

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2022/5320/P	Naresh Ramchandani	05/02/2023 19:35:18	COMMNT	<p>In theory, the idea of a nursing home is a positive one for the neighbourhood and the elderly people who will benefit. But the plans submitted are too far too large for the space, far too tall and architecturally inappropriate for the surrounding roads and will bring far too much traffic to the area.</p> <p>It looks like another case of a developer looking to maximise a piece of land for all possible profit regardless of the consequences.</p> <p>I hope there is a process that can downscale the size and greed of the current proposal and make it more fitting for the neighbourhood.</p> <p>Naresh Ramchandani 31 Laurier Road London NW51SH</p>
2022/5320/P	Bernadette Oleary	05/02/2023 23:34:00	COMMNT	<p>I am absolutely outraged by the recent application of 5 story building. I new this was going to happen, it seems to be standard practice. Do as required to begin with and then keep pushing for higher building. This is a conservation area with 2 and 3 story houses. This is a monstrous building completely out of place in this quiet residential area. My privacy is going to be completely compromised by being overlooked. I strongly object to this application. Another example of greedy developers with no regard for green space and the environment.</p>
2022/5320/P	Peter Hillel	05/02/2023 12:27:47	INT	<p>We have a number of objections:-</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Building size: It will be half as tall again as the surrounding houses and tower over them. 2. It will generate considerable extra traffic and noise on the adjacent narrow residential streets (staff, caterers, deliveries, visitors, waste disposal vehicles, ambulances and other medical traffic. 3. Insufficient onsite parking which will inevitably spill out onto the surrounding roads. 4. With four secondary schools close by and the many 6th formers who constantly walk between the LaSWAP consortium schools, all this additional traffic will be an extra hazard. 5. Light pollution! Lights on all night every night to the detriment of the nearby houses.
2022/5320/P	Declan O'Brien	03/02/2023 10:54:07	OBJ	<p>The last application for replacement of the Mansfield Bowling Club building had an acceptable impact on the Dartmouth Park Conservation Area because it replaced a dated, unattractive building, but had the same footprint and bulk of the original. The current application is for 4 storeys and a basement so 3m taller, and has a 64% increase in floor space. Therefore, a much increased bulk compared with the permitted scheme. This is undoubtedly harmful to the Dartmouth Park Conservation Area and contrary to the Camden Local Plan Policy D2, the NPPF and the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990.</p> <p>The application does not appear to take into account the three the local schools, other than a Saturday programme. The impact of the additional traffic generated by this scheme will be significant given that one of the entrances to this development is in Croftdown Road which is meant to be a car free</p> <p>Increase in traffic with large construction vehicles and machinery travelling up and down the road during construction and operation as there is likely to be at least 150 people working there operation, including night time staff</p>

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2022/5320/P	Robert Sumerling	05/02/2023 21:03:53	OBJ	<p>These comments assume that the members of the Planning Committee will have read and have access to the Application and the entirety of the supporting documentation and these comments should be read accordingly. I am Robert Sumerling and I live at 6 Laurier Road.</p> <p>Reports read as though they have been in preparation many months yet local residents without expertise or funding are given just a few days to comment.</p> <p>Overdevelopment The site is 0.5 hectares, that is 8,500 sq m. The proposal is to build 5,652 sq m of care home space. Whilst I agree that the site should be redeveloped, the proposal is for a building that is too big for the site and represents overdevelopment.</p> <p>The application is to build a 78 room Care Home. Supporting documents clearly indicate a building 5 storeys high but the plans show a building only 3 or 4 storeys high. Item HV Regen clearly shows 5 storeys at p28.</p> <p>At Document 59 - Design Review Panel at p33 shows 4 storeys but at p36 second from left, shows 5 storeys. p42 shows 4 floors. At 16.00 p52 shows 4 storeys; p53 shows 4 plus storeys; p54 shows 5 storeys; p55 shows 5 storeys.</p> <p>Almost all pictures are of two young people with one car in view. I note also copious references to security. That, and pictures of young people, suggest to me that the plan may be altered to a gated residential community.</p> <p>Transport There is an assumption that most people arriving by car will use local streets to park. In the Transport Statement:-</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 2.7 there is discussion only about car parking. The only reference to cycle parking is to 6 short stay places. There must be adequate secure cycle parking for staff and visitors and with E-bike charging. • 4.9 only 2 car chargers will be provided. This is insufficient. • 4.11 cycle parking is underprovided for staff and visitors. <p>At Document 57 - Existing Site Analysis refers only to car parking and not to cycling.</p> <p>Energy Use The application is characterised by inadequate assurance and vague aspiration about energy conservation.</p> <p>At Document 1.5 I note the assurance that there will be no central energy plant but see reference at 16.03 to gas boilers</p> <p>At Document 68 Rainwater harvesting has been “considered” – this should be a definitive statement about grey water systems. There is nothing about solar shading. There is nothing about use of power storage batteries.</p> <p>Thermal efficiency is said to be “better than Building Regs” – the applicant must do better and state detail.</p> <p>There should be a thorough and ambitious energy conservation statement.</p>

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

Document 16.03 Energy and Sustainability. Space heating is to be by gas boilers – see p9 at 1(d). Page 12 annual gas consumption estimated 1.253 million cubic metres and emissions at 319220 kgs per annum CO2. Gas boilers will add to local pollution.

Solar hot water is considered to be “not realistic”. Why not?

At p17-18 Ground source heat pumps and Air source heat pumps should be installed but neither are discussed or appear in the design detail.

The document entitled BRUKL has 10 pages of complex data but no explanation

END.

2022/5320/P	Laura Hart	03/02/2023 17:02:05	OBJ	<p>I'd like to object to this proposal as it's going to impact massively on the area, bringing higher volumes of traffic congestion, noise pollution, air and light pollution. My child attends Brookfield school and this development will bring with it an entourage of lorries / trucks / waste collection and high levels of road disruption and congestion, making the roads more dangerous for children arriving and leaving Brookfield School, and the other 3 schools surrounding the site. Brookfield school has also become a healthy school street to improve air quality in the vicinity of the school.</p> <p>Please don't authorise this development.</p>
-------------	------------	---------------------	-----	---

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2022/5320/P	Robert Sumerling	05/02/2023 21:03:57	OBJ	<p>These comments assume that the members of the Planning Committee will have read and have access to the Application and the entirety of the supporting documentation and these comments should be read accordingly. I am Robert Sumerling and I live at 6 Laurier Road.</p> <p>Reports read as though they have been in preparation many months yet local residents without expertise or funding are given just a few days to comment.</p> <p>Overdevelopment The site is 0.5 hectares, that is 8,500 sq m. The proposal is to build 5,652 sq m of care home space. Whilst I agree that the site should be redeveloped, the proposal is for a building that is too big for the site and represents overdevelopment.</p> <p>The application is to build a 78 room Care Home. Supporting documents clearly indicate a building 5 storeys high but the plans show a building only 3 or 4 storeys high. Item HV Regen clearly shows 5 storeys at p28.</p> <p>At Document 59 - Design Review Panel at p33 shows 4 storeys but at p36 second from left, shows 5 storeys. p42 shows 4 floors. At 16.00 p52 shows 4 storeys; p53 shows 4 plus storeys; p54 shows 5 storeys; p55 shows 5 storeys.</p> <p>Almost all pictures are of two young people with one car in view. I note also copious references to security. That, and pictures of young people, suggest to me that the plan may be altered to a gated residential community.</p> <p>Transport There is an assumption that most people arriving by car will use local streets to park. In the Transport Statement:-</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 2.7 there is discussion only about car parking. The only reference to cycle parking is to 6 short stay places. There must be adequate secure cycle parking for staff and visitors and with E-bike charging. • 4.9 only 2 car chargers will be provided. This is insufficient. • 4.11 cycle parking is underprovided for staff and visitors. <p>At Document 57 - Existing Site Analysis refers only to car parking and not to cycling.</p> <p>Energy Use The application is characterised by inadequate assurance and vague aspiration about energy conservation.</p> <p>At Document 1.5 I note the assurance that there will be no central energy plant but see reference at 16.03 to gas boilers</p> <p>At Document 68 Rainwater harvesting has been “considered” – this should be a definitive statement about grey water systems. There is nothing about solar shading. There is nothing about use of power storage batteries.</p> <p>Thermal efficiency is said to be “better than Building Regs” – the applicant must do better and state detail.</p> <p>There should be a thorough and ambitious energy conservation statement.</p>

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

Document 16.03 Energy and Sustainability. Space heating is to be by gas boilers – see p9 at 1(d). Page 12 annual gas consumption estimated 1.253 million cubic metres and emissions at 319220 kgs per annum CO2. Gas boilers will add to local pollution.

Solar hot water is considered to be “not realistic”. Why not?

At p17-18 Ground source heat pumps and Air source heat pumps should be installed but neither are discussed or appear in the design detail.

The document entitled BRUKL has 10 pages of complex data but no explanation

END.

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2022/5320/P	Fiona Mullane	03/02/2023 09:30:33	OBJ	Objections to the planning application by Harrison Varma for a 78 Bedroom Residential Home under Planning Application reference 2022/5320/P.

To whom it may concern,

My interest in this site is based on my knowledge and love of the area, having been brought up in Dartmouth Park (1968 – 1987) and, since then, visiting my mother regularly who currently lives on Regency Lawn, Croftdown Road.

I have been involved in the neighbourhood consultation process which Harrison Varma followed prior to making this application.

I object to the planning application mainly on the basis that it does not comply with the National Planning Policy Framework.

s.12 National Planning Policy Framework states that:

“The presumption in favour of sustainable development does not change the statutory status of the development plan as the starting point for decision-making. Where a planning application conflicts with an up-to-date development plan (including any neighbourhood plans that form part of the development plan), permission should not usually be granted. Local planning authorities may take decisions that depart from an up-to-date development plan, but only if material considerations in a particular case indicate that the plan should not be followed.”

The “Development Plan” includes The Camden Local Plan (2017), the Dartmouth Park Neighbourhood Plan (March 2020) and The London Plan (2021). As this application conflicts with the “up-to-date development plan”, the application should be rejected.

All of these plans making up the “up-to-date plan” recognise the need for affordable housing in Camden. The extant permission provides for 21 dwellings, 11 of which are “affordable” and therefore would go some way to fulfilling this need. There is also a recognised need for specialist older persons housing (Policy H13, The London Plan) but a care home is specifically excluded from this definition.

The Dartmouth Park Neighbourhood Plan (DPNP), with regard to the present site, provides (inter alia) as follows:

The following principles are set out to guide acceptable development proposals:

1. The development would be residential only and would not exceed the density provided for in the current consent.
2. The total footprint of the development would not exceed that of the previous Bowling Club building and would not intrude into the green space reserved for leisure activities as shown on Fig. 6 (of the Camden Biodiversity Action Plan).
3. The design of new housing would respond positively to the characteristics of surrounding residential development and in particular will be informed by the terraced typologies that are prevalent in the surrounding area.
4. The development will be expected to provide the maximum amount of affordable housing provided for in the Local Plan policies and this Neighbourhood Plan.

Application No: Consultees Name: Received:

Comment: Response:

5. Provision should be included for intermediate housing that will help meet the needs of local teachers, nurses and other medical staff.
6. Any development should be car-free, in accordance with Camden Local Plan Policy T2 (Parking and car-free development).
7. The part of the site shown in Fig. 6 would be reserved for sport / leisure /recreation purposes and would be publicly accessible.
8. The developers would put in place procedures to ensure that the open space is sustainably managed and maintained for the future for the benefit of the public.
- 9.

As far as item 1 above is concerned, the current application is for a 78 bed care home. The developers, during one of their consultation with neighbour sessions, claimed that a 78 bed care home was equivalent to 21 residential dwellings, based on the assumption that each of the dwellings would comprise either 3 or 4 bedrooms. It is disingenuous to claim that a 78 bed care home is equivalent to 21 residential dwellings, however you look at it. (They also claimed, when questioned whether they would consider building a care home on a much smaller scale, that according to their operating partner, a care home of fewer beds would not be sustainable). This development would clearly exceed the density provided for in the current consent.

As far as item 2 above is concerned, whilst the actual footprint of the proposed development is nearly equivalent to the footprint of the Bowling Club building, the actual volume and floor space of this proposed building far exceed, not only the original Bowling Club building but also the extant permission for 21 dwellings. This building is 30% higher and contains 68.8% more floor space than the extant permission, against which this development must be measured, now that the Bowling Club Building has been demolished. The proposed development does not provide any affordable homes, whether for older people or families (as required by item 4 above and as required by the Camden Local Plan Policy H4) and neither does it provide for any specialist older persons housing (Class 2 developments fall outside the requirement to build affordable homes for any age group) or “intermediate housing” for local teachers, nurses and the like, as required by item 5.

This proposed development is not entirely “car-free” as required by Item 6 above (which reflects the Camden Local Plan policy T2). Indeed, a facility such as this not only requires a basic level of parking to be provided for visiting medical and nursing staff and other service providers, it will also generate a significant amount of car and van traffic in an already congested area (see below on Traffic Generation and Congestion).

The last point on the DPNP is that the developers, whilst recognising their obligation to retain the designated open space and within that to provide some tennis facilities, they have not addressed the issue of how this open space will be maintained or managed and by whom in their application. They were not able to give a definitive answer to this question when it was posed to them at one of the neighbourhood consultation meetings.

I do not believe that there are “material considerations” which would justify departing from the Local Development Plan such as it stands.

Heritage Area:

This site falls within the Dartmouth Park Conservation Area. The Council is statutorily obliged, under Section 72(1) of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990, to pay special attention to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character or appearance of the Conservation Area.

Application No: Consultees Name: Received:

Comment: Response:

I submit that a development of this size and scale and for the Class C2 use applied for, would not enhance or preserve the character or appearance of the Conservation Area, rather, it would be harmful to it.

