

Printed on: 29/01/2021 09:10:07

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2020/3461/P	Abby Cronin	28/01/2021 16:40:23	OBJ	<p>Planning Application 2020/3461/P - 2 Chester Road</p> <p>As a long-term resident of the Dartmouth Park community, I support Camden Council's commitment to housing the homeless. However, residents must be persuaded of the merits of the Planning Application 2020/3461/P - 2 Chester Road.</p> <p>I believe this planning application is inadequate in numerous areas & must NOT be approved.</p> <p>PLEASE NOTE the following Comments and Objections to this Planning Application: COVID-19 has a 100% impact of this architectural plan.</p> <p>1. Consultation with the Public: Most residents were not aware that public consultations about this Planning application were taking place. Therefore, residents were not adequately informed about the scale and location of this architectural design. Residents missed the opportunity to view the plans in St Mary Brookfield due to inadequate publicity of this planning application. Consequently, residents have not been able to understand the impact this over-sized development would have on this community. Question: what other consultation dates were organised?</p> <p>2. Location: The building is not appropriate to the corner site which is an important, prominent, and significant transition between Chester Road and Dartmouth Park Hill. The design does not complement the buildings around it. It is out of scale to the street scape of both Dartmouth Park Hill and Chester road.</p> <p>3. Size, Bulk, Volume & Population Density: The case was not made for building a series of three blocks on a site which is far too small to adequately house up to 200 people in 50 new dwellings. Height, bulk, scale, mass and colour of the building dominates. The materials, proportions, features and colour need to be designed to complement the surrounding streets. For example: reduce horizontal bands between floors and below the roof, divide the horizontal elevations vertically into 4 panels, thereby replicating the rhythm of houses opposite.</p> <p>4. Local planning and conservation policies: This planning application does not meet the statutory developments plans, the DPNF (Dartmouth Park Neighbourhood Forum) as stated on the DPNF website (13.01.2021)</p> <p>5. Covid 19: Covid-19 has been with us since December 2019. The planning application was launched in September 2020. The internal space inside the three blocks have NOT taken account of the impact of this global virus. Crucial internal features such as adequate social distancing, safe ventilation, circulation, and accommodation to allow for self-isolation are absent. Sunlight and fresh air are vital. The proposed dwellings are seriously under sized and have fixed windows. External space is cramped and shaded. It is an environment in which Covid-19 will thrive.</p> <p>6. Alternative Planning Proposals: No realistic alternative plans for the site and homeless service were presented. Camden has an abundance of empty buildings. Why not investigate refurbishing existing buildings and convert redundant office space into homeless persons accommodation and prioritise space to meet the needs of the?</p> <p>7. Objections and Comments from the Community have been dismissed or ignored. Comments from the council state that: 'Notwithstanding the concerns raised, there is support amongst the</p>

Application No: Consultees Name: Received:

Comment: Response:

local community and their representatives for the proposal to redevelop the current hostel at 2 Chester Road.¹ This is neither fair nor true. Pre-planning objections were based on policy, concern about impact and complaints about misleading drawings and images, manipulative and inadequate consultation.

8. Consultation with Islington Planning Department. The project affects Islington residents as it is on the borough boundary. Was Islington Council consulted about this planning application?

86 representations on the planning application were uploaded on Camden's web page by October 2020. 13 representations were sent at pre-planning stage to the project manager consultation and copied to us. They included planning considerations such as:

Representations by category Planning application stage stage
Design, Size & Height of New Buildings or Extensions
Use intensification, Impact on social & physical infrastructure
Loss of Light, Privacy of Neighbours for example overlooking through overlooking
Disabled Access
Noise arising from New Uses
Traffic, Parking, Road Safety

Policy – not in accordance with development plan

**COVID-19 implications of the development : **Not known about at pre-planning stage

Comments compiled by:

Abby Cronin, Camden

9 Bramshill Gardens

London NW5 1JJ

Additional Comments & Objections have been made by the
DARTMOUTH PARK NEIGHBOURHOOD FORUM

<https://dpnf.org.uk/index.php/media-information/>

NEWS - POSTED ON 13 JANUARY 2021

DPNF comments on Chester Road Planning Application:

Dartmouth Park Neighbourhood Forum would like to ensure that residents are aware of the forum's response to the proposed development in Chester Road. Details below.

