

APPENDIX 7

DARTMOUTH PARK NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN (APRIL 2018 CONSULTATION DRAFT)

Compilation of comments received by the deadline of 15 June 2018

	Source	Clause/ Policy	Comment	Response
1.	Historic England	1	We consider this to be well written, accurate and accessible, and likely to have positive benefits for the heritage, local character and vitality of the Plan area. The Plan clearly identifies the architecture and the history of the area as a key strength to be protected but also to inspire the way in which the area should develop	Noted
2.	Member of public	1	I hugely admire and respect all the work that people have put in to drawing up this plan, and support all that is proposed in it. But I am at a loss to understand why no mention appears to be made about the outrageous decision to build a sixth-form centre in the middle of the historic 'green' astride Highgate Road. A few of us tried to object to this, and ask for the centre (which I know is needed) to be built elsewhere on the school sites. But this appeared to get no support from established local organisations, and the centre is now in process of construction. I feel that this destruction of the open green corridor that is arguably the finest feature of the Dartmouth Park area makes rather a mockery of your worthy efforts to maintain the character and amenities of our neighbourhood. It's very sad, but there doesn't seem to be anything one can do about it now. As with the ASV Garage site, the tennis court area should ideally have been returned to grass/lawn, like the other	This is not a matter for the Neighbourhood Plan as the development is under construction.

	Source	Clause/ Policy	Comment	Response
			part of the strip in front of Parliament Hill School, and like the area in front of Grove Terrace.	
3.	Natural England	1	Natural England does not have any specific comments on this draft neighbourhood plan.	Noted
4.	Member of public	1	I feel that the document is too long and unwieldy to be properly useful. I am an architect and very involved, and I still find it hard. There is too much repetition. For example: a policy is stated, then later on reasons for the policy are enumerated - but these have almost always been given, in similar wording, in the policy itself.	<p>We agree that we would prefer the plan to be shorter and will review opportunities but the example given follows the format recommended by Camden Council so will not be reviewed.</p> <p>At present, the document is structured so that each section is fairly self-standing. This inevitably leads to some duplication, but we think that overall it is better to be clear even it that means the document is slightly longer.</p>
5.	Member of public	1	First, may I commend you on a truly impressive piece of work. I am highly supportive of the spirit and approach of the plan which seeks to conserve the best of the area's past while looking to a socially, economically and environmentally sustainable future neighbourhood. I am content for the plan to be submitted as it is, and will simply highlight below some policies and projects of which I am personally particularly supportive and make a couple of suggestions which may assist with achieving adoption of the plan by the council.	Noted
6.	Member of public	1	I should like to underline my support for the plan's approach to quality in design, which recognises the value of both historic and more contemporary architecture which can be complementary rather than necessarily in tension. We are lucky to be the location of high quality design in private and social housing and I strongly support the plan's commitment to diverse and affordable tenures and potential approaches to	Noted

	Source	Clause/ Policy	Comment	Response
			<p>adapting buildings for evolving family needs so that local residents can stay in the area.</p> <p>The plan is strong on the importance of an accessible public realm, a shared sense of place and also the contribution of this of thriving local independent businesses and workplaces.</p>	
7.	Member of public	1	<p>I agree with other comments on the website that the document is too lengthy with too much repetition. It is also too often simply aspirational. However, the hard work involved must be acknowledged.</p>	Noted. See response to 4 above.
8.	TfL Gavin McLaughlin Principal Planner	1	<p><i>Please note that these comments represent the views of Transport for London (TfL) Borough Planning officers and are made entirely on a "without prejudice" basis. They should not be taken to represent an indication of any subsequent Mayoral decision and they do not necessarily represent the views of the Greater London Authority (GLA). Any views or opinions are given in good faith and relate solely to transport issues.</i></p> <p>Thank you for consulting TfL Spatial Planning on the draft Neighbourhood Plan.</p> <p>The draft London Plan was published on 29 November 2017 and sets out an integrated economic, environmental, transport and social framework for the development of London over the next 20-25 years. We are now expecting all new planning policy documents to give material consideration to the policies set out within this document, noting that the decision-maker is to determine the balance of weight to be given to adopted and draft policies.</p>	Noted

	Source	Clause/ Policy	Comment	Response
			<p>Firstly I would like to reiterate that TfL Spatial Planning is keen to work with the Council to deliver aspirations for sustainable growth in the borough and Dartmouth Park area.</p> <p>On behalf of TfL I also wish to submit a number of General and Detailed comments, as follows:</p>	
9.	TfL Gavin McLaughlin Principal Planner	1	<p>General Comments <i>Healthy Streets</i> Throughout the documents there is no explicit mention of Healthy Streets, although many key Healthy Streets principles are included.</p> <p>Given the Mayoral focus on these themes and the Healthy Streets for London Toolkit we have published (https://tfl.gov.uk/corporate/about-tfl/how-we-work/planning-for-the-future/healthy-streets), it would be good to explicitly reference to Healthy Streets principles and indicators in the document.</p> <p>Generally, TfL is supportive of the policies and proposals put forward, as they are consistent with the Healthy Streets approach of the Mayor's Transport Strategy (MTS) and new draft London Plan.</p> <p>The plan's focus on protecting and enhancing community facilities including the local shopping centres and parades is also welcomed by TfL, as these facilities help to encourage healthier, more active and car-free lifestyles in which more shopping and leisure is done locally, often by bike or on foot. We agree that the neighbourhood should remain 'a cohesive locality with shared, well-used facilities.' (p. 14)</p>	<p>Noted.</p> <p>Direct reference to TfL's Healthy Streets policy incorporated into section 8.4 of the chapter on Transport and Streets. There is also a reference in policy TS1(c)(ii).</p>

	Source	Clause/ Policy	Comment	Response
10.	TfL Gavin McLaughlin Principal Planner	2.2	<i>2.2 Issues and opportunities</i> The final bullet point on “coping with the transport and environmental implications” is worded quite negatively with too much focus on private vehicles. The language could be changed to specify the routes referred to are roads and streets rather than public transport or cycling routes. The issue could also be treated and explicitly identified as an opportunity to increase the quality of local roads and streets as walking and cycling routes. Finally the term ‘cross-London route’ is somewhat unclear; ‘East-West route’ might be more appropriate.	Final bullet point amended to read: ‘improving the quality of local roads and streets as walking and cycling routes, while mitigating the transport and environmental effects of a location on key routes into Central London and on a busy east-west route (which includes Chetwynd Road).’
11.	TfL Gavin McLaughlin Principal Planner	2.3	<i>2.3 Our Vision for Dartmouth Park</i> This section should mention improving the local population’s healthy by increasing active travel in the Plan Area. Currently it seems too focused on abstract characteristics of the built environment and Dartmouth Park itself as a geographic area. However it would benefit from discussing and setting out aspirations for how the Neighbourhood Plan can help Londoners as people. This would follow a similar approach to recently published documents such as the Mayor’s ‘A City for All Londoners’ (available from https://www.london.gov.uk/get-involved/all-consultations/city-all-londoners) and TfL’s ‘Healthy Streets for London’ (available from https://tfl.gov.uk/corporate/about-tfl/how-we-work/planning-for-the-future/healthy-streets), both of which are reflected throughout the Mayor’s Transport Strategy (MTS, 2018, available from https://www.london.gov.uk/what-we-do/transport/our-vision-transport/mayors-transport-strategy-2018)	Reference to ‘increasing opportunities for pleasant and safe active travel’ added to vision statement. However, the focus on the built environment and Dartmouth Park as a geographic area are entirely appropriate in a neighbourhood plan, as the focus is on land use planning issues. As noted above, references to the Mayor’s Healthy Streets policies have been added elsewhere in the Plan.

