

<b>Application No:</b>	<b>Consultees Name:</b>	<b>Received:</b>	<b>Comment:</b>	<b>Response:</b>
2022/5320/P	Nicholas Moore	30/01/2023 12:25:55	OBJ	I strongly object to the application as the proposals are clearly a substantial over development of the site in terms of build volume. The provision of 8 car park spaces for 78 room care home is wholly inadequate and totally unacceptable.
2022/5320/P	Dr Tim Megarry	30/01/2023 21:12:47	OBJ	<p>43 Woodsome Road, London NW5 1SA</p> <p>Dear Sir,</p> <p>We are most concerned that the recent application for planning to build a very large care home on this site will have serious deleterious effects on the tranquillity of our neighbourhood.</p> <p>We note firstly, with apprehension, that the current proposal does not include any provision for on-site parking and that it would be highly likely that the surrounding streets, including our own, would both lack parking spaces and become congested with new traffic. We are equally concerned secondly that this will potentially harm air quality, produce more noise and become an increased hazard for all local residents in general and in particular for school children attending the three schools in the immediate area. Finally, we know full well that the promises of private developers to adhere closely to the plans that they propose are in practice frequently broken entirely in the interests of the developer's profit margin and that the relevant local authority has very little option but to accept these changes. We feel therefore that granting full planning permission will most likely lead to some unforeseen additional factors that will lead to further deterioration of our neighbourhood.</p> <p>There are all too few urban public spaces in London and in our opinion the Mansfield Site would be far better used as a small park.</p> <p>Dr Tim and Henrietta Megarry</p>

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2022/5320/P	Caroline jacobs	30/01/2023 13:46:40	OBJ	<p>I object to the proposed building on the grounds that:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"><li>1. The proposed building extends significantly beyond the footprint of the original club buildings and previous planning approval. Building has also moved closer to the York Rise end of the site, negatively impacting local residents.</li><li>2. The proposed elevations are significantly and uniformly higher than the original building and previous planning approval footprint. The proposed building appears overly large for the location, particularly given the placing of the building within the one end of the site.</li><li>3. The plans provide far too few on-site parking for staff, visiting professionals, deliveries and residents; visitors.</li><li>4. The care home design appears to provide very little external outside space for care home residents and their visitors to use.</li></ol> <p>I also object also to the proposals for the open space. I would like to see</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"><li>1. A larger public communal garden /open space with replacement of the tennis courts / pavilion with additional community outdoor space that is more inclusive in terms of potential users and leisure uses. There are sufficient tennis courts nearby.</li></ol> <p>Finally, given the narrowness of local roads and the large number of schools in the vicinity any future planning approval should include significant restrictions on the time and vehicle size for developers; traffic and delivery of materials.</p>

---

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2022/5320/P	Matthew Pearce	30/01/2023 15:45:34	OBJ	<p>Objection.</p> <p>The intended use, care home and tennis facilities, is acceptable. The misstatements byt the advisors around the traffic and pollution are cynical.</p> <p>The scale of the development is significantly in excess of what is appropriate for the site;</p> <p>1) 5 levels and 78 beds will dominate both the physical landscape. The neighbourhood plan is clear that the redevelopment should match the existing footprint of the bowling centre. This site, by elevating itself to fit closely to that requirement becomes a monolithic structure that has no resemblance to the surrounding buildings and no merit of its own. It is in excess of what should be build on the site.</p> <p>2) The amount of traffic; from visitors, resident movement, deliveries but most of all staff will be a significant. The conservation area is already congested.</p> <p>2 a) Moreover, the plans inclusion of only 8 parking spaces feels like a cynical exercise to avoid the air traffic control report that would be required - as referenced in the report - if there were more than 10 spaces. (I note that the site has capacity for more spaces). I would like to remind the decision makers that the streets of Dartmouth park are already over polluted (legally) and in fact the "dip" in the landscape in the middle of Dartmouth park (running along York Rise where this development is) is particularly polluted.</p> <p>2 b) The statement in one report that because there are only 8 spaces, that the amount of traffic would be below the traffic caused by the previous proposal is a nonsense. A care home of this size will have a very high level of staffing required (50+?) and a significant portion of those workers, especially those working on shifts, will drive to and from work. This will mean that the local area will have to absorb the traffic and the parking.</p> <p>3) Green space management needs to be funded rather than just proposed.</p> <p>This developer has said in the past that he does not want to "force" a proposal onto residents. He should withdraw this application.</p>