The application particulars state that the building height is over 62 metres. This may be a sloppy error on the part of the applicant. The actual building is likely to reach a height of 13 metres, based on the ceiling heights mentioned and the number of storeys. There is no other building of this height in the area. Its size and shape will be overbearing. The illustrations of the building make much use of artistic licence. I would question whether one could access any of the viewpoints from which the drawings are made. The site is simply too small to gain that kind of perspective of the building from any angle. The building, as provided for by the measurements given, will be enormous and will harm the character and appearance of the Conservation Area.

Under Policy A1 of the Camden Local Plan, the Council should seek to protect the quality of life of occupiers and neighbours. Permission for development should only be granted where it does not cause unacceptable harm to amenity. Factors to be considered by the Council are: visual privacy, outlook, sunlight, daylight and overshadowing.

I submit that a building of this scale and height will interfere with the amenity value of all neighbouring properties, taking into account the factors as above, particularly the houses along Regency Lawn and York Rise which are at a lower elevation and therefore more easily overlooked than those on Laurier Road and Dartmouth Park Avenue. I would also say that following the Supreme Court ruling in the NEO Bankside residents' favour (February 2023), the Council now has a legal duty to consider how any development impacts the visual privacy of surrounding buildings, whether from a public space or a private one.

Other points to make as part of my objection are:

That the application is flawed as it:

- provides inaccurate measurements for the height of the building
- has not used the correct traffic data to furnish its Transport Report (taking only information from one comparative care home development rather than from the 2 equivalent homes and then averaging out the data) which smacks of only presenting data to suit their own ends rather than providing objective data which the Council can use to inform its judgment.
- Does not provide sufficient information on the potential noise and air pollution caused, not only by the building works themselves, but also by the 24 hour operation of a building of this kind
- Is not within the scope of the extant permission for 21 dwellings which is the benchmark by which this application must be assessed.

Traffic Generation and Congestion:

I have serious concerns about the traffic generation and parking problems that a development of this kind will have on the local community, who are already suffering with congestion problems on their streets due to the proximity of Hampstead Heath and the Saturday Farmer's Market in the grounds of William Ellis school on a Saturday. The development will have 8 dedicated parking spaces on site (which is contrary to the DPNP and Camden Local Plan aim of a car-free development) which will not be sufficient for the number of visitors/staff/service providers.

Application No: Consultees Name: Received:

Comment: Response:

The proximity of a junior school at the top of the road (Brookfield School) and a large Secondary school immediately opposite the entrance road to Mansfield Green – La Sainte Union and by two secondary schools at the Highgate Road end of Croftdown Road, William Ellis and Parliament Hill mean that the streets surrounding the site are busy with parents dropping children off and with children walking to school. Increased traffic, as estimated (perhaps underestimated based on the flawed data used (- see above)) at 18,250 car trips per annum (this can be doubled, bearing in mind the data is for single trips not for a car arriving and leaving the site), making an additional 100 trips per day, 365 days of the year plus delivery trucks and vans, refuse lorries and potential ambulance visits. The access road to the site gives onto Croftdown Road which is narrow and close to two junctions, one with York Rise and one with Brookfield Park. Although the kind of traffic which will inevitably be generated by this development may not peak at the same times as the school traffic, it will be a constant trickle and this will interfere with the amenity value of the Conservation Area and could present an increased danger to pedestrians, some of whom are very young and who are encouraged to walk to school.

By its very nature, a residential care home is a 24-hour facility. The applicants have said that there will be lighting to communal areas within the home and around its perimeter. Whether the lighting is permanently on between dusk and dawn or triggered by movement sensors, the lighting from within the building and without will have a detrimental effect on the dark skies policies being developed around the country and also directly on the biodiversity of the area which has never been lit at night and has hence benefited from many varieties of bats (at least 9 have been identified) and different species of birds making their homes here. The area is well known for its migratory swifts who populate the area during the summer months. Insufficient evidence has been provided for how a development of this size and scope will affect the habitat of these protected species.

Overburdening of Local Services:

I have serious concerns about how the local primary care services will cope with an additional 78 elderly and possibly unwell individuals living in their catchment area. The application states that the development, once complete, will generate 25 full time jobs (or their equivalent) but this number of staff is not sufficient to operate a fully functional 78 bed care home. This means that some services will have to be contracted in which could mean that the primary care services will be overburdened (chiropractic, physiotherapy, GP services, pharmacies etc).

My objections are mostly based on the overbearing size and nature of this development and the fact that they are contrary to the Local Development Plan and that the size and scale will exceed the extant permission for 21 residential houses. I also question whether, based on the claims made by the developer regarding a minimum size requirement for sustainability of a care home, this development is not sustainable and that the business plan of the developer, in conjunction with their operating partner, is flawed and unworkable on a site of this size, with the constraints associated with it. An unsustainable development should not be granted planning permission, in accordance with the NPPF.

Finally, I have concerns for the residents of Regency Lawn, in particular, who have the shortest gardens of all the houses surrounding this site but behind whose houses all the vehicle deliveries and parking will take place. This will cause a loss of amenity for them in terms of using their outside spaces due to noise and pollution

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
				<p>from vehicles dropping off, turning, waiting etc. Also, the building, in its proposed form and orientation, will be not only be overbearing to these properties in terms of its proximity to their properties and its overall height and mass but also will result in a loss of privacy and loss of light.</p> <p>For all the above reasons, this application should be rejected.</p> <p>Thank you for taking the time to read this.</p> <p>Fiona Mullane</p>
2022/5320/P	Emily potter	03/02/2023 13:51:49	OBJ	<p>I object to this proposal. The existing site is an area of greenery and a has been a community amenity of value, it has great potential to be a considered and beautiful development that is sympathetic to its location and surroundings, a local asset. Instead the proposed development is too high and too dense for this site. The direct Neighbouring properties are just two storeys high by comparison. In particular the proposed location of the taller buildings will overlook people's gardens from the community. In summary the proposal is on direct opposition to the established principles of the Dartmouth Park conservation area and will have a negative effect on the local community and ecology.</p>

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2022/5320/P	Robert Sumerling	05/02/2023 21:03:59	OBJ	<p>These comments assume that the members of the Planning Committee will have read and have access to the Application and the entirety of the supporting documentation and these comments should be read accordingly. I am Robert Sumerling and I live at 6 Laurier Road.</p> <p>Reports read as though they have been in preparation many months yet local residents without expertise or funding are given just a few days to comment.</p> <p>Overdevelopment The site is 0.5 hectares, that is 8,500 sq m. The proposal is to build 5,652 sq m of care home space. Whilst I agree that the site should be redeveloped, the proposal is for a building that is too big for the site and represents overdevelopment.</p> <p>The application is to build a 78 room Care Home. Supporting documents clearly indicate a building 5 storeys high but the plans show a building only 3 or 4 storeys high. Item HV Regen clearly shows 5 storeys at p28.</p> <p>At Document 59 - Design Review Panel at p33 shows 4 storeys but at p36 second from left, shows 5 storeys. p42 shows 4 floors. At 16.00 p52 shows 4 storeys; p53 shows 4 plus storeys; p54 shows 5 storeys; p55 shows 5 storeys.</p> <p>Almost all pictures are of two young people with one car in view. I note also copious references to security. That, and pictures of young people, suggest to me that the plan may be altered to a gated residential community.</p> <p>Transport There is an assumption that most people arriving by car will use local streets to park. In the Transport Statement:-</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 2.7 there is discussion only about car parking. The only reference to cycle parking is to 6 short stay places. There must be adequate secure cycle parking for staff and visitors and with E-bike charging. • 4.9 only 2 car chargers will be provided. This is insufficient. • 4.11 cycle parking is underprovided for staff and visitors. <p>At Document 57 - Existing Site Analysis refers only to car parking and not to cycling.</p> <p>Energy Use The application is characterised by inadequate assurance and vague aspiration about energy conservation.</p> <p>At Document 1.5 I note the assurance that there will be no central energy plant but see reference at 16.03 to gas boilers</p> <p>At Document 68 Rainwater harvesting has been “considered” – this should be a definitive statement about grey water systems. There is nothing about solar shading. There is nothing about use of power storage batteries.</p> <p>Thermal efficiency is said to be “better than Building Regs” – the applicant must do better and state detail.</p> <p>There should be a thorough and ambitious energy conservation statement.</p>

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
				<p>Document 16.03 Energy and Sustainability. Space heating is to be by gas boilers – see p9 at 1(d). Page 12 annual gas consumption estimated 1.253 million cubic metres and emissions at 319220 kgs per annum CO2. Gas boilers will add to local pollution.</p> <p>Solar hot water is considered to be “not realistic”. Why not?</p> <p>At p17-18 Ground source heat pumps and Air source heat pumps should be installed but neither are discussed or appear in the design detail.</p> <p>The document entitled BRUKL has 10 pages of complex data but no explanation</p> <p>END.</p>

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2022/5320/P	Robert Sumerling	05/02/2023 21:04:02	OBJ	<p>These comments assume that the members of the Planning Committee will have read and have access to the Application and the entirety of the supporting documentation and these comments should be read accordingly. I am Robert Sumerling and I live at 6 Laurier Road.</p> <p>Reports read as though they have been in preparation many months yet local residents without expertise or funding are given just a few days to comment.</p> <p>Overdevelopment The site is 0.5 hectares, that is 8,500 sq m. The proposal is to build 5,652 sq m of care home space. Whilst I agree that the site should be redeveloped, the proposal is for a building that is too big for the site and represents overdevelopment.</p> <p>The application is to build a 78 room Care Home. Supporting documents clearly indicate a building 5 storeys high but the plans show a building only 3 or 4 storeys high. Item HV Regen clearly shows 5 storeys at p28.</p> <p>At Document 59 - Design Review Panel at p33 shows 4 storeys but at p36 second from left, shows 5 storeys. p42 shows 4 floors. At 16.00 p52 shows 4 storeys; p53 shows 4 plus storeys; p54 shows 5 storeys; p55 shows 5 storeys.</p> <p>Almost all pictures are of two young people with one car in view. I note also copious references to security. That, and pictures of young people, suggest to me that the plan may be altered to a gated residential community.</p> <p>Transport There is an assumption that most people arriving by car will use local streets to park. In the Transport Statement:-</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 2.7 there is discussion only about car parking. The only reference to cycle parking is to 6 short stay places. There must be adequate secure cycle parking for staff and visitors and with E-bike charging. • 4.9 only 2 car chargers will be provided. This is insufficient. • 4.11 cycle parking is underprovided for staff and visitors. <p>At Document 57 - Existing Site Analysis refers only to car parking and not to cycling.</p> <p>Energy Use The application is characterised by inadequate assurance and vague aspiration about energy conservation.</p> <p>At Document 1.5 I note the assurance that there will be no central energy plant but see reference at 16.03 to gas boilers</p> <p>At Document 68 Rainwater harvesting has been “considered” – this should be a definitive statement about grey water systems. There is nothing about solar shading. There is nothing about use of power storage batteries.</p> <p>Thermal efficiency is said to be “better than Building Regs” – the applicant must do better and state detail.</p> <p>There should be a thorough and ambitious energy conservation statement.</p>

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
				<p>Document 16.03 Energy and Sustainability. Space heating is to be by gas boilers – see p9 at 1(d). Page 12 annual gas consumption estimated 1.253 million cubic metres and emissions at 319220 kgs per annum CO2. Gas boilers will add to local pollution.</p> <p>Solar hot water is considered to be “not realistic”. Why not?</p> <p>At p17-18 Ground source heat pumps and Air source heat pumps should be installed but neither are discussed or appear in the design detail.</p> <p>The document entitled BRUKL has 10 pages of complex data but no explanation</p> <p>END.</p>
2022/5320/P	Chris Potter	05/02/2023 21:43:27	OBJ	<p>A development of this size (height and footprint) in a conservation area contradicts the ethos of a conservation area. A retirement home is a respectable idea, but the suggested capacity outweighs the practicality of the location: - the approach roads are quiet residential streets and the main pedestrian thoroughfares for two schools; the impact of, firstly, construction traffic and, secondly, the traffic of the numerous employees and deliveries that a 78 bed facility will draw, will drastically increase road traffic and pollution in the area. There also seem to be too few environmental or renewable considerations in the proposal which, at a time like this, should be front and centre. In its current form, the proposal feels bloated and unwieldy and will be harmful in the short and long term to the local environment and population.</p>

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2022/5320/P	Neil Sankoff	05/02/2023 15:50:48	OBJ	<p>We are residents of Regency Lawn, and our property is directly behind the proposed Mansfield Site development. I object to this proposal for the reasons set out below:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The scale of the proposed development would give rise to a loss of privacy and a loss of amenity by air pollution, light pollution and noise pollution. 2. The size and scheme of the proposed development would have an adverse impact on the character of the conservation area. <p>Loss of privacy and overlooking and general loss of amenity including nuisance by light, air and noise pollution</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Loss of privacy: The proposed development is a 5-storey building directly overlooking our house and garden. - Light pollution: The building and grounds will be lit at all hours, including a glass-fronted stairwell and approximately 124 outdoor lights. - Air and noise pollution and loss of amenity of our garden: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The proposed facility will be in use 24 hours / day, 365 days / year. Under the proposed development, our garden will abut parking spaces and a service road that will be in use at all hours: staff vehicles (particularly at shift changes); food delivery; ambulances; rubbish collection; collection of clinical waste. • Croftdown Road is a narrow road. On many stretches, Eastbound vehicles must pull over into parking spaces and driveways to allow Westbound vehicles to proceed, and vice versa. There are two schools on the road, each within a few hundred metres of the Site. The road is frequently congested, particularly at school pick-up and drop-off times (both during the school week and on weekends during term time, when the schools host extracurricular activities). The proposed development would increase substantially the number of vehicles using the road (particularly larger commercial vehicles) and, consequently, the frequency and severity of congestion and air and pollution from idling, honking, reversing vehicles. This will be exacerbated by the entrance to the site, which is quite narrow and situated directly opposite a driveway servicing a school. As such, the proposal fails to 'use the Healthy Streets approach to prioritise health in all planning decisions' as required by GG3, section A of the London Plan. <p>Overshadowing, overbearing and adverse visual impact</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The height and bulk of the proposed development are significantly greater than that of the bowling club that previously occupied the site, and the proposed development is not 'stepped' back. As a consequence, the proposed development would: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Cause overshadowing and overlooking on our house and garden • Directly block sunlight to our home and garden • Adversely impair the current visual horizon line from the top floor of the Regency Lawn terraces - The proposed development vastly exceeds the plan of the previous structure and does not utilise other approved areas. - Overlooking would be enabled by vertical strips of glazing, stretching from the ground floor to top level of the 5-storey building, that will face directly into our home. - Our privacy would be impacted by our sheer physical proximity to the site and the scale and height of this building. - The boundary of vegetation proposed to separate our garden from the parking spaces and service road is inadequate, consisting only of a few trees. - There is no outline for security of the Open Space.