	Source	Clause/ Policy	Comment	Response
12.	TfL Gavin McLaughlin Principal Planner	2.4 8.4 TS1, TS2	<p><i>2.4 Our Objectives</i> The reference to 'Transport and Streets' is strongly supported by TfL.</p> <p><i>Policy TS1 Safety and accessibility for pedestrians and cyclists</i> The recommendation that low trafficked crossovers should have a continuous footway treatment is supported. However continuous footways can be inappropriate for more highly trafficked intersecting side roads.</p> <p>This policy could also be supported with timed traffic closures around schools, which Camden Council have already implemented elsewhere to reduce vehicular drop-off / pick-up and give more space for walking.</p> <p><i>Policy TS2 Cycling improvements</i> It would be worth referencing the London Cycling Design Standards (LCDS, available from https://tfl.gov.uk/corporate/publications-and-reports/streets) in this section. More specific language could also be included on improving cycling comfort by providing segregated carriageway space for cycling where appropriate, reducing motor vehicle dominance, rationalising on-street cycle parking and encouraging developers to incorporate dedicated cycling facilities.</p> <p><i>Policy TS3 Traffic reduction</i> We recommend considering the role that filtered permeability could potentially play in existing and new streets to reduce through motor vehicle traffic and improve conditions for walking and cycling.</p>	<p>Noted, although some of the suggestions, like filtered permeability, are not land use planning and so outside of the remit of the Neighbourhood Plan.</p> <p>Policy wording amended for clarity that walkways and cycleways should be continuous. This policy is most likely to apply to side roads, as the Council itself is responsible for main roads.</p> <p>Not a land use planning issue, although a project in Appendix 7 encourages alternatives to the car for transporting children to schools.</p> <p>Reference to London Cycling Design Standards added to supplementary text to Policy TS2(a).</p> <p>A new policy TS2(c) encourages developers to incorporate dedicated cycling facilities, such as segregated carriageway space for cycling and on-street cycle parking. Improving cycling facilities is also addressed in a Project in Appendix 7, 'Measures to improve permeability and parking for cyclists'.</p> <p>Not a land use planning issue.</p>

	Source	Clause/ Policy	Comment	Response
13.	TfL Gavin McLaughlin Principal Planner	3.3 DC3	<p><i>Policy DC3 Requirement for good design</i></p> <p>TfL Spatial Planning is generally supportive of this policy, particularly sub-section (g) on developments providing cycle parking and delivery space ‘to ensure a high quality and well managed streetscape’.</p> <p>However the understanding of urban design expressed in the policy and throughout the document seems to neglect public space between buildings, which is dealt with only as ‘hard and soft landscaping of the existing streetscape’ in the supporting text (p. 25).</p> <p>Issues such as the permeability and legibility of the street network to pedestrians and cyclists are key parts of successful and functional urban design, which seems to be acknowledged only briefly in the policy as ‘the scale and rhythm of the streets’ (p. 14) and also, again vaguely, on the next page:</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">‘The neighbourhood’s cohesiveness is enhanced by the convenient and attractive linkages offered by a pattern of streets on a rough grid, with short pedestrian cut-throughs, paths and passages adding to people’s route choices.’ (p. 15)</p> <p>TfL Spatial Planning would suggest that the Plan should mention walking, cycling and public transport in both the Design and Transport policy sections.</p> <p>For further guidance on integrating these two elements, the Forum should consult new draft London Plan such as GG2 (Making the best use of land), GG3 (Creating a</p>	<p>Noted.</p> <p>This is not an urban design document. We have addressed the issues of permeability and legibility in the context of land development in Policies DC1 and DC3.</p> <p>Walking, cycling and public transport are addressed at length in Chapter 8.</p> <p>Noted. We believe our policies are consistent with these documents, with a strong emphasis on provision of both space and facilities for walking,</p>

	Source	Clause/ Policy	Comment	Response
			Healthy City), D1 (London's Form & Characteristics), T2 (Healthy Streets), T5 (Cycling), D7 (Public Realm), all of which clearly prioritise and promote public transport and active travel as critical to London's current and future built environment and urban design. Also, our Liveable Neighbourhoods programme, which could provide inspiration and is highly relevant (see https://tfl.gov.uk/info-for/boroughs/liveable-neighbourhoods).	cycling and public transport.
14.	Member of public	3.4 DC3	Policy DC3: a lot of what is in this policy is also in the DP Conservation Plan, to which reference should be made without repetition here. An example is item (e). Generally most of the principles here are enshrined in good planning practice. Items (d) and (e) are too non-specific to be useful in a neighbourhood plan. Each case needs to be judged on its own merits.	Disagree that (d) and (e) should not be stated here. Taken as a whole, Policy DC3 attempts to set a standard for development in the Dartmouth Park area and to avoid the inconsistency that can arise from an approach of judging each case on its own merits.
15.	Member of public	3.4 DC3e	This working is too restrictive in my opinion. Extensions and modifications should be complimentary rather than sub-ordinate	Drafting retained as consistent with the Conservation Area Statement and as reflecting the general view of residents. See also 17 below.
16.	Member of public	3.4 DC3	bottom right image of 7 Glenhurst Avenue I don't recognise the design as being sub-ordinate, it is complimentary. I think that the caption should be rewritten to reflect this.	Caption revised to remove reference to subordination.
17.	Member of public	3.4 DC4a	Small residential developments do not have to be sub-ordinate to be worthy of support. The key criteria in that they are of an appropriate scale to compliment the original dwelling	Drafting retained as consistent with the Conservation Area Statement and as reflecting the general view of residents. This is particularly the case in respect of small residential extensions, which by definition should be small in scale and situation. However, the supplementary text recognises that there might be occasional exceptions, such as where an end of terrace property is extended in the same style as the original.
18.	Member of	3.4	Page 27 - Photo	Credit had already been agreed with Cousins and

	Source	Clause/ Policy	Comment	Response
	public	DC4	Design work should be credited to the Architects; Cousins and Cousins	Cousins, but reference to architects added.
19.	Member of public	3.4 DC4	Policy DC4 on small residential developments is particularly welcome. Dartmouth Park will benefit hugely from sympathetic extensions which will enable young families (like mine) to stay in the area we love over the long term.	Noted
20.	Member of public	3.4 DC4	We are particularly in support of Policy DC4 to promote small residential developments. I think those of us keen to stay in the area we love and extend our houses to do so are particularly keen to find a way to do this with everyone's interests considered, including those of the conservation committee who fear an ugly outcome. We absolutely want to enhance the area and be sympathetic to existing architecture, whilst having the local and borough support to expand our homes.	Noted
21.	TfL Gavin McLaughlin Principal Planner	3.4 DC1	<i>Policy DC1 Enhancing the sense of place</i> Part (b) of Policy DC1 is broadly supported by TfL Spatial Planning in line with Policy G7 (Trees and Woodlands) of the draft new London Plan and current London Plan Policy 5.10 (Urban Greening). That said, the second sub-section should perhaps refer to 'publicly accessible' green or open spaces, as the policy could currently be used to justify a private green or open space being maintained or replaced even if an important community or transport-related land use was being proposed to replace it. TfL Spatial Planning would also encourage the Forum and Council to consider defining Dartmouth Park as 'Urban' in the Neighbourhood Plan rather than 'semi-rural'. It is too centrally located within London to	Noted but no changes proposed The policy is not intended to be limited to publicly accessible spaces. Disagree. Residents almost universally referred to the semi-rural character of the area in consultations. The character is distinctly different from that in Kentish Town.