---

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2022/5320/P	Craig Rebuck	30/01/2023 10:49:30	OBJ	<p>I would like to raise issues and bring to the attention that the documents placed on record do not convey the environmental and long-term effects on the area.</p> <p>Already there are serious issues with traffic and pollution in these narrow streets caused by additional traffic using and delivering to the school and using its facilities.</p> <p>The area has become a cut through at times and will be further affected by the changes in Croftdown Road infant school restrictions.</p> <p>I am not against the plan in its essence as I believe it could be a good use of the local land.</p> <p>However, I am not convinced that the building and supporting of such a project with such scale cannot have a knock-on effect to the already stretched residents and environment.</p> <p>Pollution levels have increased along Highgate Road with the enforcement of the new bus lane at all times. The schools do not assist with asking parents or delivery drivers to switch of their engines (idling issues). We are now facing a 2-year building project and a longer-term issue with increased traffic pollution and parking issues.</p> <p>There have at times been fights in the street when two cars meet in the road, and one will not yield to the other. I believe that.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. extra traffic in the building of the project</li> <li>b. increased pollution from staff and visitors.</li> <li>c. increased parking issues for visitations ranging from at least 7.00am to 11.00pm will affect the local streets. (Already stretched at times of the Saturday food market and evening usage at the schools)</li> </ul> <p>Size and scale of this project seems cumbersome and in attempting to squeeze local objections parking and facilities into the space the only direction that this building could go is upwards. Thus, creating a large building oversized for the space A 5 story building is oversized for this area and I object to this sensitive area being burdened with such extra and cumbersome building.</p> <p>I am not a planning expert and there has been little time to explore the correct and precise way to enable this project to be more sensitively planned for and to engage with the different objections that will result in this application.</p> <p>I believe that a meeting with the owners and selected representatives of the local area will assist in finding and smoothing out the various issues that have and will arise from this application.</p> <p>I am not a planning expert and there has been little time to explore the correct and precise way to enable this project to be more sensitively planned for and to engage with the different objections that will result in this application.</p> <p>I believe that a meeting with the owners and selected representatives of the local area will assist in finding and smoothing out the various issues that have and will arise from this application.</p>
2022/5320/P	MORTON SCHATZMAN	30/01/2023 18:15:52	SUPC	I would like the development to be limited to three stories in height.

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2022/5320/P	Sam L Witherow	30/01/2023 15:14:44	OBJ	<p>My family and I are local residents and we strongly object to this development.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. This is a huge multi-story building in a historic conservation area. Seems absurd that it's not OK to alter a bay window but it is OK to build a massive great new modern development. It makes a mockery of the very concept of a conservation area.</li> <li>2. There is no parking planned. Where will visitors/staff park? This is a quiet residential area with narrow streets which already sees massive traffic overflow from people visiting the heath and the farmers market.</li> <li>3. I have 2 small children. Given the above the roads already feel less safe at weekends. With huge lorries hurtling up the narrow streets during the construction phase this will now be extended to weekdays, not to mention the increased burden on air quality (crazy given the dense concentration of schools here).</li> </ol>
2022/5320/P	Robin Howells	30/01/2023 13:19:48	INT	<p>Planning Application2022/5320/P: Former Mansfield Bowling Club</p> <p>Comments:</p> <p>Cc Camron.Aref-Adib@camden.gov.uk Sian.Berry@camden.gov.uk Anna.Wright@camden.gov.uk</p> <p>We write as residents of Brookfield Park (contiguous to the site in the Application).</p> <p>We object strongly to aspects of this Application. Essentially what is not acceptable is the general overcrowding of the site, and the demands that 78 care home units and 25 FT staff would make. Principally it is the height and bulk of some of the proposed buildings, which are clearly much over-scale in relation to the surrounding environment in a Conservation Area. In our view the maximum above-ground height of the buildings should be three storeys.</p> <p>Access to the proposed development, for vehicles and pedestrians, is narrow and inadequate. Much extra traffic for deliveries, staff and visitors would be generated. Parking proposed is very limited, as it is on the surrounding roads. This is also problematic in relation to local schools.</p> <p>The whole proposal should be substantially scaled down.</p> <p>Robin and Coral Howells</p>