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
				<p>Adverse impact on the character of the Dartmouth Park conservation area and Mansfield Open Space</p> <p>- The proposed development does not 'preserve or enhance the character or appearance' of the Dartmouth Park Conservation Area, as required by the principles and aims of the Dartmouth Park Conservation Area Appraisal and Management Statement adopted by Camden Council from 22 January 2009 (the 'Principles' – see p. 53-57).</p> <p>We endorse the report submitted by Howard Cole, and thank you for considering responses to this proposal.</p>
2022/5320/P	Natasha Cendrowicz	05/02/2023 17:24:54	OBJ	<p>I live on Laurier Road and I am unhappy about the scale of this proposal. There will be huge disruption to residents during the construction. My quiet enjoyment of my property is already compromised by 2 major refurbishments to houses on my road. The additional traffic generated by this proposal will also jeopardise those of us who live in the area. There is not adequate parking for this development. I already pay for the pleasure of parking near my property. In future I will have the pleasure of paying for parking, without it being near to where I live. I have 2 teenage sons who attend local schools. My eldest son has asthma. The additional traffic will cause even more air pollution. Please refuse this application and ask them to come back with something more modest and in keeping with the plot.</p>
2022/5320/P	Farhana Yamin	05/02/2023 19:43:55	COMMNT	<p>I strongly object to this application for a commercial care home for 78 people. I have four points:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The planned building is too large in numbers of people that the home would care for; - The building itself are too tall for this area and would be an eyesore and there is loss of visual and natural amenity. We are going from what was largely an open site with trees/greenery and nature to a massive care home that is too massed for this site; - the traffic & congestion generated by hundreds of vehicles daily (covering staff & residents as well as their visitors and deliveries) would be dangerous to many school children who use this road and surrounding roads and create toxic air pollution for all; - parking is inadequate /non-existent and the truth is there would be a knock on effect & illegal parking all around this peaceful residential areas including my street; we already get lots of parking at weekends for the Heath and now it would be non-stop. - the change of use to a social purpose - a care home - seems thinly disguised excuse to build a very high rise building that is changed to expensive,high rise flats for private residents. T
2022/5320/P	Astrid Sharkey	05/02/2023 20:03:09	OBJ	<p>This proposal, so large in scale, is potentially a massive over development. It would result in a very poor outcome for the entire neighbourhood, were it to go ahead. The construction process in itself would be extremely disruptive with noise and general pollution - especially, but not exclusively, to the properties on the perimeter. There are three secondary and a primary schools in close proximity . The narrow streets can already be congested in rush hour, with difficulty for passing vehicles that would inevitably include the large trucks for deliveries, rubbish and recycling . All this additional traffic would need to feed into Highgate Road - a hotspot for traffic and pollution. This application should be rejected and the proposal re- examined.</p>

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2022/5320/P	C Wells	05/02/2023 22:29:30	OBJ	<p>Response to Application to Develop the Former Mansfield Bowling Club, Croftdown Road London NW5 1EP 2022/5320/P –</p> <p>I am submitting the following objections in a personal capacity as a resident of some 35 years in the immediate area who has also given my time to both the DPCAAC and the DPNF. I also have some knowledge of this area as a former chair of the HLSI Local History Archives.</p> <p>This development does not adequately take account of either the DPCAAC plan or the current DPNF Plan and nor does it respond to any of the prior local consultations involving residents and local groups.</p> <p>The site has been long been designated as open space in successive Local Plans and is correctly described as positively contributing to the character of the conservation area.</p> <p>Any development must be residential only and not exceed the density provided for in the consent obtained by Generator- not so in this case.</p> <p>The total footprint of the development must not exceed that of the previous bowling club building and should not intrude into the green space reserved for leisure activities.</p> <p>The current proposal is unacceptable in terms of height, mass, bulk and footprint and is totally out of keeping with its context.</p> <p>This design fails to respond positively to the characteristics of surrounding residential development.</p> <p>There will be an adverse impact due to height and bulk on biodiversity and wildlife both in terms of shading on the surrounding footprint but also nearby gardens.</p> <p>The amount of subterranean building will also adversely impact on local underground water courses and could increase the risk of flooding due to its proximity the Fleet tributary and other rising springs. Please note the name of nearby Brookfield Park.</p> <p>This proposal does not provide affordable housing as per the Neighbourhood Plan.</p> <p>There is nothing in this proposal which would preserve and enhance the character and appearance our area- quite the contrary.</p> <p>This application must be refused, and the applicant encouraged to come up with an alternative proposal.</p>
2022/5320/P	Marwan Al-khafaji	04/02/2023 18:36:03	OBJ	<p>Croftdown Road is a very narrow road which already has a lot of traffic. My fear is this development will attract a lot more . Construction traffic followed by all other traffic that comes with a development of this size. This will increase pollution in an area dense with local schools.</p>

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2022/5320/P	Kate	03/02/2023 11:14:23	OBJ	<p>As a local resident and a parent of young children, I strongly object to the proposed redevelopment of the site into a 78 bed care home.</p> <p>The scale of the proposed development is simply too large and I'm deeply concerned about the impact it will have on our neighbourhood, particularly on the health, safety and wellbeing of my own children and other young residents of our community.</p> <p>First, the increased traffic flow in the area will pose a safety hazard to children who walk, scoot or bike to schools, nurseries and local parks.</p> <p>Second, the higher levels of air pollution will affect the health and wellbeing of young children, who are more susceptible to the negative effects of air pollution.</p> <p>Third, the proposed development may lead to increased noise levels (from emergency vehicles, increased road traffic, food delivery, waste collection, etc.) and decreased privacy for families living in the area. This could have a negative impact on the quality of life for families, especially for young children who need a quiet and peaceful environment for proper sleep and development.</p> <p>Lastly, the redevelopment and the above mentioned traffic/air pollution/waste/noise issues associated with it could discourage new families from moving into the area, resulting in a decline in the overall quality of life for all residents.</p> <p>In conclusion, I strongly urge Camden planning committee to consider the negative impact of this proposed redevelopment on the health, safety, and wellbeing of local residents, especially our children, and to deny the application.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2022/5320/P	Lucy Herron	04/02/2023 09:28:36	OBJ	<p>This is a real disaster for Croftdown Road and the surrounding streets in terms of the lack of adequate parking provision at this site. Croftdown Road is already grid locked with Heath visitors (especially at the weekend) as well as people coming for the Farmer's Market, and the vans belonging to traders at the Farmer's Market themselves.</p> <p>The number of traffic jams and stand offs with cars attempting to move around each other, reversing back up the road, refusing to get out of each other's way turns a narrow residential street into a noisy and chaotic mess which is dangerous when trying to cross the road with small children at the weekend and early morning on the way to school. There is not enough parking for the residents themselves. Then you add in 78 residents, all their relatives coming to visit, plus all the staff - 109.</p> <p>They will take up any available space on Croftdown Road and make it even harder for us to park our cars, not just at the weekend but at any time. As the staff will be doing night shifts and early starts, there will be cars parking and car doors slamming all times of the day and night.</p> <p>There are lots of families with small children and the increase in road traffic is bad in terms of road safety and also more fumes they will be breathing in. I accept that it's busy on Highgate Road but Croftdown Road is a residential street and it shouldn't be as busy as a main road yet it will be, and it will be worse because it is much narrower but will take all the traffic going on and off Highgate Road as people arrive and leave.</p> <p>There are three secondary schools in the area - it is terrifying watching the teenagers crossing the road without looking and I am amazed there hasn't been a fatal accident or near miss in the time I have lived here. Add in more cars, articulated lorries during the construction of this site, catering lorries and ambulances daily to support the needs of the residents at the old people's home - this is going to have a very dangerous impact on the area. I expect to see more damage to cars parked on this already narrow road which isn't designed to have such heavy traffic and large vehicles.</p> <p>The planning around how people are meant to visit the home and get to work hasn't been factored in. The council have taken away bus routes and the buses to the William Ellis stop (which would be nearest the home) are infrequent, so people will be forced to drive when investment should be made to enable people to use public transport.</p> <p>It is a large site and there is adequate space to factor in parking with the redesign of the home. This doesn't seem to have happened presumably because they would rather use the space for units for the elderly than parking to adequately support a smaller number of residents to live there. This is maximising profit to the developer while leaving the residents of Croftdown and surrounding streets with a real issue.</p> <p>We would ask you to insist on a more useful parking provision for this home.</p>

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2022/5320/P	Sara Whyte	04/02/2023 12:15:46	OBJ	<p>This application is for a large commercial property within a residential conservation area. The building is far too big and overbearing, the floor space has been increased by 68% above the permitted scheme, it's impact on the local area has been totally underestimated, the invasion of privacy for the neighbouring properties and the increase in traffic as a result of this proposal has been totally underplayed. This is a flawed application with insufficient detail as to its true impact so must be rejected.</p> <p>Staffing - it is stated that 25 nursing and care staff will be on site at peak periods but the Care Concern group operational statement says there will be supporting healthcare professions (doctors, physiotherapists, podiatrists, hairdressers, activity therapists) plus the other support service staff which are needed for such a large venture (chefs, cleaners, gardeners, security, administration and reception). None of these have been included in the planning statement and will obviously have an impact on the local area. No reference has been made to the impact on local services e.g. GP surgeries. These will also be affected by the 41 new homes at Highgate Newtown currently being constructed.</p> <p>Noise - the general running of such a large unit will mean frequent, loud and distracting noise. The loading bay for deliveries and collections, as well as the ambulance area, are badly placed as they are too close to the houses in Regency Lawn, who will be adversely affected by the increase in noise level. It is unreasonable to expect the neighbours to have to close their windows on a warm sunny day.</p> <p>Just a fleeting reference is given to waste management but how many times a week does clinical waste from 78 dementia patients need collecting and how many times will the food waste of 234 meals per day (and that is just for patients) need collecting. The storage of refuse is to be in a communal refuse store with louvred doors. There is no mention of how the odours are to be controlled. The commercial kitchen ventilation will be through an extract duct on the roof, presumably forcing the kitchen smells out into the surrounding areas.</p> <p>Traffic - the Road Safety Action plan, part of the Camden Transport Strategy 2019-2041 states its wish to “reduce and mitigate the impact of transport based emissions and noise” . This proposal will dramatically increase traffic volume in the Dartmouth Park area. Camden’s Healthy School streets initiative aims to “improve air quality in the vicinity of the school and cut down on traffic outside schools”. The amount of schools quoted in the application has missed out the 2 schools in Croftdown road and the other 2 based opposite Croftdown road. The La Swap pupils also walk around the area on their way to and from Acland Burghley.</p> <p>As well as the admitted 11-12 deliveries per day (24 journeys in all) the traffic will increase further due to community staff, family and friends visits and collections (waste, food, clinical and rubbish - the waste collection lorries are run on diesel thus introducing more pollution to the area). This level of traffic is predicted for the completed care home and does not include the piling rigs, tipper trucks, 16.5 articulated vehicles, concrete mixers and sundry vehicles which will be needed for the estimated 2 years of construction.</p> <p>Light - the right to light impacts the amount of accessible sunlight, especially during the winter months. The lower winter sun will be blocked by the 4 storeys which will overshadow the gardens and ground floor kitchen/living rooms in Regency Lawn which will lose the morning sunshine.</p> <p>The 124 artificial external lights surrounding the building will impact all the residents whose bedrooms face the unit.</p> <p>Bats - the proposal to add bat boxes to mitigate the harm is ridiculous as bats feeding behaviours are affected by artificial light as it affects their commuting and foraging routes. (Bats.org.uk)</p> <p>Swifts - congregate in large numbers here during the summer months and are also affected by artificial light.</p>