	Source	Clause/ Policy	Comment	Response
			reasonably be considered 'semi-rural', especially as Kentish Town, which is defined as a District Centre in Annex 2 of the current London Plan, is located 800m South, and the Public Transport Accessibility Level (PTAL) ranges from 3 – 6b in the vast majority of the Plan Area.	
22.	Member of public	3.4 DC 3	It's great to see the samples of what constitutes 'good design'. The Van Heynigen Howard scheme in particular is a great development. It is interesting that this scheme on York Rise is a development in the back garden of a house. It is not a garden shed, it is not an out building. The presumption that rear garden development for new homes should be refused is wrong. If there is direct access from mews roads, streets or to garage sites, planning policy must be in favour of creating more housing. This type of small site is exactly what will assist planning policy, well managed by Development Control. It is precisely the type of housing development that the neighbourhood plan should be supporting for residents down sizing to smaller homes, allowing them to stay within the neighbourhood. It cannot be a good thing to use the Neighbourhood plan to promote Nimbyism.	We are unable to include a policy that promotes buildings in gardens as this would be counter to Local Plan policies, e.g. Policies A2, A3, D1 and D2. Development in gardens would adversely affect the green and leafy character of the area while not materially addressing housing need.
23.	Member of public	3.4 DC 4	Attack on the Conservation Area eg DC4 The draft professes support for the Conservation Area but includes proposals which undermine it. A key driver in the establishment of the Conservation Area was the need to protect the roof lines etc of eg Spencer Rise. Since the establishment of the Conservation Area all but one proposal to build an additional roof story on Spencer Rise houses has been refused planning permission. Describing what is proposed as a 'loft conversions' is quite wrong as there	We have tried to strike a balance between the strongly-held views of some in the area, including the DPCAAC, that changes should be kept to a minimum and the breadth of opinion in certain parts of the area that a small degree of flex is required. All the 4 DC policies are very clear that change will only be allowed if several criteria are met, and we note the comment from Historic England that the Neighbourhood Plan is "likely to have positive benefits for the heritage, local character and vitality

	Source	Clause/ Policy	Comment	Response
			isn't a significant void in the 'butterfly' roofs. What is proposed is an additional roof story.	of the Plan area. The Plan clearly identifies the architecture and the history of the area as a key strength to be protected but also to inspire the way in which the area should develop”
24.	Member of public	3.4 DC4		
25.	Member of public	3.4 DC 4	<p>The exception was an extension to a run of already altered rooves. There has been more than one Inspector's Appeal against these refusals all of which have failed.</p> <p>The Inspector's observations in rejecting the earlier appeal from no. 47 (T/APP/X5210/E/96/813040/P9 and T/APP/X5210/A/96/273911/P9) are but one example:</p> <p>“I consider that your proposal would appear out of place and discordant in the street scene from both Spencer Rise and Chetwynd Road. ...it would adversely affect the relatively unspoilt character and appearance of the terraced houses along Spencer Rise and destroy the symmetry of the roofscape, particularly at the rear.”</p> <p>“You have pointed out that there are already a number of existing roof extensions nearby on this side of the</p>	<p>We feel that the integrity and character of the Conservation Area can be maintained by the policies in the neighbourhood plan, which are a lot more conservation-minded than several respondees want to see. We note that Historic England agree (see 24 above).</p> <p>We also note that the planning applications referred to are more than 20 years old, when the Inspector's judgements were made against a different set of national and local planning policies.</p> <p>Re Traffic – we have limited our policies to those things that we can include policies on, hence having much less in the policies on traffic than many in the neighbourhood would like to see. However, it is appropriate to recognise issues of concern in the area, including traffic, and we have included a</p>

	Source	Clause/ Policy	Comment	Response
			<p>road. At my site visit I saw roof extensions at nos. 37, 51, 53 and 55 which were clearly visible from Spencer Rise. However, the Council have indicated that these took place before the Conservation Area was designated. As I understand that unsympathetic roof extensions were a contributory in the designation of the Conservation Area, I do not consider that the existence of these other roof extensions justifies your own proposal. To my mind, these existing roof extensions reinforce the need to resist further similar proposals, such as this one.”</p> <p>The Spencer Rise share a common feature of the Conservation Area, viz the rear elevations are typically visible from the highway via gaps between buildings and are often as important to the character of the Conservation Area as the fronts.</p> <p>Since these decisions all this has been written into the Conservation Area Statement approved by the Council, after extensive public consultation, to guide planning. This isn't something where 'good design' in an individual proposal can address the issues. Given that much of the housing within the Conservation Area is, like Spencer Rise, within terraces or like groupings, any additional roof story etc, no matter how brilliantly designed, cannot preserve let alone enhance a given street scape unless, of course, all the houses in the terrace can be treated similarly.</p> <p>I focus here on Spencer Rise because it is referred to in the draft but the same points can be made a general policy to support 'enlargement'.</p> <p>It beggars' belief that the Forum Committee contends its draft policies are compatible with it's statutory duty,</p>	<p>Project in Appendix 7 that seeks to address the issue of traffic in Dartmouth Park.</p>

	Source	Clause/ Policy	Comment	Response
			<p>shared at every level of the planning system, to do what it can to preserve and enhance the character of the Conservation Area in performing its functions. Certainly, it doesn't seem to me that freeing a small number of local residents from planning constraints previously and for more than a decade thought necessary to preserve and enhance the character of the Conservation Area can be justified as a means of better preserving and enhancing it.</p> <p>I have not so far found another proposed local plan which seeks to reverse years of local conservation guidance and planning decisions.</p> <p>It is anyway a nonsense to suggest that a planning policy of relaxing restraints on unsuitable enlargements can be limited to helping existing desirable residents. Any relaxation of such restraints will apply equally to developers etc. and the evidence is overwhelming that they would be the main beneficiaries. Nor is there, I suggest, any evidence that those allowed to enlarge their homes will necessarily stay residents.</p> <p>Finally, I suggest the approach adopted is incompatible with Council's Local Plan which continues to provide for guidance on how best to preserve and enhance its Conservation Areas being given via Strategy Statements approved by the Council following consultation.</p> <p>Other matters;</p> <p>I am determined to limit my comments but must add an objection to the references to the Forum Committee meeting the Council to discuss traffic issues. The Forum has no mandate to speak for the community. There are extremely good reasons why traffic issues are excluded from the remit of neighbourhood forums,</p>	

	Source	Clause/ Policy	Comment	Response
			most important of which is that most of what impacts on the area arises outside the local area and isn't amenable to local measures. A specific example here would be the need to address blockages of commuter traffic which generates rat running traffic through the area.	
26.	Member of public	3.4 DC 3 h	Shutters and Windows: All would agree that shutters are not desirable (page 26 and elsewhere). But in some situations, such as chemist shops, there is a need to find a system that provides adequate security. It would also be useful to stress the desirability of attractive window displays. This is a clear Camden policy but rarely acknowledged by planners. Display windows which are blocked out with blinds, membranes or advertisements, should be strongly discouraged. (see Tesco Window below)	We agree and note that this is covered by LBC policy. We have been encouraged by LBC not to repeat their policies. However, DC3(h) discourages <i>solid</i> external shutters; other alternatives (including internal shutters) are available and preferable.
27.	Member of public	3.4 DC 3h		
28.	Member of public	3.4 DC 4	Extensions, etc. I think that this is well covered in the reference to DC3. However, perhaps the inherent conflict in increasing the number of larger and more expensive properties and the need for affordable housing should be recognised. Also there is probably a	Noted re DC3. The housing policies seek to retain and encourage affordable housing. We have decided not to say anything specific about home offices, but DC4(g) provides that development in gardens should not occupy an excessive part of the garden or result

	Source	Clause/ Policy	Comment	Response
			need to qualify the reference on Page 26 under DC4 point (g) and elsewhere relating to home offices. When applications for such home offices in gardens are made, especially in Conservation Areas, they should not result in a significant reduction in the open space, which impacts on the rural character. Too often we have seen such buildings, often with full facilities taking up a large proportion of a rear garden	in the loss of garden space which contributes to the character of the local area.
29.	Member of public	4.3 Hi(b)	Page 31 – policy H1(b) I think that this wording ducks an important issue. I think a blanket relaxation is not right either, however a presumption in favour of the provision of additional space for housing through extensions and loft conversions would serve the aims of policy H1(b) well as long as the design proposals were in keeping with the other policies written to ensure that extensions are appropriate.	We believe that the DC policies are a good compromise on this issue, which has divided opinion throughout the course of preparing the Neighbourhood Plan.
30.	Member of public	4.4 a	4.4 (a) (i) What is implied by “improve the broad range of tenure”?	Amended to delete ‘and improve’.
31.	Member of public	4.4 H1	I was surprised that the section on Rear Extensions seemed more supportive of these structures than I would have expected. It is of course understandable that occupants may want to build rear or side extensions and does help to keep expanding families in the area rather than moving out but I feel that, especially in a conservation area, these should always be in keeping with the design of the existing building (as well as being solely for domestic use) and not glass faced square boxes as seems to have been permitted in some back gardens. It must be incredibly distressing for next door neighbours to have to endure extensions of this nature which completely alter the outlook from their own back gardens. I feel that planning regulations and	The DC policies are clear that extensions need to be in keeping with the existing building. See for example DC4(a).

