

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2022/5320/P	T Ogilvie	02/02/2023 22:23:32	OBJ	<p>I am a resident of York Rise and I love this area. I am fully aware of how very very lucky my family and I are to live in such a beautiful part of London, with a garden and such easy access to the Heath. I have been struggle with myself about the need for a care home but the equal need to develop the site thoughtfully. I don't want to be negative about building a much needed home for the elderly, we all have to be willing to accept progress and be accommodating to an ageing population. But it seems likely this will be a 'Thursday Murder Club' care home for the wealthy, rather than an affordable option for local people. And I have many concerns about the proposed building and site layout and therefore am objecting to the proposals.</p> <p>York Rise is the lowest point of the site. In fact our houses are lower (by something like 1.5m) than the existing ground level of the bowling club land. This must be because we are on the route of the River Fleet, which altho now in pipes, still attracts rain water run off in times of heavy rain. My neighbours remember a flood in the 1960s where all the York Rise cellars completely filled with water. In consideration of the water table, Camden must remember the case made by the City of London to re-structure the swimming ponds due to concerns about flooding. While the ponds may now be safely dammed, what research has been done on the impact of the large cellar area of the proposed Care Home and additional hard surfacing around the site which will have a huge impact on water drainage?</p> <p>We used to look out on the old bowling club, which was a substantial size but nothing compared to what is proposed. I guess the developers are following the rules in taking the roof line to its very highest point but it seems a cheat to me, to claim a small area (less than 10% of the old roof) is the permissible height throughout. While the architects have been clever in creating a softer more interesting shape of building (than the old 1960s rectangle of the bowling club) it is just so massive and is breaking the previous footprint of the former building. This has to be completely unacceptable. Camden Council (councillors and planning dept) made it very clear in previous applications that the original footprint is to be respected. The extra building area is on the York Rise side, which with our drop in height, will loom over our gardens and block out the view from our windows.</p> <p>Concern for wildlife is also in my mind. With the light pollution, air conditioning and heating from the building creating a noisy, bright nighttime that will drive away the birds that nest in the trees surrounding the site. Nature may seem like a small thing, especially as we have the Heath so close but despite that proximity, the streets of Dartmouth Park have noticeably fewer sparrows and blackbirds since we moved here 13 years ago. However they have flourished in the wilderness that is the current bowling club site, left to nature over the last few years. The site itself was gifted to the local community for their benefit. Burdett-Coutts, who gifted the land, knew how close the site was to the Heath but she also recognised how much local people value their smaller green spaces and allotments, as the land became for a while. I fought hard when the site first come up for development, because I wanted to respect the legacy of Burdett-Coutts. If we had managed to stop the handful of Bowling Club directors who ran the club into the ground and then profited from its sale, we could have ensured the site had no value. This would have been the perfect outcome, there are many families with no outside space, living locally in the flats around Brookfield, Gospel Oak and towards Archway who could have had enormous pleasure and benefit from allotments on the site, and continue Burdett-Coutts good work.</p> <p>Even this Government has renewed calls to protect nature. Therese Coffey MP said from (our local) Camley street Natural Park: "there is no solution to climate change without protecting and restoring nature'... nature has been taken for granted for too long, used freely as a resource with little thought for the consequences." It seems pretty ironic that the lovely Wild Wood Nature School (nature-based primary school, an alternative to</p>