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
				<p>"It has important implications for the bird's physiology, breeding cycle and fitness and may have cascading effects on their ecosystem" (nature.com/articles)</p> <p>A continuous level of light is also known to have effects on general wildlife and ecosystems.</p> <p>Height - the roof top plant enclosure for heat pumps will result in a higher level of the building visible from the surrounding homes. This will also set a precedent for a 6 storey building for any future applications.</p> <p>There is no mention of who will be responsible for the security, management and provision of finances for the upkeep of the "Green space".</p> <p>The large basement raises concerns about how much it will raise the water table and any spillage to the surrounding properties.</p> <p>This application needs to be rejected.</p>
2022/5320/P	Susannah Taffler	05/02/2023 20:59:03	COMMNT	<p>I very much oppose this planned development in a residential conservation area surrounded by schools bounded by narrow roads and with minimal parking. If it goes ahead it will only generate noise, pollution and lorry and delivery van traffic adversely affecting local residents and make their parking by their houses in the nearby roads very difficult quite apart from increased traffic risk to children going to the local schools.</p> <p>In addition the scale of development is all wrong and the planned care home too high for the area.</p> <p>I very much hope Camden planning committee will take into account the obvious highly negative impact on the surrounding area the planned development would lead to and all the copious local objections from those who would suffer from it. Profit for the developers would then be at the direct expense of local residents' quality of life with much of their direct and indirect costs exported on to them.</p>
2022/5320/P	Noelle Kumpel	05/02/2023 16:02:30	OBJ	<p>I wish to object to this planning application for the following reasons.</p> <p>1. The proposed structure is completely out of proportion to other structures in the neighbourhood. While it was initially stated by the developers that the structure would not differ in scale to that removed, the proposal is for a building up to 62.7m high. The design as currently proposed is far too close to neighbouring properties, which will affect their light and cause them to be overlooked.</p> <p>The amount of construction required will be significantly detrimental to what is otherwise a quiet residential neighbourhood.</p> <p>The size of the development will certainly increase traffic and congestion in streets that are home not only to a large resident population, but also a primary school (Brookfield), a secondary school (La Sainte Union), and two other nearby secondary schools. This will have a substantial negative impact on air quality, which is a cause of numerous health risks and deaths in London. It sacrifices children's health for developer profits.</p> <p>The traffic will also increase the risks of accidents given all the school children in the area, an issue which is already a concern.</p>

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2022/5320/P	Angus Rollo	05/02/2023 21:00:00	OBJ	<p>We strongly object to this application.</p> <p>Its size (78 beds and 5 storeys) is grotesquely out of proportion for quiet residential roads in a conservation area.</p> <p>It would also lead to excessive volumes of traffic, both during the construction phase and once built, with resulting impact on air quality and noise pollution, and further strain on parking. The eight parking spaces would be patently insufficient to cover staff and visitors, not to mention the numerous contractors that would be needed to supply the facility. The facility itself would also create light and noise pollution that will adversely impact the surrounding neighbourhood.</p>
2022/5320/P	Tara Ballarotto	05/02/2023 18:21:10	OBJ	<p>I Object to the development of a 78 bed nursing home in the Mansfield bowling club.</p> <p>Taking away a natural green space within the community to erect a development is environmentally not the right thing to do by taking away green space for the local community who already lives here. The air quality is already low, the noise of the plans is non stop taking any more green space from the community is just polluting and ruining the health of the locals.</p> <p>On top of that this establishment will add an additional amount of cars, traffic and people into an already dense neighbourhood. There are a lot of schools and school children who run around the neighbourhood freely and adding such a big establishment and additional populations will make the neighbourhood less safe for the school children whose family feel in security due to the lack traffic and cars.</p> <p>Lastly building such a large structure into a neighbourhood that has a traditional look and feel and is not a high rise type of area and would ruin the aesthetic of the area.</p> <p>I really you Camden council think more of the constituents than you of money in this case.</p>

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2022/5320/P	Aniela Shuckburgh	05/02/2023 21:00:30	COMMNT	<p>In principle, we have no objection to the redevelopment of this site with a residential home, public garden and tennis courts. However, we share the concerns of our neighbours that the height of the proposed residential home is higher than the surrounding buildings, which is neither in keeping with the area nor appropriate for a building in the middle of an already built up area. Increased traffic congestion is also a concern as many of the local streets are quite narrow and not suitable for significantly increased traffic.</p> <p>In terms of the tennis courts, we would urge the Council to ensure that the construction of the care home is contingent on the tennis courts/development of the northern end being completed first. It is easy to see a scenario where the northern end is not appropriately completed when the developer has achieved their main aim of building the care home.</p> <p>We would also resist floodlights on the courts as this would allow play late into the night and be a disturbance to local residents. The proposed tennis pavilion should not be higher than one-storey and overlook any of the residents' gardens.</p> <p>The houses on Dartmouth Park Avenue that back onto the site also have existing direct access onto the site, which we presume would be maintained.</p> <p>This is going to be a significant construction project with all the associated noise, mess, traffic congestion and impact on air quality for an area with lots of families and many local schools. We would urge the Council to ensure that there are stringent controls on when work is allowed to take place, careful safety protections in place as many children and young people are going to and from school and rules when site vehicles have access to the site (not at night or outside working hours).</p>
2022/5320/P	Morgan Lewis	05/02/2023 18:19:29	OBJ	The proposed scheme is overly dense for the area. There needs to be more on-site parking for this many employees.
2022/5320/P	D Ma	04/02/2023 18:41:37	OBJ	<p>This is a conservation area. The previously approved planning application was on the imprint of the old building at an appropriate height. This developer is building a 5 story monolith that is barely 1m away from some residential boundaries. Happy for a care home to be there but an appropriately sized one for the space and residential streets that will bear the daily brunt of the increase of vehicles. The only reason it needs to be so big is to house a sufficient number of residents in the borough requiring care. Except, this is not for the community. Like the developer's other care home which is on Bishop's Avenue, it is a FOR PROFIT PRIVATE care home. They do not accept any local authority funded or topped up residents. How can Camden Council, in good conscience allow this type of enormous glossy development that is half the height of the millennium wheel in a community space?</p>

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2022/5320/P	Bill Anderson and Susie Figgis	03/02/2023 09:48:32	OBJ	<p>We are residents in Spencer Rise. We object to Spencer Rise being used as the construction vehicle route to the site.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Spencer Rise is a very narrow road with pavement parking on either side. There is already considerable tension in the street caused by cars travelling in opposite directions not being able to pass each other. 2. This has been compounded by the increase in delivery vehicles using the street as a cut through. We have been informed by drivers that it is their companies' routing/navigation applications that make them use Spencer Rise. 3. The intersection of Spencer Rise and York Rise is a very tight corner. Large vehicles regularly get stuck here and parked cars are often damaged.
2022/5320/P	John Dick	05/02/2023 20:55:44	OBJ	<p>I think this will cause harm to the Conservation Area. My family includes 3 young children (12, 9 and 4) will be impacted by the extra traffic, fumes and disruption during the building period and afterward. This will have a detrimental effect on the local schools.</p>
2022/5320/P	Teo Lasarte	03/02/2023 22:29:58	COMNOT	<p>I am against the development given its scale and height. I ask that the conservation area be respected.</p>

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

2022/5320/P	Hilary Reicher	05/02/2023 12:03:41	OBJ	
-------------	----------------	---------------------	-----	--

¿
¿
¿

I am the secretary of the Croftdown Road Residents Association.
Our concerns about the project (planning application 2022/5320/P) are as follows:

General:

The last application for replacement of the Mansfield Bowling Club building had an acceptable impact on the Dartmouth Park Conservation Area because it replaced a dated, unattractive building, but had the same footprint and bulk of the original. The current application is for 4 storeys and a basement so 3m taller, and has a nearly 70% increase in floor space. Therefore, a much increased bulk compared with the permitted scheme. This is undoubtably harmful to the whole of the Dartmouth Park Conservation Area and contrary to the Camden Local Plan Policy D2, the NPPF and the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990.

We do not object to redevelopment of the site; it needs to be of a scale fitting in to the neighbourhood. This proposal is monstrous and does not.

Affordable housing requirement:

The application proposals do not include any provision for affordable housing and are therefore contrary to Camden Local Plan Policies H4 and H8

Traffic and parking and road safety:

The application does not appear to take into account the four local schools, other than a Saturday programme. The impact of the additional traffic generated by this scheme will be significant on both air quality and general road safety. One of the entrances to this proposed development is in Croftdown Road which is meant to be a car free area.

This should also be seen in the context of the impacts on traffic, emission increases and parking due to the soon to be finished housing development, 41 flats, in Bertram Street now called Quarter, whose 2nd entrance is in Croftdown Road. This is a car free site so those residents with cars will need to drive and park locally and delivery vehicle traffic will also increase.

During construction:

There will be heavy construction machinery and lorries travelling up and down the road during the build. On completion, the running of such a large project will inevitably mean a considerable increase in commercial and operational traffic.

The Croftdown Road Residents Association urges you to reject this latest application for development of the site.

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2022/5320/P	Felicity Taylor	04/02/2023 14:42:54	OBJ	<p>If this development is allowed to go ahead, it invites the question ¿What is the point of a Conservation Area? It is just to make sure that people do not have the wrong kind of windows, or is it intended to conserve the amenities and character of a neighbourhood?</p> <p>The height of the building is out of keeping with the area, and will infringe on the privacy of local residents.</p> <p>The increase in traffic congestion and pollution will not end with the building work, but will be in fact be worse because of the unsuitability of the site, the lack of parking facilities on site, the constant traffic of deliveries, patients, medical staff, ambulances, visitors who will tend to be older and frailer, and unable to use public transport.</p> <p>This additional traffic will spill over into local roads in the area, and it makes a nonsense of the Brookfield School Healthy School Healthy School Streets project. It will be an additional safety hazard as well as more exposure to high levels of pollution for the many pupils walking to and from the three large secondary schools in the area, and to several primary schools.</p>

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2022/5320/P	Prof. Tim Blackburn	03/02/2023 13:40:29	OBJ	<p>I wish to object to this planning application in the strongest terms, for several reasons.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The proposed structure is completely out of proportion to other structures in the neighbourhood. While it was initially stated by the developers that the structure would not differ in scale to that removed, the proposal is for a building up to 62.7m high. That is nearly half the height of the London Eye (130m) and only a few metres less than Grenfell Tower (67m). The briefest of visits to the site will show how ridiculous this would be in this residential setting. Moreover, as addressed in point 2, the number of patients proposed to be housed here will inevitably lead to huge negative environmental impacts. 2. The size of the development will certainly increase traffic and congestion in streets that are already frequently used a rat-run, but which are home not only to a large resident population, but also a primary school (Brookfield), an adjacent secondary school (La Sainte Union), and two other nearby secondary schools. This will have a substantial negative impact on air quality, which we know is a cause of numerous health risks and deaths in London and beyond. It completely undermines the Healthy School Street initiative - children's health being sacrificed for developer profits. 3. The traffic will also increase the risks of accidents given all the school children in the area, an issue which is already a concern. I see no adequate provisions in this proposal for how all the extra traffic and parking needs will be accommodated in this area. 4. The design as currently proposed is far too close to neighbouring properties, which will affect their light and cause them to be overlooked. 5. The amount of construction required will be significantly detrimental to what is otherwise a quiet residential neighbourhood. 6. As an ecological scientist, I can say with confidence that the ecological survey is totally insufficient to assess the presence of populations of threatened invertebrates (or other species) on the site. For example, it states "Jersey tiger (Euplagia quadripunctaria) has been recorded on multiple occasions 1km north of the site, with the most recent record from 2021". Yet, this species is frequently seen on the verge of the proposed development, and is regularly caught in substantial numbers just 100m away in Laurier Road where I run a regular moth trap, including throughout 2022. Furthermore, other invertebrates in this area include Oak Hook-tip - Vulnerable according to the UK Red List – and Prays peregrina – a species first described from Hampstead Heath and known principally worldwide from this small area of London. My moth trap frequently attracts stag beetles, nationally scarce species, with protection under Schedule 5 of the Wildlife and Countryside Act (1981). I have also seen Firecrest in this area, a scarce breeding bird species in the UK. Hampstead Heath and its environs are a stronghold for Hedgehog in London. The assessment of the impact of the development on these species is completely inadequate. Even small patches of habitat can be important to support metapopulations of vulnerable species in a matrix of otherwise unsuitable structures, and the removal of such patches can lead to local and regional extinction - these issues have not even been considered. There was a single walkover visit on 6th May 2022 - it is not possible to make any sort of evidence-based decision on the suitability of this site for species on the basis of such limited evidence. <p>Furthermore, the scale of this application gets greater and its impact worse, with every iteration. I have no trust in these developers not to switch to a residential development once planning is granted, having used the care</p>

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
				home designation as a Trojan Horse. I am surprised and disappointed that Camden Council does not dismiss these plans out of hand.
2022/5320/P	Myles Ogilvie	03/02/2023 12:33:11	OBJ	<p>Dear Sirs,</p> <p>My property is one of the closest to the new development. It lies on York Rise which is the adjoining road below the bowling club, and therefore overlooked by it. The new proposal extends the envelope of the old Bowling club closer our house, and higher than the original building. Our entire family life would now be observed from the bowling club - all our rear windows and our garden will have zero privacy. This proposal substantially impacts the quality of life available to us in our home.</p> <p>The bowling club site is large and other residential roads around the site are higher than the club itself, meaning they are not overlooked by the development. Positioning the building extensions in these other directions will have negligible impact on the privacy of those properties which will NOT be overlooked or lose any privacy as a result. There adjustments need to be made to respectfully accommodate the concerns of all neighbours.</p> <p>Given the lack of consideration for the aspect and geography of York Rise and the impact on the life of my family and our neighbours families in this street, I object to this proposal.</p> <p>Myles Ogilvie</p>