	Source	Clause/ Policy	Comment	Response
			<p>enforcement on this issue need tightening up.</p> <p>I agree it would be very useful to consider development of smaller accommodation units suitable (and affordable) for current residents who are young people or older people so that they do not have to move out of the area.</p>	Noted.
32.	Member of public	4.4 H1	<p>There is a conflict between H1 (b) and H1(c). Every time a loft extension is allowed in the small houses of Spencer Rise and Twisden Road, adding another bedroom and increasing the value of the house, a smaller much sought-after unit of which there is an inadequate supply, is lost. Even though the intention in H1(b) that “each such proposed change would need to be justified on the particular facts involved” it is hard not to suspect that the “sympathetic approach” proposed combined with residents pressure would sometimes override DPCAC policies.</p> <p>Policy DC4(f) it is surprising that this picture of a roof extension in York Rise page 28, is shown as a good example. The planning application was vigorously opposed by both the DPCAAC and the CTRRA see application no. 2012/4597/P for reasons. What was originally glass balustrading has now been obscured creating an ugly effect.</p>	Noted. See comments above – e.g. 23, 25. See also 33 below, which reflects the sentiments in the petition sent to DPNF.
33.	Member of public	4.4 H1b	<p>First of all thank you so much for all your hard work in providing a cohesive plan for the area. I am thoroughly in support of your plans for the area between Kentish Town and Gospel Oak. It is clearly very clever and well thought out. And myself and my wife found your meeting on it extremely informative and made us excited for the developments of our area.</p>	Noted.

	Source	Clause/ Policy	Comment	Response
			<p>On a personal note, I am most excited about Policy H1(b)I live in one of the small workers' cottages on Spencer Rise that have previously been denied the ability to extend into the loft. My wife is pregnant and we plan to spend a very long time in our house and will soon need the extra space.</p> <p>Nobody likes construction in their area. Its almost human nature to not want noise building work to happen near you. However, it seems particularly unfair that the conservation area many of whom live 4 story houses will not allow this reasonable development to make the houses more practical for young families to live in, I could not afford to buy the next size up of house in the area, so if we do not get permission to build an extra room we will have to move out of the area. The other argument for not allowing these developments as far as I understand it are</p> <p>1) That it will detract from the aesthetic of the area I live opposite an 1960's council block. almost every house in the area is different. There is no uniform aesthetic. I would say 50% of the houses on the street have loft conversions before the ban was put in. It seems so arbitrary to ban the other house on the street from building up to the height of their neighbours.</p> <p>2) That we should preserve them as starter homes. The houses are valued at £1.2 -1.5 million These are not starter homes. A starter home is what I lived in before which was a 1 bedroom flat. That is a fact of modern life in London.</p>	

	Source	Clause/ Policy	Comment	Response
			I really cannot stress how important that clause is. I know its a small part of your overall plan, but it is one that will make the most dramatic influence on mine and my family's life.	
34.	Member of public	5.4	I strongly support maintaining community facilities such as the Library and HNCC so that they are financially and practically sustainable. Commercial outlets such as shops and cafes also are very important hubs as are sports facilities and music venues (including churches).	Noted
35.	Member of public	6.1	<p>6.1 Vision."be fully accessible to all residents"</p> <p>On page 43 the Forum appears to believe that Camden planners are fully capable of applying and enforcing Camden policies relating to access to shops when this is clearly not the case in instances here and in others area of Kentish Town where they miserably fail either from lack of resources, knowledge or will in involving enforcement.</p> <p>There is a paramount need here for the plan to take more proactive action and set out clearly that all new shopfronts installations should provide level access. This would alert the planners to this issue (which they often seem unaware of) and strengthen their hand.</p> <p>Policy DC3 (h) page 23 "in construction and alteration of shopping and other commercial frontages in the Neighbourhood Centres...". Could it be noted that good design should always include adequate amenity ie accessibility.</p>	Now addressed in DC4(h), which provides that shops that do not provide access to everyone will be resisted.
36.	Member of public	6.4.1	A cash point at Swains Lane is a good idea. It would be useful to have a public toilet nearby (though there is one nearby on Hampstead Heath near the information office and the cafes all have one) .	Noted

	Source	Clause/ Policy	Comment	Response
37.	Member of public	6.4.1	Noble House Properties Ltd, not Noble Homes. The wording in the s106 Agreement only provides the Retail Forum with an advisory role although the landlord has to use his best endeavours to let to independent retailers. There is provision for the Council to exert some pressure (see attached extract from S106a <i>not downloadable</i>). However, it might be worth pointing out that the Landlord will need to set rents at a level that would sustain local businesses.	Noted. Point about rent levels now included in discussion of 'Opportunities' in respect of Swain's Lane.
38.	Member of public	7	<p>Thank you for such thorough work. However, the section on Ch7 Environment and Sustainability is inadequate on detailed policies about the highly urgent crisis of Climate Change.</p> <p>Climate Change is a Development issue, because the EU directives and Camden's policies have serious targets, which require changes to the exterior appearance of homes in Dartmouth Park.</p> <p>Also Fuel and Food poverty also need similar exterior improvements. I do not see any policy about the large number of families in the Dartmouth park are in Fuel+Food poverty, needing high levels of home insulation (external needing Development Control permission)</p> <p>Note: in Camden's data (a little out of date), One in 7 homes in Dartmouth Park are in Fuel + Food poverty. See Harold Garner, LBC officer, Sustainability Acting Head, for data.</p> <p>You seem to confuse Sustainability with Green trees etc, important though they are. You do NOT yet include</p>	<p>The draft policies in a previous version of the Neighbourhood Plan were deleted on the request of LB Camden because, amongst other reasons, we were unable to provide an adequate evidence base or policies that complied with the strategic policies, which a Neighbourhood Plan must to meet the 'Basic Conditions'. In addition, these concerns are addressed at length in the Energy Efficiency Planning Guidance for Dartmouth Park, which demonstrates that there are many measures which can be taken to improve efficiency other than external insulation and which often have a much higher return.</p> <p>A reference to fuel and food poverty is now included in Section 7.3.</p>

	Source	Clause/ Policy	Comment	Response
			<p>Sustainability as an urgent crisis issue in the Draft.</p> <p>The United Nations Brundtland definition of sustainable Development is :- Development which meets the needs of today, without compromising the needs of future generations of our children. I.E. Not causing irreversible Climate Change.</p> <p>The joint UK/US Research expedition to the Antarctic with “Boaty Mcboatface submarine”, in oct 2018 says that for every 5 years we put off sustainably cutting our Fossil Fuel energy use to nearly zero, the sea will rise another metre. London will be destroyed by a metre sea rise. They think it is too late to stop the sea rising 1.4m. and a ¼ m by 2070.</p> <p>We need to urgently insulate our homes thoroughly, so a minimum of energy is burnt, whether Fossil fuels or other. Insulation has to be on the outside, with a rainproof stucco coating.</p> <p>If not, many deaths will occur if insulation is inside, during summer heatwaves, which are expected to increase in frequency and intensity</p>	
39.	Member of public	7	<p>Following my comments on 15/6/18, I have a further comment:- that you need to correct a legal error in your Draft. While this is just after your deadline, it is an important legal issue to correct:-</p> <p>Your Draft section Ch7 Environment and Sustainability ,ES4 Energy is legally NOT correct about Solar Panels on flats and houses and bigger buildings. This may be because Permitted Development changed since 2014</p>	Noted. Amended so the policy now applies only where the solar panels do not constitute permitted development.