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
				<p>mainstream education with a strong focus on children's well-being and spending time in nature.) has been given permission by Camden Planning to develop York Rise Church Hall to create a peaceful oasis for children, yet it backs onto the bowling club site.</p> <p>The bowling club site is being over developed, the green space is not being protected for local people, the water table and the impact of the development have not been considered. The wider impact on traffic flow has been substantially dwelt on in other objections, but even putting aside the parking issue, the weight of traffic, delivery vehicles and associated pollution will be substantial, not just during the build but in perpetuity.</p> <p>Please can Camden Planning stand up for their own principles in ensuring the building remains within the site boundary. Please can Camden Planning stand up for the 'public green space' in and around the tennis club, ensuring that maintenance is addressed and protected in perpetuity, that the green space has a public exit onto Croftdown Road so that access is protected. Please can Camden Planning do a thorough investigation into the water table and the impact of the building on flood risks. Please can Camden Planning stop permitting disproportionately tall buildings in this area, as each permission creates a precedent for the next even larger development (consider the much needed but overly tall Highgate Newtown Community centre). The Care home is welcome. More jobs are welcome. Less is more! Let's see this site developed at an appropriate scale.</p>
2022/5320/P	Annemarie Egan	02/02/2023 13:43:42	OBJ	<p>I object strong to this Planning Application in its present form. I am a resident who lives opposite the proposed development. My reasons for this objection are :-</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The increased volume of traffic that it will generate on an already congested street. 2. It will increase the volume of car owners visiting/working at the proposed development looking for parking spaces on an already heavily congested street. At present two cars cannot pass each other without one vehicle pulling over to let the other pass. 3. The proposed scheme has not taken into account the present parking and traffic issues, it will only be adding to them. 4. The increased air pollution will have a big impact not only on the residents, many of whom are elderly, but also on the pupils and teachers of the surrounding schools. 5. The proposed development will have an overbearing and detrimental effect on the area. This is a conservation area and any proposed development needs to be sympathetic and work with the local surroundings. <p>The Planning Application as it stands needs to be revised.</p>
2022/5320/P	Denise Ho	02/02/2023 12:38:33	COMMNT	<p>I object the proposed development because the development will generate a lot of traffic, including delivery lorries, waste disposal lorries and other vehicles of the visitors and staff alike. Downcroft Road and the road around the area is very narrow, when the two sides of the road are parked with cars, it is very hard to drive through. The space between the car is only wide enough for just one car to pass through. we often have to find a slot without a car parked on the road to drive in to give way to a car coming towards us. If big lorries are using the road, it is impossible to drive through. Often one has to reverse to a road junction where larger space is available to give way to other cars. It is not safe to drive on a road like this at present. It would be much worse if so many residents are to move into this neighborhood.</p>

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2022/5320/P	Megan	02/02/2023 22:06:44	OBJ	<p>Living in this Conservation Area, I like the privacy, the peace and the sense of safe community. If this proposal goes ahead, it will cause harm to the Conservation Area. I will not appreciate the sudden number of people trying to find parking and disrupting the flow of the area we live in. It is already difficult to find parking as it is. Along with this, there will be an increase in vehicular emissions and will add an increased level of traffic in this area of narrow streets on a daily basis.</p> <p>I heavily object to this disruptive planning.</p>

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:
2022/5320/P	Robert Minto	02/02/2023 14:24:26	OBJ

Response:
From: Rob Minto, Laurier Road resident

I would like to object to the proposed planning application 2022/5320/P on the following basis:

1) The developer diagrams are misleading, and I feel the impact of the height of the proposed building is far greater than the drawings suggest.

In the application, it says:
Maximum height (Metres): 62.7
Number of storeys: 5

Another document, the services strategy, also says there will be 5 floors.

However, the images in the elevation plan specifically only show 4 storeys:
<http://camdocs.camden.gov.uk/HPRMWebDrawer/Record/9894039/file/document?inline>

The planning statement also shows several photos / impression images of a building project that is clearly NOT 5 storeys, and clearly not 62m in height.
<http://camdocs.camden.gov.uk/HPRMWebDrawer/Record/9894020/file/document?inline>

These discrepancies are troubling.

There seems to be a clear gap between the marketing and the reality. The imagery is clearly wrong, showing a building with 3 or 4 storeys at most.

The overall height, of 62.7m, is also deeply worrying. This is nearly the height of Grenfell Tower, which is 67m. (I only make the comparison for scale, not about fire risk.)

Why has the developer applied for such a potentially tall building? A five-storey development does not need 62m of height. On this point alone, the application should be rejected, as you could fit a 20-storey tower block into 62m.

2) The proposed building goes too far up to the boundary of several properties in Laurier Road, affecting their light, aspect and privacy.

3) The scale of the project will put undue pressure on traffic and increase pollution in the neighbourhood.

I go past the site most days taking or collecting a child from Brookfield Primary School on foot or by bicycle. The traffic along York Rise and Croftdown Road, near Brookfield Park, along streets which are too narrow for passing vehicles, is often intimidating. Drivers get frustrated having to give way, and to 'compensate' often accelerate and speed up far too much.

Without a nearby bus stop or Tube, the overwhelming number of staff and visitors will drive. For the developer to submit a statement that says: "The proposed development will therefore lead to no reduction in air quality and is in accordance with the relevant national and local planning policies." is just nonsense.