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2022/5320/P	Neil and Juliet Harris	04/02/2023 16:47:55	OBJ	<p>We OBJECT to the current planning application.</p> <p>We have lived at 42 Laurier Rd for 11 years. Our garden borders the proposed development site and, crucially for us, is one of the properties that will be closest to this new building.</p> <p>We maintain that the new building has vastly increased in scale since the original proposal was granted (on appeal). Originally planning was granted for a building that observed the original footprint of the club and also its height.</p> <p>The new proposal not only exceeds the height of the old building by many meters, it also strays from the original footprint considerably.</p> <p>Furthermore, it can be shown that the architects are working from an old building footprint that is itself incorrect. We have photo's that show where the original building lay - it is now assumed that the old building extended half way across our garden which is incorrect and thus extends the old footprint by many meters to the south west.</p> <p>This new building is totally out of character for this conservation area - both in style and scale. The massing of a 4 storey structure (plus basement) against the upper Laurier gardens of such a monolith will have a detrimental effect on our properties.</p> <p>We accept that some sort of building will be necessary on this site but the decision to increase its scale in this way makes a mockery of the existing planning laws.</p> <p>We therefore OBJECT to this application.</p>
2022/5320/P	Myles Ogilvie	03/02/2023 12:33:14	OBJ	<p>Dear Sirs,</p> <p>My property is one of the closest to the new development. It lies on York Rise which is the adjoining road below the bowling club, and therefore overlooked by it. The new proposal extends the envelope of the old Bowling club closer our house, and higher than the original building. Our entire family life would now be observed from the bowling club - all our rear windows and our garden will have zero privacy. This proposal substantially impacts the quality of life available to us in our home.</p> <p>The bowling club site is large and other residential roads around the site are higher than the club itself, meaning they are not overlooked by the development. Positioning the building extensions in these other directions will have negligible impact on the privacy of those properties which will NOT be overlooked or lose any privacy as a result. There adjustments need to be made to respectfully accommodate the concerns of all neighbours.</p> <p>Given the lack of consideration for the aspect and geography of York Rise and the impact on the life of my family and our neighbours families in this street, I object to this proposal.</p> <p>Myles Ogilvie</p>

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2022/5320/P	James S Dooley	05/02/2023 17:21:10	OBJ	<p>I live at 11 Regency Lawn which is immediately adjacent to the entrance road between Croftdown Road and the site for which the above planning permission has been submitted (the former Mansfield Bowling Club). Because of this I have several concerns regarding the proposal set out and the effect that it will have on me and my property, as well as the local community.</p> <p>I object to this application because of the disruption due to noise from entry and exit of vehicles from the Care Home, discussed in the first section (1) below. Other points are discussed in (2) to (6).</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Noise/disruption from vehicles entering and leaving the site when open Safety of users of Croftdown Road adjacent to the site entrance Disruption to me by light from bollards. Design and construction of the entrance road. Height of the Care Home development. Other points. <p>1. Noise/disruption from vehicles entering and leaving the site when open.</p> <p>The Transport Statement on page 26 gives the number of expected LGV deliveries as 12 arriving and 11 departing each day. In addition based on the 25 staff given as servicing the patients, 17 single or multiple vehicle occupant trips are I think shown (Table 6.6). The latter is highly likely to be an underestimate. For example, visitors to patients in the Care Home are not included. Some will be travelling a distance to see loved ones and even though parking spaces are restricted, many will come by car and be dropped off, or will come by taxi.</p> <p>This disruption from vehicles is compounded by the observation that noise resonates down this entrance road when made within it – possibly because of the solid boundaries (i.e. walls).</p> <p>My quiet living areas are at the back of my house, and disruption is predictable and a major concern. Previously a second entry roadway has been raised and discussed. Is this still an option?</p> <p>2. Safety of users of Croftdown Road adjacent to the site entrance.</p> <p>I am concerned by the effect on those using Croftdown Road as a result of the entry and exit of vehicles etc into and from the entry road to the Care Home</p> <p>Thus the use of Croftdown Road by children and traffic has I believe been greatly underestimated. I was surprised that one of the entrances to La Sainte Union Catholic School in Croftdown Road (virtually opposite York Rise) does not appear to be mentioned anywhere. The Music School is, but this is to my knowledge only active on Saturdays. La Sainte Union School is open Monday to Friday during term time. Students enter every day of the week at between around 8.15 and 8.30am, come out onto the pavements and road for breaks at 11am and 1pm, and leave at around 3-3.30pm. Moreover, younger children with their parents cross the Mansfield Bowling Club entrance in Croftdown Road en route for school at around 9am and return at 3.30 or so. Children from other local schools also pass this way at the start, occasionally during and at the end of their day. The safety of these school children and their parents needs to be taken into account – both after the Care Home has been opened but also particularly during the construction phase.</p> <p>An additional potential risk to pedestrians could be the proposed change in the radius of the pavement, adjacent to the entrance road. This is planned to be increased to a 'radius' of 5 meters I think, to allow larger lorries to exit without detriment to the cars parked opposite. I think any potential risk to pedestrians needs to be analysed.</p> <p>3. Disruption to me by light from bollards.</p>

Application No: Consultees Name: Received:

Comment:

Response:

There are data regarding the lighting strategy. My house is recognised as being the only property onto which significant light from bollards will spread but this is said not to be a problem as I have no windows in that wall. However, these bollard lights will extend past my wall and alongside my garden fence at the back and then into the parking area etc of the Care Home. I wish to point out that my living room on the first floor and main bedroom on the 2nd floor look out over rear part of the entrance road itself, and also over the entry area of the proposed Care Home. Thus there will be numerous foci of light visible from my windows. There does not seem to be a clear policy stated of whether they will be turned off at a set time. As far of quality of life is concerned this is a major concern.

4. Design and construction of the entrance road.

In the image provided of the entrance road (Page 5 of 1962-PL-DAS PT8(2)), the road is shown as a single entity with no pavements. However, there are currently two tarmac pavements, one on each side. This 'plan' needs review and modification for two main reasons.

a. The pavement in this entrance road adjacent to the wall of my house (No 11) provides the route to the front doors of Regency Lawn numbers 11, 13, 14, and 15. Thus we walk down this pavement to the gate at the back, and thence to the patio gardens and then the front doors (which for these houses are at the back). This pavement is used by ourselves, family, visitors, postal workers, couriers etc. Such a pavement is important for our safety.

b. This entrance road is subject to flooding when there is heavy rain and poor drainage. Currently the raised pavement is high enough to take us above such water when it collects. Importantly, should there be no raised pavement, pedestrians (us and indeed those walking towards the proposed Care Home) would be at risk of having to walk through water.

In addition to this pavement issue, it appears that the road surface is to be rebuilt and details of this will be needed. The roadway will need to be strong enough for the large number of construction lorries needed during the build so as not to result in damage to the adjacent houses.

5. Height of the Care Home development.

The impact of the height of the proposed development is important to appreciate and others are addressing this because of the closer relationship of their properties to the new build. However, it does appear that the plans show a taller building by one floor compared with photographs shown of the former Bowling Club building (with the small 'hut' on the roof – being wrongly used, in my opinion, as an argument for a 4th floor) and also I think compared with the planned residential development approved after appeal a few years ago. Others will be better able than I to argue for or against this, but I have major concerns about this particularly for others more closely overlooked by the main development.

6. Other points.

The application consists of over 60 files with some very long documents, and review in the time available was challenging. However, other points at this stage include:

Security for the site when completed needs specifying. The possibility of people wandering freely there at night concerns me. Gates on the entry road are mentioned, but I could not see any detail given for these.

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2022/5320/P	Myles Ogilvie	03/02/2023 12:33:18	OBJ	<p>Dear Sirs,</p> <p>My property is one of the closest to the new development. It lies on York Rise which is the adjoining road below the bowling club, and therefore overlooked by it. The new proposal extends the envelope of the old Bowling club closer our house, and higher than the original building. Our entire family life would now be observed from the bowling club - all our rear windows and our garden will have zero privacy. This proposal substantially impacts the quality of life available to us in our home.</p> <p>The bowling club site is large and other residential roads around the site are higher than the club itself, meaning they are not overlooked by the development. Positioning the building extensions in these other directions will have negligible impact on the privacy of those properties which will NOT be overlooked or lose any privacy as a result. There adjustments need to be made to respectfully accommodate the concerns of all neighbours.</p> <p>Given the lack of consideration for the aspect and geography of York Rise and the impact on the life of my family and our neighbours families in this street, I object to this proposal.</p> <p>Myles Ogilvie</p>
2022/5320/P	Nicola Pittam	05/02/2023 17:21:39	OBJ	<p>I wish to object to the current planning application because of the implications for the volume of traffic on Croftdown Road where it is already very difficult to park and where the road frequently gets blocked as cars try to pass each other.</p> <p>The proposal is for a large 78 room care home. That implies a larger number of staff, all of whom will be continuously coming and going at all hours. There will also be a steady stream of visitors to see the residents.</p> <p>There is limited provision for car parking on the site. As controlled parking only operates between 10am to 12pm weekdays, staff and visitors are likely to use the street to park outside those hours, thereby making a difficult parking situation for residents of Croftdown Rd intolerable. The increase in traffic flow will also block the roads, exacerbating the existing problem (the street already gets blocked at peak periods). The proposal as it stands is likely to lead to snarled up roads for most of the day instead of just for an hour.</p> <p>I think the proposal to have a care home only works if the number of beds is reduced considerably from the proposed 78.</p>

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2022/5320/P	Dartmouth Park Neighbourhood Forum	05/02/2023 23:18:40	OBJ	<p>This is a sensitive site in the heart of the Dartmouth Park Conservation Area, surrounded on all sides by homes. Significant improvements are required to the proposed development before we can support it.</p> <p>Chapter 9 of the Dartmouth Park Neighbourhood Plan (DPNP) sets out the community's expectations for the site:</p> <p>"The community's strong preference is for the Mansfield site to remain wholly in use for sport, leisure and recreation purposes. The Forum is not seeking to allocate the site for development. However, should development proceed on this site, we would support a scheme incorporating the following principles:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The development would be residential only and would not exceed the density provided for in the current consent. • The total footprint of the development would not exceed that of the previous bowling club building and would not intrude into the green space reserved for leisure activities as shown on Fig. 6. • The design of new housing would respond positively to the characteristics of surrounding residential development and in particular will be informed by the terraced typologies that are prevalent in the surrounding area. • The development will be expected to provide the maximum amount of affordable housing provided for in the Local Plan policies and this Neighbourhood Plan. • Provision should be included for intermediate housing that will help meet the needs of local teachers, nurses and other medical staff. • Any development should be car-free, in accordance with Camden Local Plan Policy T2 (Parking and car-free development). • The part of the site shown in Fig. 6 would be reserved for sport / leisure / recreation purposes and would be publicly accessible. • The developers would put in place procedures to ensure that the open space is sustainably managed and maintained for the future for the benefit of the public." <p>Others have commented on the broader issues relating to development of this site, including the requirement for open space and local issues including drainage (River Fleet) and the impact on traffic and parking of a facility employing a significant number of staff.</p> <p>In the context of these other objections, we will focus our comments mainly on design, where the most relevant Neighbourhood Plan policies are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • DC1 on sense of place, "ensuring that multi-unit developments in areas predominantly characterised by traditional terraced, semi-detached and detached housing will have scale and massing which respects that of surrounding buildings." • DC2 requires that in the case of developments within the Dartmouth Park Conservation Area, including alterations or extensions to existing buildings, ensuring that the development preserves or enhances the character or appearance of the Conservation Area; • DC3 sets out that good design in Dartmouth Park means: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> (a) achieving high quality design that respects the scale, mass, density and character of existing and

Application No: Consultees Name: Received:

Comment:

Response:

surrounding buildings and preserves the open and green character of the area;
(b) relating developments to the urban landscape value of the street setting, including respecting the established orientation and grain of existing development, established building set-backs, and arrangements of front gardens, walls, railings or hedges;
(c) relating developments to established plot widths in the streets where development is proposed, particularly where they establish a rhythm to the architecture in a street;
(d) where multi-storey developments are permitted in accordance with the other policies in this Plan, avoiding juxtaposition of buildings of significantly different scale and massing and incorporating a gradual transition from the scale of the surrounding built context where appropriate;
(e) ensuring that any extensions or modifications to existing buildings are subordinate to the existing development and in keeping with its setting, including the relationship to any adjoining properties;
(f) using good quality materials that complement the existing palette of materials used within the immediate area;
(g) providing within the development boundary sufficient appropriately sited and well integrated amenity space, refuse and recycling storage, bicycle and mobility vehicle parking and storage, and delivery space (as appropriate to the size and type of development) to ensure a high quality and well managed streetscape.

The scheme falls significantly short of the desired 'high-quality design' set out in the Plan. Reasons are set out below:

1. Scale and massing: Whilst the premise of a 4-storey building on this site is not necessarily out of context, a 4-storey building of this size and mass is not in keeping with the immediately adjacent Conservation Area of residential-scale buildings. The consultation suggested the taller elements would be in the centre of the site though the current proposal has a 4-storey wing projecting out to the Laurier Road boundary. This is 2 storeys higher than the previous building and there is no assessment of the impact of this on the amenity of the Laurier Road gardens
2. Design: The design is uninspiring and lacks clarity and proportion in plan form, elevational treatment and scale. In particular:
 - i. The tennis court elevation (which is top-heavy). Some effort has been made to break up the mass on the top floor but this is not successful.
 - ii. The entrance has an unwelcoming institutional appearance. This is the main public-facing aspect of the proposal but looks like the rear service wing of the building. (also note that the images of the entrance differ between the submitted drawings/ DAS and some of the supplementary documents)
 - iii. Courtyard design reflects a brief which has been inserted into an established building mass rather than a considered piece of architecture. Among other issues, this results in ground-floor bedrooms with full-height windows opening directly onto the main central gathering space.
3. Materials: The change in brick colour goes some way to define different building elements but does not serve the purpose of reducing the scale of the building, but rather increasing it and lending to the institutional feel. A change of material to reflect the surrounding roofs and a reduced scale of the top floor might help.
4. Sustainability: The DAS suggests that the rooms will be naturally ventilated by opening windows for fresh air. This is contrary to the Sustainability statement which suggests an MVHR system will be used to circulate air mechanically. The latter is required to meet the Sustainability targets. If windows are openable then targets will not be met. Can they clarify which it is?
5. Tennis court to gardens ratio: If this is to be a more public space rather than a private tennis facility, a larger garden, more usable with the community building, feels more appropriate.
6. Community building: The Tennis club community building appears to be an afterthought and bears no

Application No: Consultees Name: Received:

Comment:

Response:

relation to the care home. Little effort has gone into the design.