	Source	Clause/ Policy	Comment	Response
			<p>Draft. This legislation reinforced and encouraged more extensive use of renewable energy panels, wind turbines, CHP, Heat pumps etc everywhere.</p> <p>You say:- “Policy ES4 Energy efficiency Support measures which increase energy efficiency and which reduce energy and resource loss, by: (a) permitting the installation of solar panels that are sensitively incorporated and (where the development is located within the Conservation Area) either are not visible from the street or are physically and visually integrated into the roof and do not project above the plane of the roof (see examples below); and “</p> <p>If you read the legislation:- The Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) (England) Order 2015 2015 No. 596 SCHEDULE 2 PART 14 Renewable Energy (see:- http://www.legislation.gov.uk/ukxi/2015/596/schedule/2/part/14/made)</p> <p>The above The Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) (England) Order 2015 Says that no-one needs to apply for Town Planning approval for Solar Panels (or other renewables like wind turbines etc) in a Conservation Area, or any other area, on a house or flat, and also other bigger buildings, subject to reasonable conditions, eg no more than 200mm above roof surface, but can be visible from the street.</p> <p>Your proposal for visually integrating solar panels into the roof costs twice as much as normal solar panels,</p>	

	Source	Clause/ Policy	Comment	Response
			<p>and so shows that you do NOT support energy efficiency, because this will considerably reduce the number of installations, and neither reduce Climate Changing Carbon emissions, nor help those in Fuel + Food poverty.</p> <p>Your Draft has to be consistent with NPPF (National Planning Policy Framework) which says how UK Planning decisions have to be made. You cannot diminish locally, in your Draft Plan, the National Legislation above.</p>	
40.	Member of public	7.3	Strongly agree with maintaining green and open spaces and not building any high rise blocks	Noted
41.	Member of public	7.3	<p>The plan suggested increasing road trees. I agree with this and would like to suggest a few more in Bramshill Gardens where I live. I would be happy to volunteer to support newly planted saplings by watering them etc.</p> <p>(NB I noted that Bramshill Gardens didn't get much of a mention in the Plan although the upper part of the street comprises a very interesting and generally well preserved set of late Victorian buildings)</p>	Noted
42.	Member of public	7.3	I wasn't sure if the small green space with trees at the top right hand side of Chester Road was included in your small green space map. This is an important green area which needs some attention as it is currently seems to be something of a focus for rubbish dumping.	Noted, but area is felt to be insufficiently defined to add to the plan of small green spaces.
43.	Member of public	7.4 ES4	The possibility of having solar panels integrated into roof tiling is a great idea – and new to me. Maybe it needs more publicity!	Noted
44.	Member of public	7.4 ES1c	Certainly there should be a complete ban on conversion of front gardens to off road parking.	Noted. The policy as drafted is consistent with Camden policies.
45.	Member of	7.4	If appropriate, I would be pleased to see collaboration	Noted. New Project added to Appendix 7 to

	Source	Clause/ Policy	Comment	Response
	public	ES4a	with Power Up North London in pursuing opportunities for community energy projects as per St Ann's Church and other sites in Camden, and to demonstrate how these might be pursued within a conservation area.	examine community energy projects in a conservation area
46.	Thames Water	7.4 ES1c	<p>This is a long letter on statutory duties which could be attached as an appendix. It contains one proposal:</p> <p>With regard to surface water drainage, Thames Water request that the following paragraph should be included in the Neighbourhood Plan: <i>"It is the responsibility of a developer to make proper provision for surface water drainage to ground, water courses or surface water sewer. It must not be allowed to drain to the foul sewer, as this is the major contributor to sewer flooding."</i></p>	This is outside the scope of land use planning. A reference has been added in the section on the Murphy's Site in Chapter 9 to the requirement for additional water and drainage infrastructure in the area if it is brought forward for development.
47.	TfL Gavin McLaughlin Principal Planner	7.4 ES2	<p><i>Policy ES2 Trees</i></p> <p>We do not support the removal of healthy trees from the Transport for London Network (TLRN) unless there is clearly no viable alternative and removal is for an essential purpose. The Neighbourhood Forum may wish to take a similar stance in line with the above policies and Proposal 43 of the Mayor's Transport Strategy (MTS).</p> <p>Para 1.2.6 of the draft new London Plan also states: 'delivering 50 per cent green <u>cover</u> across London, will be important to help London become a National Park City.'</p> <p>Increasing the total number of trees and diversity of tree species, though positive, could still happen without supporting the Mayor's National Park status and biodiversity aspirations. It would therefore be advisable to change the policy wording at sub-sections (b) and (d)</p>	<p>Noted. We believe Policy ES2 is consistent with this approach.</p> <p>Noted.</p> <p>ES2(b) amended to refer to tree canopy cover.</p>

	Source	Clause/ Policy	Comment	Response
			<p>so that they apply to the spatial amount of tree canopy cover rather than the 'number of trees' or 'tree diversity'.</p> <p>This can prevent mature trees being replaced by small sub-standard trees which provide less ecosystem and biodiversity benefits</p>	
48.	Member of public	8.3	<p>8.3: Traffic Volumes Chetwynd Road should not be referred to as a "through route", this gives it status as a "Connector Road" which it does not have as a residential Local Road. It is a rat run.</p> <p>Although high levels of traffic volume and concern about pollution especially on Chetwynd Road has been identified and ... "a strong desire to reduce through traffic" vague aspirations are offered ie in 8.4 the aim "to reduce the effects of traffic on residents in Dartmouth Park, including noise, safety, health and air pollution".</p> <p>The problem has been relegated to Appendix 7, project no 15, Chetwynd Road Study... "which aims to engage with Camden in an exploration of the possibilities ranging from measures locally, in the street itself, to radical reorganisation of traffic management in a wider area, possibly as far afield as Kentish Town".</p> <p>It should be noted however that the groundwork has already been done by local residents who organised a petition which was presented to the Council who then commissioned traffic surveys and based on these findings produced a report. A deputation was made to the Culture and Environment Scrutiny Committee last October. Traffic planners have been considering</p>	<p>We understand that traffic is a concern but legally must limit our <i>policies</i> to land use planning. The issue has not been 'relegated' to Appendix 7: that is only way it can be addressed. A Project in Appendix 7 therefore proposes a study into solutions to the high volumes of traffic along Chetwynd Road.</p> <p>Noted. The Forum has submitted comments to Camden on its recently proposed options for addressing the traffic problems in Chetwynd Road.</p>