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
				<p>It is also contradictory. On page 31 of the Planning Statement, it says: "it is estimated that the proposed development will generate approximately 11-12 deliveries per day by small to medium sized vehicles."</p> <p>How will 11-12 deliveries, most in diesel vans, not affect the air quality?</p> <p>The statement also suggests that only 7 out of 25 staff will drive, and that most visits will be made on foot, with the rest equally split between public transport and car.</p> <p>Even at these best-case scenarios, the extra deliveries and traffic will burden the area with a lot of extra traffic, causing noise, congestion and pollution.</p> <p>OVERALL</p> <p>The developer is allowed to make nice imagery to help sell their plan. However, the pictures are not consistent with the actual detail. The proposal is far bigger than the images suggest, both for neighbouring properties, but also the impact on traffic and pollution.</p> <p>I don't object to tennis courts and a care home in principle. However, this plan is detached from reality, in terms of size, and the impact on congestion and the surrounding area.</p>
2022/5320/P	Kate Pettican	02/02/2023 22:27:11	OBJ	<p>I am objecting to the proposed redevelopment of the Mansfield Bowling Club in Croftdown Road to become a care home as I think it will be much too big for the site and the area. It is unrealistic for the developers and the council to think that all the staff and visitors will come to the care home by public transport. Many will want to drive and this will cause more pollution and congestion in an already busy area. There will also be many service vehicles coming in and out of the site on a daily basis that will clog up the narrow roads.</p> <p>The proposed building looks very big and at five stories will tower over the neighbouring properties on York Rise and Regency Lawn.</p> <p>While I am not against a care home being built there, the size of it and parking for staff and visitors needs to be properly thought through for it to be considered a viable option.</p>
2022/5320/P	George Cunningham	02/02/2023 21:42:19	APP	<p>I strongly oppose this proposal as it is not in keeping with this conservation area. This community will be significantly impacted both in the short and long term by this proposal which is clearly pure profiteering. There are far better communal uses for this space than a care home. The ground currently hosts abandoned tennis courts and there is no reason that this area could not be revived and become the centre piece of the community alongside the heath. Instead this proposal brings traffic, noise and pollution!</p>

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2022/5320/P	Jacqueline Benson	02/02/2023 15:51:29	OBJ	<p>I have lived in Laurier Rd since 1971 and enjoyed playing tennis for years at the Kenlyn. I am happy tennis courts will be retained but I object to the proposed height of the new building.</p> <p>The new building will also increase traffic in the area and also increase pollution</p> <p>We would all miss the open space there which I know is especially valued by residents of Dartmouth Park zAvenue and also the top of Laurier Road..</p>
2022/5320/P	Jacqueline Benson	02/02/2023 15:51:25	OBJ	<p>I have lived in Laurier Rd since 1971 and enjoyed playing tennis for years at the Kenlyn. I am happy tennis courts will be retained but I object to the proposed height of the new building.</p> <p>The new building will also increase traffic in the area and also increase pollution</p> <p>We would all miss the open space there which I know is especially valued by residents of Dartmouth Park zAvenue and also the top of Laurier Road..</p>
2022/5320/P	Jacqueline Benson	02/02/2023 15:51:20	OBJ	<p>I have lived in Laurier Rd since 1971 and enjoyed playing tennis for years at the Kenlyn. I am happy tennis courts will be retained but I object to the proposed height of the new building.</p> <p>The new building will also increase traffic in the area and also increase pollution</p> <p>We would all miss the open space there which I know is especially valued by residents of Dartmouth Park zAvenue and also the top of Laurier Road..</p>
2022/5320/P	Rosanna Selway	02/02/2023 18:30:05	OBJ	<p>Construction is noisy, uses hazardous chemicals and materials and generates lots of extra traffic. This is a safety concern both for air quality which the council proposes to be working hard to reduce. The area is a conservation area and this project will cause disruption to wildlife.</p> <p>The proximity of several schools is of serious concern, my son attends Brookfield primary school. We know medically that children's lungs are most affected by traffic and especially those affected by asthma. The charity Mum's for Lungs have conducted lots of research on this. Besides there is already a care home very close by on hornsey lane, close to the junction with Highgate hill. There are likely others nearby also.</p>
2022/5320/P	Graeme Blyth	02/02/2023 13:04:48	OBJ	<p>I am a parent at Brookfield Primary School and object to his application on the grounds of significantly increased traffic and air pollution. The developer's assertion that the impact will not be material is absurd and based on misleading assumptions.</p> <p>They use, as a comparison, the estimates for the currently consented [residential] scheme, which are for peak times only. This is appropriate for a residential development, but not a care home, where the pattern of visits is likely to be much more steady throughout the day, so the full 453 trips generated per day should be considered. They are assuming that 56% these will be on foot, however most people old enough to be visiting someone in a care home are likely to be of fairly advanced age themselves and much more likely to drive. If 80% travelled by car, this development could lead to 50 new car journeys per hour, on a road which has recently been designated a zHealthy School Street, and which is already narrow and overcrowded.</p> <p>They also make no estimate of weekend travel or deliveries, which are likely to be significant.</p>
2022/5320/P	Cereinyn Ord	02/02/2023 13:28:49	INT	<p>I oppose the building of the care home due to the significant disruption and increased traffic in a residential area which also is home to schools.</p>