7. Trees: The proposal looks to cut through the root bowl of Tree 14 and excavate more into it than is shown in the arboricultural statement. This is for the tree officer really but the applicant should clarify the levels around this tree. The plan shows ground protection to the roots but proposals seem to excavate 1 storey through the roots to within around 1m of the trunk.

We would also raise the following important points:

- Public access to open space: Whatever schemes is approved on this site, it is imperative that the open space is accessible to the public. A mechanism needs to be in place to ensure that the space cannot be privatised at a later date.
 - Affordable housing: Camden Local Plan Policy H4 makes it clear that development in use class C2 will be required to include affordable housing. It is not evident that the applicant is aware of this. We note that the proposal will be for a very high end care home. If a care home is to be built here, we would require a reasonable element of affordable accommodation to be included before we can offer our support. Camden Council will hopefully be aware that the same developer made the national news by claiming that affordable housing would not be viable on a development of 109 £2million (average) homes on The Bishops Avenue – see <https://www.theguardian.com/society/2021/nov/20/affordable-homes-in-billionaires-row-scheme-unviable-says-developer>
-

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2022/5320/P	Mr & Mrs Rose	04/02/2023 15:17:07	OBJ	<p>Mr & Mrs Rose Regency Lawn objections to Planning 2022/5320/P Mansfield Site</p> <p>We have lived in Regency Lawn for over 35 years. Our home is a three storey town house with 20ft (6.1m) garden. Our ground floor kitchen/dining room, 1st floor sitting room, 2nd floor master bedroom and garden are at the back of the house and overlook the Mansfield site. We would be more than happy for a member of Camden Planning Department to visit our house and so appreciate our location and the impact of the potential build on our and our neighbours' quiet enjoyment with regard to privacy, visual impact, lighting, loss of sunlight, overlooking and noise nuisance emanating from the proposed overbearing build.</p> <p>We fully endorse the separate objection lodged on our behalf by Howard Cole Town and Country Planning experts.</p> <p>We have no objection in principle to a care home but we do have objections to the scale of the planning application and the basis on which some of the impact assessments are based:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Object to size and overbearing massing. The Scheme approved on appeal January 30th 2017 was for a part 2 storey and part 3 storey building with no basement incorporating 21 residential dwellings Planning 2015/1444/P with other associated permissions re. tennis courts etc. This application should be treating the extant planning as the benchmark whereas a 5 storey building, including basement, far exceeds the extant plan in height, 62.7m (we believe this figure is inaccurate), and mass, the internal floorspace is at least 68.8% bigger than the extant plan, and oversteps the original footprint at various points whilst not utilising other areas of available footprint particularly with regard to the Eastern elevation, this point is clearly shown on many documents including the Wolff Architects Ground Floor Plan. <p>SMPlanning Planning Statement doc. submitted 19/12/2022 16.24</p> <p>4.4 Community Engagement - It appears that the concerns shared by the community have not been acknowledged and taken into account especially with regard to Regency Lawn, Croftdown Road.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. Regency Lawn houses nos. 4 - 9 are nearest to the original footprint - the new plan encroaches yet nearer. b. During community engagement we were assured the 4th floor would be set back and therefore not visible from 4 -9 Regency Lawn. The plans indicate otherwise (Wolff Architects Mass Distribution plan 6.3) <p>The Dartmouth Park Neighbourhood Forum's comments have been ignored.</p> <p>6.38 "The consultation responses included a response from the Dartmouth Park Neighbourhood Forum which was supportive of the site being allocated for a residential care home commenting 'A care home is an appropriate use provided it does not exceed the size and massing of the current approved development'"</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 2. Object to the lack of assessment with regard to the impact of the build to 4 -9 Regency Lawn. Document 1962 PLDAS - PT1(2) 1.1 <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. Site Location Significant Buildings ignores Regency Lawn in its assessment whereas all other local buildings are highlighted in some way. b. Assessment of Impact Section 5 Heritage Statement. We refute the statement made 5.15 Dartmouth Park Conservation Area as we do not consider that the architectural quality will improve the area based on their

Application No: Consultees Name: Received:

Comment: Response:

assessment of our homes. Their subjective comment on the “detractive” nature of our houses is no reason for the developer and architects to ignore the views and impact of the build on the families living in Regency Lawn and so build bigger.

c. Assessment of Impact Section 5 - “The proposed scale of the new building has been considerably designed to ensure its sensitive integration into the surrounding built environment. A stepped form has been chosen to mitigate the impact of additional massing in the area. Four-storey elements of the building are limited to the centre of the Site boundary. Three and two-storey elements are situated closer to the boundary and reflect the scale of existing houses here”. We do not consider that this is the case in respect of Regency Lawn houses which are on the same level as the footprint and nearer given their short gardens whereas houses in Dartmouth Park Avenue and Laurier Road have considerably longer gardens and look down on the site as they are on a hill. As Doc 1962 PL DAS PT7 (2) clearly indicates.

d. It has been repeatedly pointed out that 5 & 6 Regency Lawn are set back from the rest of Regency Lawn Croftdown Road and hence their 20ft gardens are shorter as these houses are located nearer to the site. However Doc 1962 PL DAS PT7 (2) Key - indicates Neighbouring Houses line runs through houses nos. 5 and 6 Regency Lawn hence any measurements regarding basement impact, inside and outside lighting impact, sunlight studies, window placement re. privacy and light pollution, location of services area and vehicle movement of large vehicles concerns are all based on inaccurate measurements as they have not been assessed by reference to houses nearest to the site.

3. Object to the insensitive placement of windows as indicated on various Wolff Architects design drawings ie. proposed Western Elevation, proposed Ground, 1st, 2nd and 3rd floor plans. The window placement is continuous from ground to top level. The windows service stairwells, lift waiting areas, bedrooms and bathrooms are considered to be an invasion of our privacy as they overlook the living areas in our house. Additionally the illumination of these areas will be considerable given the use of the building which is intended so we will suffer light pollution. Wolff Architects Chapter 6.10 Security Lighting - “24 hour lighting to communal parts of block will be utilised. This will include communal entrance halls, lobbies, landings, corridors and stairwells and all entrance/exit points”.

4. STRONGLY OBJECT to the location of the Service Area as indicated on various site plans and RO1-JT-SD-Transport Statement F4 Caneparo Associates 4.13 and Appendix G & H refers.

a. According to the plan all large vehicles move onto the site in forward gear but will need to reverse onto the back fences of 5 & 6 Regency Lawn in order to leave the site in forward gear. Unhealthy emissions from vehicles predicted.

b. “12 vehicles a day, between 7am and 7pm, visiting Service area plus further refuse and clinical waste removal throughout the week”. This is likely to be a significant underestimate and as already pointed out 5 & 6 Regency Lawn are both nearest to the site and have the shortest gardens. We will lose the right to quiet enjoyment of our gardens and living areas. Noise pollution is a real concern as every reverse movement of commercial vehicles is preceded by a continuous siren like warning beep and a loud message ‘vehicle reversing’. 12 commercial vehicles incoming, consequently 12 commercial vehicles leaving equals 24 journeys, at least!

c. Waste storage, clinical and other, will have a dedicated space BUT IT IS NOTED doors will be air ventilated with louvred access doors. Concern over noise from constant access, unpleasant odours and possible vermin interest.

d. No new trees indicated to be planted behind 5 & 6 Regency Lawn to attempt to mitigate the sight of and

Application No: Consultees Name: Received:

Comment: Response:

muffle the sound of these daily commercial vehicle visits.

5. Object to and question the findings of Lighting Impact Assessment and External Lighting Design. We disagree that the design will "cause minimum impact on the surroundings".

a. 4a. Site Lighting Layout (landscape) 35+ outside ground lights on site immediately behind Regency Lawn. Plus a further 6 Building Facade Lighting - Ground Floor 4b refers. This is far too much lighting and its effects on the neighbouring properties are wholly underestimated. The plan is considered to be light pollution.

b. Ecological Appraisal 3.6 Swifts, the record of one is inaccurate. From May to September there is a considerable number over the site. There are 3 swift nesting boxes on Regency Lawn. 3.7 Bats species x 9. Before the site was derelict and the bowling club was in business there was minimal outside lighting which was movement sensitive and hence the bats thrived. The Bat Conservation Trust clearly states the detrimental impact of light spill on the nocturnal habits of bats. The addition of bat boxes is not a suitable mitigation response as bats will not thrive due to the proposed lighting plan.

6. Object to size of development and consequent effect on air quality due to transport emissions. Air Quality Consultancy Assessment J10-1286A 10F3(2) Road Transport Emissions

a. 8.3 refers to the "proposed development is expected to generate a total of 18,250 car trips per year (50 per day)".

b. 9.9 refers to "transport emissions predicted in the air quality neutral assessment exceed the benchmark derived for an average development of this nature in Inner London".

This refers to the daily activity of the building should it receive consent. We feel the assessment is flawed and underestimates the traffic hence the emissions are of immense concern. Further impact statements will have to be considered in the Construction Management Plan should it get that far.

7. Object to size of the 'commercial' care home and the impact on local roads with regard to transport links, parking and emissions. 2 hour parking restrictions in local roads Monday to Friday 10 - 12. It is stated that there are to be 25 members of staff, divided into day and night shifts, for a 78 bed care home. Surely the number of staff is greater as in addition to nursing staff there will be cooks, cleaners, hairdresser, maintenance engineer, groundsman together with healthcare professionals and visitors attending the building daily. Parking for 1 x tennis club member(!), 2 electric charging points and 5 other spaces is not adequate. So movement of and parking cars in local roads will be adversely affected as public transport won't be suitable or appropriate for all.

The application fails to mention the impact on local schools of the transport and vehicle movement to the Mansfield site other than Saturday Music Makers at La Sainte Union School. La Sainte Union's commercial and teacher vehicle and student entrance is diagonally opposite the vehicle entrance to the Mansfield site but its weekday existence is not included in any report. This is a large secondary school with a 6th form partnership, La Swap, with four local schools. Pupils walk, use public transport, cycle and are given lifts to and from school. The large contingent of 6th form La Swap students move around the streets visiting the 4 locations at all times of the day either moving between classes or 'hanging out'. At certain times of day the roads and pavements in the area are severely clogged up as a consequence. Hence both road safety and emissions are a big concern in a Camden designated Healthy Schools street. The application also failed to mention the 41 flats, 1,2 & 3 beds, named Quarter, to be opened this year. The site is car free. There are two entrances one of which is in Croftdown Road. More cars to be parked and traffic on the local roads already

Application No: Consultees Name: Received:

Comment: Response:

predicted have not been taken into account.

8. Object to the basis on which the calculation is made Daylight and Sunlight Report (2) 4.3 1 -10 Regency Lawn. 8 Regency Lawn has been used to calculate the impact. No.8 house is further away from the potential build as the plan shows the building line tapers away from Regency Lawn houses. House nos.4, 5 & 6 are nearest. The proposed top storey does not extend across all of the build, it is nearest to nos. 4, 5 & 6 Regency Lawn. Standing in our kitchen/dining room overlooking the site the sun was directly in our faces on 23/1/23 at 8.30am. The sun is no higher than the highest house in Laurier Road and shines through the gap between two houses. The height of the application build would block out the sun. Photograph is available for scrutiny. It is likely that a number of houses in Regency Lawn wouldn't have the benefit of early morning sunlight in the winter months should there be a 4th floor so close to and overlooking Regency Lawn. This could also have an impact on the solar panels placed on four Regency Lawn roofs. Daylight and sunlight are essential for good mental health and well being.

9. Object to there being insufficient information regarding the placement of extractor and ventilation outlets. There are concerns over their placement and the impact of odours and 24 hour high noise levels and visual effect should they be protruding from the roof thus making the build even higher. The now demolished club house was part 2 storey with a small shed containing water tanks or similar on the top. Further information is required on extractor and ventilation outlets and their likely impact on neighbouring houses. We had problems with the Mansfield Bowling Club's noisy ventilation which they changed once they were made aware of the negative impact on us.

10. Object to the lack of information as to security and management of the public open space. Also the space does not adequately provide space if one is not a tennis player, child and carer or allotment holder. The tennis courts and accompanying pavilion take up an unreasonable amount of space and appear to have been given preferential treatment. It is not addressed as to how the site can be kept safe for carers and toddlers without the risk of inappropriate members of the public using and abusing this public area, previously private open space. Further information regarding the management, security and funding of the site is essential before the treatment of this area is passed.

11. Object to behind 5 and 6 Regency Lawn being the only area throughout the site where there is no additional landscaping. Trees are essential to mitigate sight of and sounds from Service area and the overbearing 4 storey building and windows.

12. Whilst it is accepted that provision of care homes in Camden is necessary and we would have no problem with a scaled down version of this plan with certain amendments which are stated above. We question the validity of HPC's conclusion that this care home will alleviate bed blocking or the Planning Statement re. the development would help free up local market housing as a result of occupants downsizing. This is defined as a dementia care home, had it been an independent/assisted living facility then very likely couples would move together from their houses or flats to an elderly care facility to meet their different needs. Unless all members of a local house or flat have dementia then houses/flats are unlikely to be freed up.