	Source	Clause/ Policy	Comment	Response
			<p>measures to address these traffic concerns and will present their initial ideas to the community shortly.</p> <p>We trust the Forum will now have an opportunity to engage with Camden as well as other residential streets to fully support such schemes that will mitigate the effects of the high volume of traffic and pollution (a major health issue) in the Dartmouth Park area.</p> <p>Page 73 "Impact on the Environment" Pollution monitoring - could add that Camden already monitors Chetwynd Road.</p>	Noted. This section already refers to Chetwynd Road.
49.	Member of public	8.4 TS3	<p>CARBON REDUCTIONS The reduction in road traffic with Murphy's relocating can be enhanced by reducing Car and Bus movements.</p> <p>FUNDING It won't happen without external impetus and influence. It could be paid for, out of the Petty Cash Budget for Crossrail 2 and S106 Funds.</p>	Noted
50.	Member of public	8.4	I note the section on public transport supports maintaining the bus routes. I would endorse this and also add that it would be good to have a bus route that goes down Dartmouth Park Hill towards Kentish Town, Camden and the WestEnd. Maybe the 134 could have a slight change of route???	This is outside the remit of the Neighbourhood Plan
51.	Member of public	8.4	I have participated in the ongoing discussion about parking in CA-U. In keeping with many of our neighbours we support an increase in restrictions from the current 10am-12 to 8am-6.30pm plus Saturday mornings in keeping with the majority of Camden areas.	This is outside the remit of the Neighbourhood Plan
52.	Member of public	8.4	I would like to draw attention to the apparent recent increase in dog fouling (including random discarding of plastic bags with dog poo inside!) and generally littering	This is outside the remit of the Neighbourhood Plan

	Source	Clause/ Policy	Comment	Response
			on the pavements. Maybe more bins (as well as enforcements) are needed?	
53.	Member of public	8.4	Better cycle routes and more cycle parking would be excellent.	Noted
54.	Member of public	8.4	Traffic calming outside Brookfield school is certainly a good idea (and Chester Road generally)	Noted
55.	Member of public	8.4 TS2	I am pleased to see the policies and projects associated with cycling, making it safer, more connected/permeable and also potentially increasing cycle parking options (which can be difficult for flat dwellers). Equally, those policies and proposals associated with improving the pedestrian experience.	Noted
56.	Member of public	8.4	<p>You are probably aware that the recently appointed Cabinet Member for Improving the Environment is a Dartmouth Park Hill resident, although his ward is Bloomsbury. One of his stated priorities is 'clean air' with obvious implications for local policies and projects regarding active travel and the school run. He attended this week's Sustrans-hosted event for elected members with an interest in promoting walking and cycling.</p> <p>The draft London Plan's Healthy Streets policy is being taken up by a number of boroughs and is a source of project funding which could well be suitable for various of the projects under consideration. Indeed, the neighbourhood plan as a whole has the potential to improve health and reduce health inequalities.</p>	<p>Noted</p> <p>Noted. References to the Healthy Streets policy have been added to Chapter 8. A reference to a potential source of funding has been added to Appendix 7.</p>
57.	Member of public	8.4	It does feel however that as a community plan, it overlooks how much a community is able to form with so much traffic and cut through of the area. More strongly worded action needs to be added about reducing non-local cars/trucks/etc from using these roads. This is not only for the now obvious reasons of health concerns,	See 48 above. A reference to the adverse effect on community has been added to Section 8.3.

	Source	Clause/ Policy	Comment	Response
			<p>but also to foster a promote more of a community feel to the streets and shared spaces.</p> <p>Please consider this as a starting point to rebuilding a stronger sense of community, as this will ultimately lead to making all of the other changes more easily.</p>	
58.	TfL Gavin McLaughlin Principal Planner	8.4 TS1	<p><i>Vision Zero</i></p> <p>The Mayor and TfL have also committed to delivering a 'Vision Zero' approach in London to make its streets safer for all. Minimising road danger is fundamental to the creation of streets where everyone feels safe walking, cycling and using public transport. As a result we are aiming for no one to be killed in or by a London bus by 2030, and for all deaths and serious injuries from road collisions to be eliminated from London's streets by 2041.</p> <p>As a result we strongly support Policy TS1 and its aim to 'make Dartmouth Park safer and more accessible for pedestrians and cyclists'.</p>	Noted. A reference to the 'Vision Zero' approach has been added to the supporting text for Policy TS1.
59.	TfL Gavin McLaughlin Principal Planner	8.4	<p><i>Buses</i></p> <p>The Forum should note that buses are essential to Healthy Streets due to the 'People choose to walk, cycle and use public transport' indicator. A successful transport system enables more people to walk and cycle more often (see https://tfl.gov.uk/corporate/about-tfl/how-we-work/planning-for-the-future/healthy-streets)</p> <p>In the Dartmouth Park Plan Area, Swains Lane, Chester Road, Raydon Street, and St Albans are all narrow roads used by route C11. We also operate routes 4 (Dartmouth Park Hill), 214 (Highgate Road and Highgate West Hill) and C2 (Highgate Hill and Swains</p>	<p>Noted</p> <p>Noted</p>

	Source	Clause/ Policy	Comment	Response
			<p>Lane).</p> <p>The plan acknowledges that some of the above streets are currently narrow and congested, and includes policies and projects designed to reduce the effects of traffic on residents, whilst maintaining and enhancing the public transport that serves Dartmouth Park. This is welcome. We also support the Plan's clear acknowledgement that public transport accessibility – including buses – is essential for the Neighbourhood Plan area.</p> <p>The section headed 'Justification for Policy TS3' (p. 80) suggests that buses contribute towards a negative environmental impact. However an increase in bus use is crucial to help improve the local environment and promote public health by supporting a shift away from private motorised vehicles.</p> <p>TfL Buses would be supportive of any initiatives in the Plan Area that protect or improve bus journey times; such as the extension of existing bus lanes, both physically and in terms of hours of operation.</p> <p>Finally, route C2 terminates at Parliament Hill Fields, then circumnavigates the roundabout at Swains Lane and heads back down Highgate Hill. As a result it is essential this turn is maintained by any street works or public realm improvement projects in the neighbourhood area.</p> <p><i>Mayor of London</i> A number of references are made in the document</p>	<p>Noted</p> <p>This is not intended and we have deleted the reference to buses in the justification for TS3.</p> <p>Noted</p> <p>Noted. A reference to this requirement has been added to Section 9.4.3 which deals with the infrastructure works required at the junction of Swain's Lane and Highgate West Hill.</p> <p>Note that references to the City of London</p>

	Source	Clause/ Policy	Comment	Response
			(Chapter 10) to the City of London Corporation which appear to be an error. These should be replaced with 'Mayor of London' or 'Greater London Authority'.	Corporation are correct, in the context of Hampstead Heath.
60.	Member of public	9.2 SNS1	Policy SNSI: our disappointing experience (working on a project for the Mansfield Bowling Club site) about community engagement is that people are very reluctant to meet, to give opinions, or to commit to a point of view UNLESS IT IS TO OBJECT. . The Neighbourhood plan should be realistic about what people are like.	Noted, but community engagement should be encouraged on larger or locally important sites. Including a provision for consultation gives a better foundation for encouraging engagement.
61.	Member of public	9.4	The principles proposed in chapter 9 with respect to neighbourhood specific sites seems sound. I endorse the proposed approaches to both Murphy's yard and the ASF garage site in particular. I am particularly pleased to see the following projects included in the plan: 1 Greenway network 2 Cycle permeability 10 Pocket parks 14 School run.	Noted.
62.	Member of public	9.4.1	EXTERNAL STAKEHOLDERS At a Macro level, I have long argued for a Ribbon Committee, Chaired by TfL to allow GOBLIN, Council, Resident, and other Stakeholders along the line to interact quarterly. For instance Schools could be given Friday afternoon access to the " Murphy's" project to learn about the Technical and Trade Employment jobs involved and Apprentices taken on, from the local Community	This is outside the remit of the Neighbourhood Plan
63.	Member of public	9.4.1	The plans for Murphys Yard (also presented at the DPF meeting in April all sound sensible . (Trees, Mixed housing, Some small business units, No high rise)	Noted
64.	Kentish Town	9.4.1	We refer to the extract of the DPNF Policy relating to	We have emailed KTNF to clarify the point about