Comments on Planning Application 2020/3461/P – 2 Chester Road

The proposed development would provide a hostel for the temporary accommodation of homeless families, in some cases women and their children at risk of violence. The new development would provide 50 new dwellings in three blocks (3 and 4 storeys) arranged around a central communal garden. The application proposes the demolition of the existing building on the site, until recently used as a hostel for single person temporary accommodation.

The Dartmouth Park Neighbourhood Forum supports the development in principle. The provision of this facility is consistent with the objective of the Dartmouth Park Neighbourhood Plan to support a variety of housing and community facilities in the area. However, we do have concerns about the detail of the proposed development.

¹ We object to the demolition of the existing building, without proof that this is essential.

(a) Camden's Local Plan Policy CC1(e) requires all proposals that involve substantial demolition to

Application No: Consultees Name: Received:

Comment: Response:

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 and that the building cannot be maintained and refurbished for continued use as a hostel (or for some other beneficial purpose). We also question the assertion that the existing building has reached the end of its life. These issues need to be explored in order to meet the Policy as to demolition.

(b) In addition, with Covid -19 the likelihood of enduring changed working patterns and reduced need for office space suggests that there may be opportunities to repurpose an existing building in the borough as a hostel instead. A number of vacant office buildings could, with minimal refurbishment, provide suitable space to house the homeless. This would avoid the need to demolish a building that could still provide years of service.

(c) The building was designed by Bill Forrest, one of the excellent young architects in Camden's architecture department in the 1960s and 70s who designed some of the finest social housing in the country, including the Highgate New Town development of which the hostel formed part. The demolition of such a thoughtful and high quality building in a conservation area is deplorable.

(d) The demolition of the existing building, with its large embodied carbon, is not consistent with sustainability objectives.

2 The proposed buildings are too large and domineering for the site in the heart of a residential neighbourhood.

(a) Even the three-storey block on Chester Road will be significantly (up to a storey) higher than the neighbouring houses. The four-storey block on Dartmouth Park Hill will present a sheer cliff-like appearance to the road.

(b) We welcome the landscaping of Colva Walk and the provision of ramps in place of steps. However, we are concerned that the Colva Walk passage would be overwhelmed by the sheer wall of the building, and that the passage would become a wind and noise tunnel.

3 The accommodation provided for residents is poor. The proposed number of residents (up to 200 in 50 units) is too high, resulting in cramped accommodation. In addition, although there is a central communal garden, there is no provision of private outdoor space such as balconies. These constraints are a concern, especially in the light of greater known risks in relation to viruses now and in the future, compared with when the design was developed. We would prefer to see more generous allocations of space for a smaller number of vulnerable families, which would ameliorate over-crowding and avoid any undue impact on local infrastructure such as medical facilities.

4 The design of the façade is poor.

(a) The development is entirely inward facing, with little engagement with the community.

(b) The proposed continuous façade is bleak and monolithic, with no setbacks, balconies or other features to break up the bulk and create a more domestic scale to blend with the neighbourhood.

(c) It is proposed to clad the buildings in shiny green tiles with a curving and asymmetric profile. The choice of these tiles is arbitrary and capricious, and has no connection or reference to the materials used in the area; the green of the tiles, in particular, is completely at odds with the warm red, brown and yellow bricks of the surrounding streets.

5 We welcome the use of prefabricated offsite construction methods and the inclusion of underfloor electric heating, air source heat pumps and green roofs.

I, Abby Cronin, support the DPNF comments & objections. They highlight major flaws in the design. I urge the Planning Committee to reject this application.
27 January 2021