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2022/5320/P	Mr & Mrs Rose	04/02/2023 15:17:10	OBJ	<p>Mr & Mrs Rose Regency Lawn objections to Planning 2022/5320/P Mansfield Site</p> <p>We have lived in Regency Lawn for over 35 years. Our home is a three storey town house with 20ft (6.1m) garden. Our ground floor kitchen/dining room, 1st floor sitting room, 2nd floor master bedroom and garden are at the back of the house and overlook the Mansfield site. We would be more than happy for a member of Camden Planning Department to visit our house and so appreciate our location and the impact of the potential build on our and our neighbours' quiet enjoyment with regard to privacy, visual impact, lighting, loss of sunlight, overlooking and noise nuisance emanating from the proposed overbearing build.</p> <p>We fully endorse the separate objection lodged on our behalf by Howard Cole Town and Country Planning experts.</p> <p>We have no objection in principle to a care home but we do have objections to the scale of the planning application and the basis on which some of the impact assessments are based:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Object to size and overbearing massing. The Scheme approved on appeal January 30th 2017 was for a part 2 storey and part 3 storey building with no basement incorporating 21 residential dwellings Planning 2015/1444/P with other associated permissions re. tennis courts etc. This application should be treating the extant planning as the benchmark whereas a 5 storey building, including basement, far exceeds the extant plan in height, 62.7m (we believe this figure is inaccurate), and mass, the internal floorspace is at least 68.8% bigger than the extant plan, and oversteps the original footprint at various points whilst not utilising other areas of available footprint particularly with regard to the Eastern elevation, this point is clearly shown on many documents including the Wolff Architects Ground Floor Plan. <p>SMPlanning Planning Statement doc. submitted 19/12/2022 16.24</p> <p>4.4 Community Engagement - It appears that the concerns shared by the community have not been acknowledged and taken into account especially with regard to Regency Lawn, Croftdown Road.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. Regency Lawn houses nos. 4 - 9 are nearest to the original footprint - the new plan encroaches yet nearer. b. During community engagement we were assured the 4th floor would be set back and therefore not visible from 4 -9 Regency Lawn. The plans indicate otherwise (Wolff Architects Mass Distribution plan 6.3) <p>The Dartmouth Park Neighbourhood Forum's comments have been ignored.</p> <p>6.38 "The consultation responses included a response from the Dartmouth Park Neighbourhood Forum which was supportive of the site being allocated for a residential care home commenting 'A care home is an appropriate use provided it does not exceed the size and massing of the current approved development'"</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 2. Object to the lack of assessment with regard to the impact of the build to 4 -9 Regency Lawn. Document 1962 PLDAS - PT1(2) 1.1 <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. Site Location Significant Buildings ignores Regency Lawn in its assessment whereas all other local buildings are highlighted in some way. b. Assessment of Impact Section 5 Heritage Statement. We refute the statement made 5.15 Dartmouth Park Conservation Area as we do not consider that the architectural quality will improve the area based on their

Application No: Consultees Name: Received:

Comment: Response:

assessment of our homes. Their subjective comment on the “detractive” nature of our houses is no reason for the developer and architects to ignore the views and impact of the build on the families living in Regency Lawn and so build bigger.

c. Assessment of Impact Section 5 - “The proposed scale of the new building has been considerably designed to ensure its sensitive integration into the surrounding built environment. A stepped form has been chosen to mitigate the impact of additional massing in the area. Four-storey elements of the building are limited to the centre of the Site boundary. Three and two-storey elements are situated closer to the boundary and reflect the scale of existing houses here”. We do not consider that this is the case in respect of Regency Lawn houses which are on the same level as the footprint and nearer given their short gardens whereas houses in Dartmouth Park Avenue and Laurier Road have considerably longer gardens and look down on the site as they are on a hill. As Doc 1962 PL DAS PT7 (2) clearly indicates.

d. It has been repeatedly pointed out that 5 & 6 Regency Lawn are set back from the rest of Regency Lawn Croftdown Road and hence their 20ft gardens are shorter as these houses are located nearer to the site. However Doc 1962 PL DAS PT7 (2) Key - indicates Neighbouring Houses line runs through houses nos. 5 and 6 Regency Lawn hence any measurements regarding basement impact, inside and outside lighting impact, sunlight studies, window placement re. privacy and light pollution, location of services area and vehicle movement of large vehicles concerns are all based on inaccurate measurements as they have not been assessed by reference to houses nearest to the site.

3. Object to the insensitive placement of windows as indicated on various Wolff Architects design drawings ie. proposed Western Elevation, proposed Ground, 1st, 2nd and 3rd floor plans. The window placement is continuous from ground to top level. The windows service stairwells, lift waiting areas, bedrooms and bathrooms are considered to be an invasion of our privacy as they overlook the living areas in our house. Additionally the illumination of these areas will be considerable given the use of the building which is intended so we will suffer light pollution. Wolff Architects Chapter 6.10 Security Lighting - “24 hour lighting to communal parts of block will be utilised. This will include communal entrance halls, lobbies, landings, corridors and stairwells and all entrance/exit points”.

4. STRONGLY OBJECT to the location of the Service Area as indicated on various site plans and RO1-JT-SD-Transport Statement F4 Caneparo Associates 4.13 and Appendix G & H refers.

a. According to the plan all large vehicles move onto the site in forward gear but will need to reverse onto the back fences of 5 & 6 Regency Lawn in order to leave the site in forward gear. Unhealthy emissions from vehicles predicted.

b. “12 vehicles a day, between 7am and 7pm, visiting Service area plus further refuse and clinical waste removal throughout the week”. This is likely to be a significant underestimate and as already pointed out 5 & 6 Regency Lawn are both nearest to the site and have the shortest gardens. We will lose the right to quiet enjoyment of our gardens and living areas. Noise pollution is a real concern as every reverse movement of commercial vehicles is preceded by a continuous siren like warning beep and a loud message ‘vehicle reversing’. 12 commercial vehicles incoming, consequently 12 commercial vehicles leaving equals 24 journeys, at least!

c. Waste storage, clinical and other, will have a dedicated space BUT IT IS NOTED doors will be air ventilated with louvred access doors. Concern over noise from constant access, unpleasant odours and possible vermin interest.

d. No new trees indicated to be planted behind 5 & 6 Regency Lawn to attempt to mitigate the sight of and

Application No: Consultees Name: Received:

Comment: Response:

muffle the sound of these daily commercial vehicle visits.

5. Object to and question the findings of Lighting Impact Assessment and External Lighting Design. We disagree that the design will "cause minimum impact on the surroundings".

a. 4a. Site Lighting Layout (landscape) 35+ outside ground lights on site immediately behind Regency Lawn. Plus a further 6 Building Facade Lighting - Ground Floor 4b refers. This is far too much lighting and its effects on the neighbouring properties are wholly underestimated. The plan is considered to be light pollution.

b. Ecological Appraisal 3.6 Swifts, the record of one is inaccurate. From May to September there is a considerable number over the site. There are 3 swift nesting boxes on Regency Lawn. 3.7 Bats species x 9. Before the site was derelict and the bowling club was in business there was minimal outside lighting which was movement sensitive and hence the bats thrived. The Bat Conservation Trust clearly states the detrimental impact of light spill on the nocturnal habits of bats. The addition of bat boxes is not a suitable mitigation response as bats will not thrive due to the proposed lighting plan.

6. Object to size of development and consequent effect on air quality due to transport emissions. Air Quality Consultancy Assessment J10-1286A 10F3(2) Road Transport Emissions

a. 8.3 refers to the "proposed development is expected to generate a total of 18,250 car trips per year (50 per day)".

b. 9.9 refers to "transport emissions predicted in the air quality neutral assessment exceed the benchmark derived for an average development of this nature in Inner London".

This refers to the daily activity of the building should it receive consent. We feel the assessment is flawed and underestimates the traffic hence the emissions are of immense concern. Further impact statements will have to be considered in the Construction Management Plan should it get that far.

7. Object to size of the 'commercial' care home and the impact on local roads with regard to transport links, parking and emissions. 2 hour parking restrictions in local roads Monday to Friday 10 - 12. It is stated that there are to be 25 members of staff, divided into day and night shifts, for a 78 bed care home. Surely the number of staff is greater as in addition to nursing staff there will be cooks, cleaners, hairdresser, maintenance engineer, groundsman together with healthcare professionals and visitors attending the building daily. Parking for 1 x tennis club member(!), 2 electric charging points and 5 other spaces is not adequate. So movement of and parking cars in local roads will be adversely affected as public transport won't be suitable or appropriate for all.

The application fails to mention the impact on local schools of the transport and vehicle movement to the Mansfield site other than Saturday Music Makers at La Sainte Union School. La Sainte Union's commercial and teacher vehicle and student entrance is diagonally opposite the vehicle entrance to the Mansfield site but its weekday existence is not included in any report. This is a large secondary school with a 6th form partnership, La Swap, with four local schools. Pupils walk, use public transport, cycle and are given lifts to and from school. The large contingent of 6th form La Swap students move around the streets visiting the 4 locations at all times of the day either moving between classes or 'hanging out'. At certain times of day the roads and pavements in the area are severely clogged up as a consequence. Hence both road safety and emissions are a big concern in a Camden designated Healthy Schools street. The application also failed to mention the 41 flats, 1,2 & 3 beds, named Quarter, to be opened this year. The site is car free. There are two entrances one of which is in Croftdown Road. More cars to be parked and traffic on the local roads already

Application No: Consultees Name: Received:

Comment: Response:

predicted have not been taken into account.

8. Object to the basis on which the calculation is made Daylight and Sunlight Report (2) 4.3 1 -10 Regency Lawn. 8 Regency Lawn has been used to calculate the impact. No.8 house is further away from the potential build as the plan shows the building line tapers away from Regency Lawn houses. House nos.4, 5 & 6 are nearest. The proposed top storey does not extend across all of the build, it is nearest to nos. 4, 5 & 6 Regency Lawn. Standing in our kitchen/dining room overlooking the site the sun was directly in our faces on 23/1/23 at 8.30am. The sun is no higher than the highest house in Laurier Road and shines through the gap between two houses. The height of the application build would block out the sun. Photograph is available for scrutiny. It is likely that a number of houses in Regency Lawn wouldn't have the benefit of early morning sunlight in the winter months should there be a 4th floor so close to and overlooking Regency Lawn. This could also have an impact on the solar panels placed on four Regency Lawn roofs. Daylight and sunlight are essential for good mental health and well being.

9. Object to there being insufficient information regarding the placement of extractor and ventilation outlets. There are concerns over their placement and the impact of odours and 24 hour high noise levels and visual effect should they be protruding from the roof thus making the build even higher. The now demolished club house was part 2 storey with a small shed containing water tanks or similar on the top. Further information is required on extractor and ventilation outlets and their likely impact on neighbouring houses. We had problems with the Mansfield Bowling Club's noisy ventilation which they changed once they were made aware of the negative impact on us.

10. Object to the lack of information as to security and management of the public open space. Also the space does not adequately provide space if one is not a tennis player, child and carer or allotment holder. The tennis courts and accompanying pavilion take up an unreasonable amount of space and appear to have been given preferential treatment. It is not addressed as to how the site can be kept safe for carers and toddlers without the risk of inappropriate members of the public using and abusing this public area, previously private open space. Further information regarding the management, security and funding of the site is essential before the treatment of this area is passed.

11. Object to behind 5 and 6 Regency Lawn being the only area throughout the site where there is no additional landscaping. Trees are essential to mitigate sight of and sounds from Service area and the overbearing 4 storey building and windows.

12. Whilst it is accepted that provision of care homes in Camden is necessary and we would have no problem with a scaled down version of this plan with certain amendments which are stated above. We question the validity of HPC's conclusion that this care home will alleviate bed blocking or the Planning Statement re. the development would help free up local market housing as a result of occupants downsizing. This is defined as a dementia care home, had it been an independent/assisted living facility then very likely couples would move together from their houses or flats to an elderly care facility to meet their different needs. Unless all members of a local house or flat have dementia then houses/flats are unlikely to be freed up.

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2022/5320/P	Mr S Kay	05/02/2023 21:37:22	COMMNT	Previously with the Kenlyn Tennis Club and Mansfield Bowling Club we had access to the site from the rear of our property. We would request the same access arrangements are allowed for the tennis courts and community space.
2022/5320/P	Professor Richard Taffler	03/02/2023 11:03:11	COMMNT	<p>I have looked at all the planning application documents in detail and it is clear that this proposed care home represents a gross overdevelopment of the site which is situated in the middle of a residential conservation area and as the plans show is out of scale and certainly out of character with the surrounding neighbourhood.</p> <p>Most importantly, there are issues with additional vehicular access and associated traffic through the surrounding narrow roads - 78 residents' visitors and over 100 employees coming and going plus continuous lorry and van deliveries and collections, noise, exhaust and other pollution in an area with several close local schools and heavy child traffic leading in addition to much increased accident and health risk.</p> <p>In addition, where is there appropriate parking provision for everyone - there are only 18 places on the plan? The surrounding roads will be serving as car parks making it difficult for the local residents themselves often to find parking. Is this fair?</p> <p>This is clearly a totally inappropriate development for the local area and if it is allowed to go ahead would serve to damage the nature of the area and be quite oppressive not just for the houses surrounding it.</p>
2022/5320/P	D Mason	03/02/2023 16:06:23	COMMNT	<p>I am not objecting to the proposed development per se, but there are aspects that need to be changed.</p> <p>1) The development is moving off the original footprint of the bowling club towards the Church Hall. Given the distance between the two buildings is small, the new building should remain on the original footprint. 2) The height of the building is much taller than the previous building, particularly on the side where the hall is. I am worried that the flats in the building will be overlooked, which will be detrimental to our tenants. 3) The overall volume of the building is much bigger than the bowling club was which will have knock-on detrimental affects for the locality because of the number of people housed and working there; as well as the visual impact.</p> <p>Our comment is that the proposals should be reduced to something similar to the original building and if the new building did not stray off the outline of the bowling site.</p>