	Source	Clause/ Policy	Comment	Response
	Neighbourhood Forum, Roger Winfield		<p>Murphy's Yard on page 88 of the Consultation Draft and would like to make the following comments.</p> <p>KTNF would like clarification of the residential figures in the above paragraph. During the DPNF AGM and the launch of this consultation, in an answer to a question from the floor, it was stated that the 500 homes figure relates to development only on that part of the Murphy Site lying within the DPNF area. The figure quoted did not include housing that could be built on that part of the Murphy Site that lies within the KTNF area. The statement above in the consultation draft contradicts the answer given at the AGM.</p> <p>We would be grateful for clarification.</p> <p>We also have some reservations that by referring to development capacities (e.g. "of up to 30,000sqm of employment space,and 500 homes...") that this could be used in the future to try to limit planning applications coming forward with greater densities which in turn could restrict the full potential of the Murphy Site.</p>	<p>residential figures.</p> <p>Re limiting density, the numbers quoted are largely influenced by the viewing corridor in the Kentish Town Neighbourhood Plan, alongside a desire for development that is responsive to context.</p>
65.	DP9 Ltd for Folgate Estates Murphy's site	9.4.1	<p>We are instructed by Folgate Estates, the owners of the Murphy site ("the Site"), to submit representations in relation to the Dartmouth Park Neighbourhood Plan ("Neighbourhood Plan") Consultation Draft (April 2018). Folgate Estates are developing proposals for the redevelopment of the Site, which is located within the designated Neighbourhood Forum Area; the emerging Neighbourhood Plan will therefore provide a framework for the delivery of the redevelopment scheme and, as a result, it is important to provide detailed comment on the draft Neighbourhood Plan.</p> <p>Note: DP9 submitted plans which were too large to attach to this compilation of comments</p>	Noted

	Source	Clause/ Policy	Comment	Response
66.	DP9 Ltd for Folgate Estates Murphy's site	9.4.1	<p>Folgate Estates supports the publication of the Neighbourhood Plan to provide a clear framework for proposals to be determined against, as part of Camden Council's Development Plan. To facilitate the timely adoption of the Neighbourhood Plan, Folgate Estates will seek to ensure that the Neighbourhood Plan meets the 'Basic Conditions', as set out in Planning Practice Guidance ("PPG"), in order to proceed to submission stage, examination and referendum. For the Neighbourhood Plan to progress from Examination to Referendum and then Adoption, it must meet the relevant Basic Conditions set out in PPG (Paragraph: 065 Reference ID: 41-065-20140306) and summarised below:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> have regard to national policies and advice contained in guidance issued by the Secretary of State; <input type="checkbox"/> contribute to the achievement of sustainable development; and <input type="checkbox"/> be in general conformity with the strategic policies contained in the development plan for the area of the authority. <p>The following comments are set against this background. We trust that these comments will be taken into account, and confirm that we would wish to reserve the right to appear at Examination and to expand upon these representations in due course. We would be pleased to discuss this representation and any of our comments further and if this is the case, please do not hesitate to contact David Morris.</p>	Noted
67.	DP9 Ltd for Folgate Estates	9.4.1	<p>General Comments Folgate Estates welcomes the publication of the consultation draft Neighbourhood Plan and the general</p>	Noted

	Source	Clause/ Policy	Comment	Response
	Murphy's site		support it provides for investment in and the enhancement of the Dartmouth Park area, as part of a Vision that seeks to ensure that <i>"Dartmouth Park is a vibrant neighbourhood with a balanced and diverse community, with thriving local centres and excellent connectivity with the rest of London."</i> (p.10). The Neighbourhood Plan provides clear support for higher density development on the Site, identifying it as a key site in recognition of its potential to enhance the Dartmouth Park area with a genuinely mixed-use scheme, including housing, employment, retail, cultural and community use (page 88). The support for a comprehensive and mixed-use approach to the site's redevelopment is welcomed, and the opportunity to engage with the Forum and the community as the project develops will be valuable to ensure that the contribution that this strategically important site can make to the delivery of the Neighbourhood Plan objectives, as well as the aspirations of the Council and the Greater London Authority, can be fully realised	
68.	DP9 Ltd for Folgate Estates Murphy's site	9.4.1	<p>'Specific Neighbourhood Site' Comments – Murphy Site 9.4.1</p> <p>The Neighbourhood Plan identifies the Murphy site as a 'Specific Neighbourhood Site' in recognition of its significant potential for redevelopment, acknowledging its cross-boundary location with the Kentish Town Neighbourhood Forum. The overarching aspirations for a high-quality, mixed-use development that is well integrated to the surrounding urban context, with open space, including green routes, is welcomed.</p> <p>The Council is in the process of developing a framework for this site, together with the Regis Road site, which will further help to guide development</p>	The densities proposed are well in excess of those in the rest of the neighbourhood so it is incorrect to suggest that existing densities are the sole determinant of site capacity. Rather, a report from AECOM for the Neighbourhood Forum provided the evidence base and the greatest constraint on heights is the viewing corridor now embedded in policy that runs through the site. That viewing corridor is not one proposed by DPNF.

	Source	Clause/ Policy	Comment	Response
			<p>proposals, and mirrors the process aspirations set out in the Neighbourhood Plan; however, there is no requirement for the two sites to be developed in conjunction, and in light of land ownership, any such restriction would unduly impact on delivery.</p> <p>Whilst the shared aspiration to deliver a mixed-use scheme on this site is welcomed, the excessively restrictive approach taken to development capacity and height is a significant concern, and will result in any redevelopment proposal failing to contribute fully to the achievement of sustainable development, and optimising site potential, in accordance with national, strategic and local planning policy. The site development capacity that has been identified should not be solely determined by densities within the area, but through a design-led masterplan approach, informed by the site's context, its accessibility, capacity of infrastructure, and taking full account of the site's contribution to the economic, social and environmental needs and aspirations of the borough and London; this approach is a requirement of both national, strategic and local policy.</p> <p>Furthermore, whilst the wider community's aspirations to celebrate local views is understood, the arbitrary height restriction of five-storeys within the viewing corridor from Kentish Town station to Parliament Hill, and its peripheral corridor, is severe and will significantly undermine the ability to deliver a redevelopment proposal which will meet the requirements of local and strategic policies as they relate to optimising density, and delivering significant replacement employment provision. Folgate Estates have engaged with the Kentish Town Neighbourhood</p>	<p>The Neighbourhood Plan does not contain any requirement for the Regis Road and Murphy's Sites to be developed in conjunction. This has been clarified in Section 9.4.1.</p>

	Source	Clause/ Policy	Comment	Response
			<p>Forum on this issue, and would be keen to work with both Forum's, the Council and the Greater London Authority, on how to appropriately address local ambitions to protect views in the context of achieving the best development outcome for the site.</p> <p>The recognition of the site's important heritage assets is welcomed, and any redevelopment will take full regard of existing heritage as part of a comprehensive design-led approach, ensuring delivery of the highest-quality design.</p>	Noted.
69.	DP9 Ltd for Folgate Estates Murphy's site	9.4.1	<p>The Neighbourhood Plan's objective to improve permeability and connectivity through the site is supported; however, the rationale for the indicative 'route 4' (Figure 9B) is unclear, and falls outside of the boundary of the Dartmouth Park Neighbourhood Plan area. Any redevelopment will seek to maximise opportunities to provide routes into and through the site; however, this must be determined through a comprehensive design-led process, and informed by a thorough assessment of feasibility, particularly with regards to any bridge structures, as well as movement patterns both within and outside the site.</p> <p>The aspiration for any development on this site to be car-free is welcomed; however, a balanced view must be taken as part of any future proposal to ensure appropriate provision is made for all uses, and users, including families and Blue Badge parking, and noting commercial requirements. The provision of car parking should therefore be determined through the planning process in accordance with the requirements of the Council and Greater London Authority.</p>	Noted. Any routes shown are indicative and not embedded in policies. This has been clarified in Section 9.4.1. Car free is a LB Camden policy so a matter to discuss with them.
70.	DP9 Ltd for Folgate	9.4.1 DC3	The requirement for good design (Policy DC3) is welcomed, and the need to integrate with the local	Noted