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2022/5320/P	Cereinynd Ord	02/02/2023 13:28:53	INT	I oppose the building of the care home due to the significant disruption and increased traffic in a residential area which also is home to schools.
2022/5320/P	Cereinynd Ord	02/02/2023 13:28:57	INT	I oppose the building of the care home due to the significant disruption and increased traffic in a residential area which also is home to schools.
2022/5320/P	Noah & Claude Franklin	02/02/2023 14:02:19	OBJ	<p>We live in Brookfield Park and are objecting to the application for the Mansfield Bowling Club development, for several reasons:</p> <p>1) In the context of the site and its surrounding area, the current proposal is ENORMOUS in height, footprint, and number of beds. It would dwarf all the houses surrounding the site. The previous approved proposal was 2 & 3 storeys high; no new build above that height pattern should be permitted here.</p> <p>2) There are not enough car parking spaces, and not enough cycle parking. 25 staff to 78 beds may well be an understatement, recognising only staff directly employed by the care home: one also needs to account for sub-contract staff for cleaning, catering, maintenance etc. - plus, of course, the many visitors coming to attend to residents.</p> <p>3) The reference parking survey was conducted in autumn. It is not a properly representative base line for the parking use of the area. For example in spring and summer (more visitors to the Heath) and on fair weather Saturdays, with the farmers market at Parliament Hill alongside the music school at LSU, the pressure on traffic and parking is significantly greater.</p> <p>4) People WILL drive. Our public transport accessibility (marked only as a Level 3) has got worse over the years. Frequency of buses has dropped. And anyone who has needed to travel at school journey times knows that it is actually physically impossible to board our local buses, which are filled to overflowing with schoolchildren. The fact that the somewhat misleading parking survey was undertaken at all is, effectively, an acknowledgement that on site parking will be inadequate, so the local streets, local residents and the council will take the strain. People will end up driving round the block in search of a space, clogging the narrow local roads, consuming fossil fuels and adding to air pollution.</p> <p>5) The pollution, congestion and noise will remain, even when the upheaval of the development phase is over. It goes against other efforts of the council to create a better and safer environment for our smaller children such as the recent air quality improvement and traffic restrictions around Brookfield School.</p> <p>6) Light pollution: direct neighbours of the proposed care home are very likely to be subjected to night light pollution and it will add to the polluting glow over a wider area.</p>