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2022/5320/P	Margaret Legg	03/02/2023 09:35:08	OBJ	<p>As a resident of 9 Regency Lawn, a property which lies immediately adjacent to this site, I wish to object to the application for the following reasons:</p> <p>Whilst I appreciate that there is a need for residential care provision in the borough, the size of the proposed care home is overbearing and does not comply with the size or nature of the previously approved scheme of development (see 2017 [APP/X5210/W/16/3153454].</p> <p>The application is flawed and inaccurate in more than one way. Firstly, it states that the height of the 5 storey building will be 62 metres (which would, in effect, be 6 times the height of the houses surrounding it) and it states that it is not within 20 metres of a water course when, in actual fact, the Highgate Tributary of the River Fleet runs underground immediately under the site to a pipe crossing the railway line at Churchill Rise. The inaccuracies which I have identified in the application give me real concerns as to the reliability of the developer's other claims which I am not in a position to check.</p> <p>Artificial Light Pollution</p> <p>There will be considerable light pollution, not only from the lights on the access road where it joins Croftdown Road but also from inside and outside the building itself (being, by its very nature a 24 hour facility) and this contravenes Camden's successful policy of reducing the impact of light in the Dartmouth Park Conservation Area roads, partly to encourage nesting birds and bats.</p> <p>Vehicle Movement and Congestion</p> <p>Access to the site is restricted and the road is narrow where the access road adjoins Croftdown Road. There are likely to be problems with all vehicles, whatever size, travelling in and out, having to enter the Mansfield site between no 10 and 11 Regency Lawn, which is tricky for large vehicles to negotiate from Croftdown Road without mounting the pavement. Croftdown Road at this point is busy with school children of all ages going to school in the morning, at lunch time and mid-afternoon (the entrance to La Sainte Union School is very close to the end of the access road). The access road can flood in heavy rain, is not wide enough for vehicles to pass each other and the houses either side of it feel the vibration of the lorries.</p> <p>Once inside the Mansfield grounds there are limited turning facilities which will be far worse if this "mini-hospital" is approved, especially in the delivery area at the back of the new proposed building and causing great distress to the Regency Lawn residents whose back gardens are a few feet away and who would constantly hear the bleeping reversing warnings and noise of lorries being emptied just beyond their back fences.</p> <p>Smell</p> <p>There is the very real potential for mal odours from clinical waste that will be stored in the basement between the weekly collection.</p> <p>Noise pollution</p> <p>There is a very real risk of unacceptable levels of noise pollution in the area, including the very troublesome</p>

Application No: Consultees Name: Received:

Comment:

Response:

hum from Ground and/or Air Source heat pumps and other possible power sources as well as noise from vehicle manoeuvring.

Loss of light

Natural light will be obstructed by such a tall building being sited so close to the south elevation of the much lower properties on Regency Lawn, which at present enjoy the priceless privilege of unobstructed light to south facing gardens. Many of the buildings on Regency Lawn have installed solar panels in order to minimise the use of fossil fuels and I am concerned that these will be obscured by the height of the building, particularly in the winter months when the sun is low in the sky and the need for electricity is increased due to the short days.

Lastly, I have concerns over the proposed "open space" area designated at the north eastern side of the site. The developers are obliged to retain some accessible open space within their scheme due to the covenants on the land. However, they have not specified how this area will be maintained, who will pay for the maintenance and who will oversee the use of it. No area of the site has ever had "public access" in the form of a public park. This has always been a private open space, with club house facilities, used by the Kenlyn Tennis Club (members only) and the Mansfield Bowling Club (again private, members only facility). If the area is not managed properly, by a caretaker who is responsible for it, there is a risk that it will be used by people who do not have a legal right to use the facility with possible repercussions in terms of anti-social behaviour, noise and lack of maintenance.

This application should be rejected on the basis that it does not "preserve or enhance" the protected status of the Dartmouth Park Conservation Area.

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2022/5320/P	Margaret Legg	03/02/2023 09:35:12	OBJ	<p>As a resident of 9 Regency Lawn, a property which lies immediately adjacent to this site, I wish to object to the application for the following reasons:</p> <p>Whilst I appreciate that there is a need for residential care provision in the borough, the size of the proposed care home is overbearing and does not comply with the size or nature of the previously approved scheme of development (see 2017 [APP/X5210/W/16/3153454].</p> <p>The application is flawed and inaccurate in more than one way. Firstly, it states that the height of the 5 storey building will be 62 metres (which would, in effect, be 6 times the height of the houses surrounding it) and it states that it is not within 20 metres of a water course when, in actual fact, the Highgate Tributary of the River Fleet runs underground immediately under the site to a pipe crossing the railway line at Churchill Rise. The inaccuracies which I have identified in the application give me real concerns as to the reliability of the developer's other claims which I am not in a position to check.</p> <p>Artificial Light Pollution</p> <p>There will be considerable light pollution, not only from the lights on the access road where it joins Croftdown Road but also from inside and outside the building itself (being, by its very nature a 24 hour facility) and this contravenes Camden's successful policy of reducing the impact of light in the Dartmouth Park Conservation Area roads, partly to encourage nesting birds and bats.</p> <p>Vehicle Movement and Congestion</p> <p>Access to the site is restricted and the road is narrow where the access road adjoins Croftdown Road. There are likely to be problems with all vehicles, whatever size, travelling in and out, having to enter the Mansfield site between no 10 and 11 Regency Lawn, which is tricky for large vehicles to negotiate from Croftdown Road without mounting the pavement. Croftdown Road at this point is busy with school children of all ages going to school in the morning, at lunch time and mid-afternoon (the entrance to La Sainte Union School is very close to the end of the access road). The access road can flood in heavy rain, is not wide enough for vehicles to pass each other and the houses either side of it feel the vibration of the lorries.</p> <p>Once inside the Mansfield grounds there are limited turning facilities which will be far worse if this "mini-hospital" is approved, especially in the delivery area at the back of the new proposed building and causing great distress to the Regency Lawn residents whose back gardens are a few feet away and who would constantly hear the bleeping reversing warnings and noise of lorries being emptied just beyond their back fences.</p> <p>Smell</p> <p>There is the very real potential for mal odours from clinical waste that will be stored in the basement between the weekly collection.</p> <p>Noise pollution</p> <p>There is a very real risk of unacceptable levels of noise pollution in the area, including the very troublesome</p>

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
				<p>hum from Ground and/or Air Source heat pumps and other possible power sources as well as noise from vehicle manoeuvring.</p> <p>Loss of light</p> <p>Natural light will be obstructed by such a tall building being sited so close to the south elevation of the much lower properties on Regency Lawn, which at present enjoy the priceless privilege of unobstructed light to south facing gardens. Many of the buildings on Regency Lawn have installed solar panels in order to minimise the use of fossil fuels and I am concerned that these will be obscured by the height of the building, particularly in the winter months when the sun is low in the sky and the need for electricity is increased due to the short days.</p> <p>Lastly, I have concerns over the proposed "open space" area designated at the north eastern side of the site. The developers are obliged to retain some accessible open space within their scheme due to the covenants on the land. However, they have not specified how this area will be maintained, who will pay for the maintenance and who will oversee the use of it. No area of the site has ever had "public access" in the form of a public park. This has always been a private open space, with club house facilities, used by the Kenlyn Tennis Club (members only) and the Mansfield Bowling Club (again private, members only facility). If the area is not managed properly, by a caretaker who is responsible for it, there is a risk that it will be used by people who do not have a legal right to use the facility with possible repercussions in terms of anti-social behaviour, noise and lack of maintenance.</p> <p>This application should be rejected on the basis that it does not "preserve or enhance" the protected status of the Dartmouth Park Conservation Area.</p>
2022/5320/P	Bard Aune & Nadia Ragozhina	04/02/2023 22:33:47	OBJ	<p>Having reviewed the documents submitted by the developer we have grave concerns about the impact on our adjoining property, and therefore object to the plans. The mass and height of the proposed main building is far greater than what was there until 2018, which is overwhelmingly likely to cause overshadowing of amenity in the form of our garden, and the positioning and orientation will most certainly lead to overlooking and loss of privacy. We can not see that these factors have been accounted for in any of the documentation.</p> <p>Furthermore, the design of the building as proposed means it will be look very much out of place in the context of the surrounding conservation area. In addition, the increased traffic from visitors and delivery drivers with little or no connection to the area is going to put our narrow and already too busy streets under further pressure. This is likely to adversely impact the character of the conservation area, as well as the safety of children attending the schools and nurseries close by.</p>

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2022/5320/P	Sam Whittaker and Genevieve Durrance	05/02/2023 16:14:49	OBJ	<p>Dear Sir/Madam,</p> <p>I am writing this letter to express my strong objection to the proposed redevelopment of Mansfield Bowling Club located in the London NW5 area. As a resident and stakeholder in this local community, I am deeply concerned about the impact that this project will have on the surrounding conservation area.</p> <p>The proposed development plans, in my opinion, do not take into account the significance of the conservation area and the importance of preserving its unique features and architectural style.</p> <p>The proposed redevelopment is too, high, too big and not in keeping with the area.</p> <p>The increased density of the development will put additional pressure on local infrastructure, including roads, public transport and community facilities, and will inevitably lead to traffic congestion and other associated problems. This will have a detrimental effect on the quality of life for residents in the area and will undermine the efforts made over the years to maintain and enhance the conservation area's environmental and cultural heritage.</p> <p>I would strongly urge Camden Council to reconsider its plans for the redevelopment of the Mansfield Bowling Club. I would also like to request that alternative solutions be explored that will preserve the unique character and heritage of this area, whilst ensuring that any new development meets the needs of the local community and does not cause significant harm to the environment or the local heritage.</p> <p>Thank you for your attention to this matter. I look forward to a positive outcome to this situation.</p> <p>Yours sincerely,</p> <p>Sam Whittaker and Genevieve Durrance</p>
2022/5320/P	Stephen Cameron	03/02/2023 16:27:10	OBJ	<p>There appear to be only 8 car parking spaces in the plans, and these are described as 'drop off/arrival area'. So for a 78 unit building, effectively no parking on site, either for staff or for visitors. Parking in Croftdown Road and the surrounding roads is already restricted and, for example, on Parents Evenings at nearby schools it is virtually impossible to find a parking space until parents have departed. Current restriction for residents only apply between 10.00 and 12.00 and given that staff and visitor travel will be largely outside these times will mean no parking space for residents in the surrounding roads! The current plan is unworkable - where is the traffic management plan? The roads are already heavily congested in the morning with schools traffic and commuter traffic, with frequent altercations and blockages. This development will make it impossible to move on the roads between 7.30 am and 9.00am. I strongly object to the plans</p>

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2022/5320/P	Alaina Newnes	05/02/2023 21:28:22	OBJ	<p>As a resident of Croftdown Road, I am concerned the development will result in this residential road becoming a busy, high frequency route for service vehicles, employees and visitors of the care home. That would also result in an increase in pollution which will impact not only residents but the pupils of the two schools on or near it. I am also concerned insufficient thought has been given to parking: the proposal simply does not include sufficient dedicated parking bays on site. It will create increased pressure on the road for parking space. As it is, it can be difficult as a resident to find parking as a result of visitors to the Heath using the road for parking. This will become worse with employees, visitors etc of the care home using the road for parking. As a mother of two very young children I am concerned by the prospect of being compelled to park some distance from my home when I need to use my car (as I do, for essential journeys).</p>
2022/5320/P	Charles Aylwin & Yen, Ming	03/02/2023 17:31:42	OBJ	<p>Objection to Planning Application 2022/5320/P</p> <p>As residents of 5 Regency Lawn, which borders the west of the site of former Mansfield Bowling Club, we are against this plan of building a 78-bed care home on the said site for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The proposed height and mass of the complex and its proximity to our property will block sunlight into our house therefore impact our quality of life. - The suggested parking space and road for service vehicles are adjacent to our garden, the noise created will be constant. - It is not clear who will be responsible and manage the proposed Open Space. This causes security concern at Regency Lawn <p>Furthermore, the streets surrounding or near the entrance to the site, Croftdown Road, Brookfield Park, York Rise, Woodsome Road and Laurier Road etc, do not have the capacity to accommodate the traffic generated during construction and parking upon completion. This will result in the deterioration of living conditions in this part of the Dartmouth Park Conservation Area.</p> <p>Care homes or affordable housing are needed in Camden. But it should be of appropriate scale to the site where it is to be built and its existing surroundings.</p> <p>For our personal wellbeing and for the environment we share with our neighbours, it is our sincere hope that this application will be refused by Camden Council.</p>
2022/5320/P	Charlie Viney	06/02/2023 09:08:50	WREP	<p>The size of the new building should not exceed the footprint of the former Mansfield Bowling Club and not be above two storeys.</p> <p>Low rise accommodation for nurses, teachers, police etc should be prioritised a</p> <p>The commitment to keep at least two tennis courts and a club house for public use must be strictly adhered to and not be axed due to 'unforeseen costs' and other tricks frequently employed by developers.</p>

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2022/5320/P	Natasha Cendrowicz	05/02/2023 17:24:57	OBJ	I live on Laurier Road and I am unhappy about the scale of this proposal. There will be huge disruption to residents during the construction. My quiet enjoyment of my property is already compromised by 2 major refurbishments to houses on my road. The additional traffic generated by this proposal will also jeopardise those of us who live in the area. There is not adequate parking for this development. I already pay for the pleasure of parking near my property. In future I will have the pleasure of paying for parking, without it being near to where I live. I have 2 teenage sons who attend local schools. My eldest son has asthma. The additional traffic will cause even more air pollution. Please refuse this application and ask them to come back with something more modest and in keeping with the plot.
2022/5320/P	Helen	06/02/2023 08:49:15	COMMNT	This development proposal is disproportionate in size and scale. Only development should be permitted on the footprint of the old bowling club. The best use for this land is a small scale row of houses for nurses and teachers with land used for planting trees, tennis and allotments. The fact that the developer may lose money by not building all over this precious site is not a consideration for the council.
2022/5320/P	Helen	06/02/2023 08:49:19	COMMNT	This development proposal is disproportionate in size and scale. Only development should be permitted on the footprint of the old bowling club. The best use for this land is a small scale row of houses for nurses and teachers with land used for planting trees, tennis and allotments. The fact that the developer may lose money by not building all over this precious site is not a consideration for the council.