	Source	Clause/ Policy	Comment	Response
	Estates Murphy's site		surroundings and landscape context is acknowledged, with development proposals needing to <i>respect</i> , but not be <i>driven</i> by, the scale, mass, density and character of existing and surrounding buildings. The ' <i>justification for Policy DC3</i> ', on page 25 of the Neighbourhood Plan, recognises that ' <i>Where large scale developments are permitted in accordance with the other policies in this Plan, with buildings that are higher than the established scale of the area, intermediate-scale blocks should be used to ease the transition between smaller and larger scale buildings</i> '; given the size of the Murphy site, at 13 acres, this allows for its redevelopment to establish its own scale, transitioning at its boundaries to respect and respond to the existing urban form.	
71.	DP9 Ltd for Folgate Estates Murphy's site	9.4.1 H1, H2, H3	The support for the provision of a range of housing, including the maximum amount of affordable housing, in a range of tenures, is welcomed (Policies H1, H2 and H3). The Neighbourhood Plan also acknowledges the need for all development proposals to fully accord with both the Council's and Greater London Authority's housing policies, including those relating to unit size and mix, and design.	Noted
72.	DP9 Ltd for Folgate Estates Murphy's site	9.4.1 ES 3	The objective to enhance biodiversity within the Neighbourhood Plan area is supported (Policy ES3), and the enhancement of existing, and provision of new, green links will be a key part of any future redevelopment proposals.	Noted. A reference to new green links is included in Section 9.4.1.
73.	DP9 Ltd for Folgate Estates Murphy's site	9.4.1	Plans with responses too large to attach for email. Full copy can be supplied for putting in a central location	
74.	Member of public	9.4.2	specifically on 9.4.2 Mansfield Bowling Club: I welcome this broadly, and agree that the majority of the site	Car free is a LB Camden policy.

	Source	Clause/ Policy	Comment	Response
			<p>should be for public use. But I feel that it is too proscriptive. We (a local senior co-housing group) hoped, and still hope, that the site can become a Community Land Trust, in which case the open space will be "sustainably managed and maintained for the future for the benefit of the public."</p> <p>- Our aim is that the housing on the site should be for older people, and think it is unrealistic and unhelpful that it should be entirely car free.</p> <p>- We also feel it would be in contradiction to items [b] and [c] of Policy DC3 if the Neighbourhood Plan insists that any new housing (strictly limited as to size) should be on the foot print of the existing bowling club building.</p>	<p>Section 9.4.2 has been amended to make clear that 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.</p> <p>The Local Green Spaces Plan will be redrawn to exclude the car park.</p>
75.	Member of public	10.2	<p>It would be great to have the Highgate Cemetery Gate in Chester Road open. It would also be very good to have better signage for tourists and other visitors from the tube stations and bus stops and at crossroads etc. More visitors would be good for the Library as well as for the Oak Café and the newly opened shop.</p>	Noted
76.	Member of public	Appendix 2	<p>It might be added after Tesco that; Provision will have to be made for deliveries to the shops in the new development, as well as for a pedestrian crossing given the existing need and the expected increase in pedestrian traffic.</p> <p>Corks and Forks was not a café delicatessen, it was a grocer/delicatessen/wine seller</p>	<p>A reference to the need to relocate the pedestrian crossing and provide loading zones for the shops has been added to Section 9.4.3.</p> <p>Noted and amended.</p>
77.	Member of public	Appendix 4	<p>Appendix 4 Additional Heritage Assets should include the Sign on the site of the Duke of St Albans pub. This has historic significance to the area given the Duke owned the Holly Lodge Estate. The sign was retained under the planning permission for the flats above the Carob Tree Restaurant on Highgate Road. I could let you have a photo if required.</p>	Added to list

	Source	Clause/ Policy	Comment	Response
78.	Member of public	Appendix 7	Public notice boards are a good idea and might mean that fewer notices have to be posted up on trees	Noted
79.	Member of public	Appendix 7	(eg Appendix 7). Toilets near Swain's Lane is rather misleading. It should be Public Toilets near the Bus Terminus at the Junction of Highgate Road with Swain's Lane. The ideal, and probably the only plausible, location, is on the West Side of Highgate Road. This is the site of public toilets that were removed some time ago after being vandalised. This site is just inside the Heath and would require cooperation from the Hampstead Heath authorities. As noted in the report, finance would be required from a variety of sources. Given that a primary use would be for the bus drivers, a possible source would be Transport for London but such toilets would also serve for visitors to the Heath.	Amended as suggested.
80.	TfL Gavin McLaughlin Principal Planner	Appendix 7	<p>Appendix 7 – Projects</p> <p>The area contains no parts of the TLRN or Strategic Road Network (SRN) and changes to the highway are therefore mainly a matter for Camden Council.</p> <p>However some proposed projects could involve widening footways and reducing speed limits. The Plan should therefore explicitly mention that maintaining a strong easily accessible bus network is reliant on maintaining good bus journey times, and that any changes to road layouts to support cycling, walking and Healthy Streets should also maintain or improve bus journey times.</p> <p>Whilst we strongly support the aspiration for improved pedestrian access to Gospel Oak station, the improvements proposed are not part of TfL's current</p>	<p>Noted, although some of the suggestions are outside the scope of neighbourhood planning.</p> <p>Requirement for further discussion referred to in the description of Project 16 in Appendix 7.</p>

	Source	Clause/ Policy	Comment	Response
			<p>confirmed investment programme and would require extensive further discussions with Network Rail and TfL Rail on funding, design and delivery.</p> <p>Other initiatives the Forum could consider are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Neighbourhood-scale traffic management, especially through local roads, to minimise through-movement by motorised traffic • Improving permeability on existing roads for cycling, e.g. more contraflows on one-way streets, gaps to permit cycle movement where there is no motor vehicle access • Exploring Cycle Streets, Play Streets and temporary closures for events, play, etc. These are ways of changing the balance between users and promoting active travel and a more diverse use of streets and public spaces in line with paragraphs J and K of Policy D7 of the new draft London Plan (2017). 	<p>Addressed in Project 15 in Appendix 7.</p> <p>Addressed in Project 2 in Appendix 7.</p> <p>New Project 20 on temporary street closures added to Appendix 7.</p>
81.	Member of public	A7.2	<p>BACKGROUND</p> <p>The Barking to Gospel Oak Passenger Group have worked tirelessly to improve this line; often getting no response and now delayed responses to the huge increases in passengers. For example, it was years before TfL connected Walthamstow Queen's Road by pathway to Walthamstow Central and many current economically viable proposals were originally proposed in 1974-75.</p> <p>IMPORTANCE</p> <p>The news that Camden Council and TfL, have not highlighted improvement of Gospel Oak, this key interchange, is perturbing. I saw some minor aesthetic changes proposed.</p>	Noted

	Source	Clause/ Policy	Comment	Response
			<p>A new Station must be woven sympathetically into this beautiful part of London. Many businesses operate successfully under Railway Arches.</p> <p>OPTIONS</p> <p>1. GOBLIN's idea of realignment and even re sighting the Gospel Oak Station on the other side of the Road need careful consideration. Townhouses on the current site would be a nice way to minimise the financial implications.</p> <p>Other comments were made outside the DPNF area:</p> <p>Reopening Highgate High Level</p> <p>Reopening Junction Road (Tufnell Park)</p> <p>Reopening Highgate Road, Low Level</p> <p>Connectivity between Goblin and the NLL</p>	