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2022/5320/P	Claudia Wordsworth	02/02/2023 09:18:01	OBJ	<p>I would like to add my voice to those expressing serious concern at the potential of this development to exacerbate traffic and pollution in the Dartmouth Park conservation area.</p> <p>As others have flagged, a care home of this size (78 rooms) has huge repercussions in terms of a 24/7 operation requiring the arrival/departure of staff, family visitors, medical attendance and deliveries. That's not to even mention the construction phase...</p> <p>I regularly visit my own mother in a care home (65 rooms) in Elstree. There is considerably more parking available there and yet all the official places are almost always already taken. I think you're dreaming about the scale of impact for a comparably small site with scant parking provision which means car wars will spill onto all nearby streets. As you will be aware, many of the residential roads close to the proposed site are often a horror because only one car can drive down them at a time.</p> <p>As you well know, this area has quite a number of schools. Elsewhere in the borough the council restricts traffic at certain times for the health of the children's lungs (and traffic congestion presumably), yet this application will increase those very same problems by design. Madness.</p>
2022/5320/P	Al Calzavar	02/02/2023 13:38:34	OBJ	<p>Don't do it! This is a single lane residential street. In addition with schools at both ends which will be affecting safety of children's. Just to get a testaste of how an increase of traffic will affect the are you just need to come early on weekends, or at early hours when parents drop their kids in La Sainte.</p> <p>This development doesn't seem to sit well within the area.</p>
2022/5320/P	Al Calzavar	02/02/2023 13:38:37	OBJ	<p>Don't do it! This is a single lane residential street. In addition with schools at both ends which will be affecting safety of children's. Just to get a testaste of how an increase of traffic will affect the are you just need to come early on weekends, or at early hours when parents drop their kids in La Sainte.</p> <p>This development doesn't seem to sit well within the area.</p>
2022/5320/P	Dr Guinevere Tufnell	02/02/2023 16:54:32	APP	<p>I and my husband, John Morton, object to the plans for this site for the following reasons:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. An increased level of traffic, causing congestion in this area of narrow streets on a daily basis. Once built, (after a disruptive 2 year construction phase) there will be significant increase in parking, emissions and traffic from lorries and other large vehicles not accounted for due to food deliveries, clinical waste, rubbish and recycling collection in addition to visitors and medical visits. 2. Additional vehicular emissions and pollution on a regular basis in an area dense with four local schools for primary and secondary aged children, two of which bookend the top and bottom of Croftdown Rd (one of which, Brookfield Primary School, recently became a Healthy School Street to improve air quality in the vicinity of the school, according to the Council website, to reduce vehicle traffic). 3. A sharp increase in parking congestion on local surrounding streets due to limitation of parking on the site. 4. Security concerns due to an unclear plan for the responsibility and management of the adjacent proposed open space 5. A large number of school children use the roads that lead to the site. They often spill onto these streets without paying much attention and will be at great greater danger of being run over or causing a dangerous accident because of the increased traffic.

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2022/5320/P	Mr & Mrs Ahluwalia	01/02/2023 21:17:31	OBJ	<p>We object to the proposed 5-storey, 78 bed care home on the former Mansfield Bowling Club site. Such a large development would be better suited near a local centre, where there are more amenities such as transport links and services. The current site is within a local residential area, and a conservation area, where the roads are quiet and residential and ideally suited to that purpose. In addition, there are four schools in the area - La Sainte Union, Brookfield Primary, Parliament Hill School, William Ellis School - and the increased congestion from a building with so many visitors would both pose safety risks as well as increased pollution, with the latter point counterproductive to Camden Council's environmental goals. Finally, local residents already struggle to park our cars and this would make it even more impossible. Building a small number of private residences in keeping with the surrounding building stock might be an alternative that suits the developer's financial goals without posing the additional stresses on public services that the Council would have to consider, but that is between the parties involved.</p>
2022/5320/P	Miss Sarah Barrett	02/02/2023 19:08:58	COMMNT	<p>I'd like to object on this planned development. Seems like a Huge site and loads more potential traffic, vehicles, pollution etc right by the my sons school.</p> <p>I do not want this to go ahead, it will impact on my sons health, his school day with noise and air, pollution, and impacting on teachers also, effectively his learning.</p> <p>Also Chester Road is already congested heavily due vehicles for another 2 local building site on that road, and of the community hall, which it delays C11 buses when I'm trying to get to work in the morning and in the afternoon pick up at school, adding more vehicles and traffic to the area will only delay the bus C11 further.</p>
2022/5320/P	Chloe Schneider	02/02/2023 21:47:25	OBJ	<p>I live at 12 Regency Lawn. I'm extremely concerned about this proposal - the main issue that concerns me is the noise that will come from the building after it has been built. The only entrance to the site is very close to our bedrooms, any vehicles entering the site can be heard and are noisy and intrusive. A 78 bed care home is likely to have multiple deliveries and visitors early in the morning and late at night. I can see the plans involve widening the access route to allow for larger (more noisy) vehicles to make deliveries. Unless the care home can confirm traffic using this single entrance will only be entering the site during the day this will have a significant negative impact on our ability to sleep. As I doubt this is possible I'm objecting to the current plans for excessive noise reasons. I think there needs to be another access route into the site - the current access arrangements are not acceptable. There have been times in the past when vehicle / delivery noise at unsociable times has been excessively loud and it seriously impacted our day to day lives. The noise impact assessment report makes no mention of this type of noise but it is considerable. In this large space these are the only vehicles to enter a quiet space where all the homes back on to, this is the only side of our homes that does not have street / vehicle noise - this is not something that I can accept.</p> <p>During the consultation process we also discussed how community allotments would be a useful community asset, I'm sad to see these are no longer included in the plans and wonder how this decision was made?</p>