</p> <p>The development is intended to accommodate 50 homeless families in excessively small units, and often for lengthy periods, with an almost total absence of on-site social, leisure or support facilities. These stressed families, doubtless including individuals with behavioural problems, will have a very damaging impact on the quality of life and cohesion of this residential neighbourhood, which is already having to accommodate a second mental health unit at the Whittington Hospital within only a few hundred metres. These families will also put additional pressure on local medical, educational, community and social services facilities.</p> <p>In sum, this proposal is an insensitive overdevelopment of the site, which should instead be developed for regular housing, including affordable housing, which is in seriously short supply in London. LB Camden should be ashamed of itself for bringing forward such an inappropriate development.</p> |

| Application No: | Consultees Name: | Received: | Comment: | Response: |
|-----------------|------------------|---------------------|----------|--|
| 2020/3461/P | John Fleming | 08/10/2020 22:03:58 | OBJ | <p>As a very long-term Islington resident, I will be directly affected by this proposed development as my family and I live in Bickerton Road, in direct view of the site.</p> <p>Please see my comments below.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Visual impact of the development: The proposed buildings are too large and domineering for the site in the heart of a residential neighbourhood. Dimensions need to be modified and reduced with regard to scale. It would be higher and larger than any of the buildings surrounding it, in terms of volume. <p>Even the three storey block on Chester Road will be up to a storey higher than the neighbouring houses. Your proposal completely fails to acknowledge how this building will sit within its surroundings. The CGI images provided seem inaccurate and misleading, giving the impression, through manipulated perspective, that the proposed building would not be as proportionally large, compared to buildings in the vicinity, as it so clearly is.</p> <p>The four storey block on Dartmouth Park Hill will present a bland, slab-like and overbearing appearance to the road, which will look intimidating. Existing views will be obstructed, particularly to the wooded Highgate ridge, hardly an environmental improvement. It might be of interest that LB Islington policy document C9 mentions views as being heritage assets which must be conserved.</p> <p>We know that LB Camden insists on strict adherence to its own regulations with regard to planning applications from Camden residents, so it seems extraordinary that in this case those high ideals are being conveniently ignored.</p> <p>The plan for the new building directly contravenes Camden's own planning policy in a conservation area.</p> <p>The building is not in keeping with the "residential" "semi-rural" nature of the Dartmouth Park Conservation Area (Dartmouth Park Conservation Management plan paragraphs 4.2 and 4.3).</p> <p>As such the four storey building would cause substantial harm to heritage assets, contrary to LB Camden's Local Plan Policy D2 Heritage. In this, the Council undertakes not to permit the loss of or substantial harm to a designated heritage asset, unless it can be demonstrated that the substantial harm or loss is necessary to achieve public benefits that outweigh that harm or loss, clearly not the case here.</p> <p>The building is also contrary to LB Islington's Local Plan (Chapter 3 Strategic Policy 3.1 Heritage and Urban Design ; Policy CS 9). This promises to protect the historic urban fabric, and adds that the aim is for new buildings to be sympathetic in scale and appearance and be complimentary to the local identity. You need to reflect, long and hard, when considering this proposal, how at odds they are to the spirit of this legislation.</p> <p>The building is out of scale with its surroundings and will have an unacceptable dominance over existing buildings and will be a 'blot on the landscape', to put it mildly. Consequently, this new building will have an adverse effect on the character and appearance of the adjoining conservation areas on both sides of the Islington/Camden border. Indeed, it needs to be remembered that Camden's own Local Plan forbids what it terms "bulky buildings"(within which category the proposed structure surely belongs), where these can be seen from a conservation area. LB Islington's St.John's Grove Conservation Area Design Guidelines states</p> |

Application No: Consultees Name: Received:

Comment: Response:

that permission will not be granted for the intensification of residential use in conversion schemes, in this case, clearly visible from the Islington side of the road, a few steps away. A higher standard of design is expected in a conservation area.

I am not averse to contemporary architecture, there are plenty of exemplary examples of modernist buildings elsewhere in LB Camden. This could be a missed opportunity to build something fit for purpose, but incorporating some ground-breaking and creative design elements. The proposed building achieves none of these aims.

- Adverse effect on the residential amenity of neighbours:

There will be factors such as noise, disturbance, opportunities for overlooking, loss of privacy, overshadowing of neighbouring properties, caused directly by a large number of transient inhabitants and the sheer size of the new hostel as the design of this building fails to address these issues.

With regard to Colva Walk, this has to be retained in its present form, with additional landscaping and retention of all trees, not reduced to a narrow alleyway with the potential to attract anti-social behaviour, fly-tipping and drug dealing, all ongoing issues in the community. At least, the current building is unobtrusive in an attractive setting surrounded by mature shrubs and trees.

I am especially concerned with the proposed loss of mature trees in and around the site which will directly affect the much-valued leafy outlook which is currently present, especially with the current concern over poor air quality in London and the mental health and wellbeing of local residents.

This would appear to be contrary to Central Government guidelines and current scientific research on mental health and wellbeing on the benefits of nature and greenery whilst in lockdown.

Also on looking at the proposed plans, it would seem that numerous hostel residents will be able to look directly across into our neighbour's second floor bedrooms in Dartmouth Park Hill from their 3rd and 4th floor rooms, which raises privacy issues, especially where children might be concerned.

.Overdevelopment:

There is no doubt that the site, as proposed, will be overdeveloped. It is interesting to note that the new, much larger, Chester Balmore apartment block nearby has 53 dwellings, whereas this proposes almost the same number in a much smaller, constrained site. It is inevitable that pressure will result on local schools, parking and medical facilities. Should this go ahead. In an area that already has a high level of social housing, social problems and mental health facilities, it is probably not the most logical progression to cram the highest number of homeless families possible into this site, to add into the mix.

The car-free claim also requires some scrutiny. Parking is already at capacity in the streets surrounding the site, so extra traffic generated by hostel residents and their visitors would not be welcome.

Also the loss of a view from the public viewpoint at street level might have a wider impact on the neighbourhood.

- Design:

Application No: **Consultees Name:** **Received:****Comment:** **Response:**

The use of green tiles as cladding for the building rather than the London Stock yellow or red bricks on most of the surrounding buildings, will not enhance the character and appearance of the conservation area in which it will sit. It will more likely cause consternation and disbelief that such a structure can exist on the site in question.

We also object to the demolition of the existing building, without proof that this is essential. Camden's Local Plan Policy CC1(e) requires all proposals that involve substantial demolition to demonstrate that it is not possible to retain and improve the existing building. The case has not been made to show that demolition is necessary; we question the assertion that the existing building has reached the end of its life. In addition, with Covid -19 the likelihood of enduring changed working patterns and reduced needs for office space suggests that there may be opportunities to repurpose an existing building elsewhere in the borough instead. These issues need to be explored in order to meet the Policy as to demolition.

The demolition of the existing building, with its large embodied carbon, does not meet with sustainability objectives.

.Covid-19:

I think the proposed plan should be paused anyway, as no consideration has been given to the current Covid-19 Pandemic and the restrictions this has imposed. The residents of this building will be expected to live in extremely small, cramped conditions, with no opportunity to observe social distancing and with limited private outside space, thereby limiting social interaction with other residents. We know from scientific research that this can cause depression and feelings of isolation.

Thank you for considering my comments and I hope you will take these on board when making your final decision.

Stay safe,
Best wishes,
John Fleming
