

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2023/3595/P	Gary Lockwood	06/10/2023 16:21:18	OBJ	<p>I should like to formally object to the proposed demolition and development planned for the Heybridge Car Park on the Castle Road Estate. I believe that the exorbitant cost of this development, which can only take place provided the car park is demolished, is far outweighed by the disruption, over a sustained period of time, caused to residents for the outcome of a maximum of 14 -20 dwellings. There are a number of other sites that are either being developed or which are more suitable for development which are far more cost effective than this one. I would strongly advocate that Camden Local Authority's financial resources are spent on void housing which could be repaired and made suitable for far more social housing tenants than this and at a fraction of the cost. This development is not value for money and barely touches the surface in the need for social housing. I find it really difficult to understand how it is possible to justify the millions of pounds being spent on this vanity exercise for Camden and the Mayor of London.</p> <p>I strongly object to this planning application as I believe that the proposal is not value for money. The site requires too much expenditure in preparation to justify the development of houses to accommodate 14 – 20 families. In addition, how much consideration has been made to the current sites being developed in areas such as Kings Cross that will house many more families and require far less money to be spent in preparation? I do not believe that alternative and more cost-effective options for this specific site have been considered and urge that this application for planning is rejected on the grounds identified in the above comments.</p> <p>I also stongly object to this planning application will also not add to the area of specific conservation interest designated to the cut de sac in Hadley Street. Blocks of flats will be out of place and detract from the allocated conservation area. Previous planning proposals included terrace style properties on the Hadley Street side of the proposed site which would be in keeping with the road than a block of flats.</p>

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2023/3595/P	Sali Phillips	29/09/2023 21:00:32	OBJ	<p>I should like to formally object to the proposed demolition and development planned for the Heybridge Car Park on the Castle Road Estate. I believe that the exorbitant cost of this development, which can only take place provided the car park is demolished, is far outweighed by the disruption, over a sustained period of time, caused to residents for the outcome of a maximum of 14 -20 dwellings. There are a number of other sites that are either being developed, or which are more suitable for development which are far more cost effective than this one. I would strongly advocate that Camden Local Authority's financial resources are spent on void housing which could be repaired and made suitable for far more social housing tenants than this and at a fraction of the cost. This development is not value for money and barely touches the surface in the need for social housing. I find it really difficult to understand how it is possible to justify the millions of pounds being spent on this vanity exercise for Camden and the Mayor of London.</p> <p>With regard to the application for the demolition of the underground car park, we have read through the Demolition Management Plan as presented by Campbell Reith Hill LLP and wish to make the following comments:</p> <p>2.0 – Overview of the Site and Proposed Demolition Works</p> <p>2.1.9 - Please be aware that, should there be unprecedented rainfall, or other adverse weather conditions, this area is liable to flooding from Hampstead Ponds.</p> <p>2.3 – Overview and the Demolition Works</p> <p>2.3.1 – “A combination of the hoarding and existing trees may require footpath closure on Hadley St and Lewis St during installation”. Please clarify this statement. Will it be one or both footpaths? For how long? How will the trees be impacted?</p> <p>2.3.2 – You mention “temporary suspension of the parking bays on Hadley St to install and remove at the beginning and end of the project” – Which parking bays are these? What additional parking will you provide? What about the electrical points recently installed?</p> <p>2.3.3 – You state that condition surveys will be undertaken by the contractor to the homes in Heybridge residential block and to the properties in the surrounding streets. The work that is intended to be done to both demolish and remove the car park is high impact and will cause considerable noise and vibration. Some of the properties are privately owned and of high net worth and could be significantly impacted/damaged by the demolition. There needs to be a full structural survey completed on each house and a reassurance that any and all damage is rectified to a high standard without delay at the expense of the contractor/Camden Local Authority.</p> <p>3.0 – Demolition Methodology</p> <p>3.1 – Summary of Demolition Works</p> <p>3.1.4 – Securing the Structure: “Temporary support deck to podium slab to prevent uncontrolled collapse” The phrase ‘uncontrolled collapse’ is extremely alarming. If there is any potential for collapse, we, the residents, would suggest that the entire demolition project is shelved and alternative plans drawn up to use the area in its existing form.</p> <p>3.1.5 – Separating the Parking Structure from Heybridge: You discuss saw cutting being the noisiest part of the demolition but make no comment regarding how long this will take. The ethos of working from home is embraced by a number of residents, several of whom run a business from their property. High levels of noise and vibration will have a significant impact on their ability to work and therefore their business. In addition, there are several people living adjacent to the Heybridge car park with serious health conditions and this level of noise will be of extreme concern to them.</p> <p>3.1.6 - Breaking down the slab: it states this will be cut by saw and broken down by hydraulic machinery on site. According to the documents sent out by the Development Partner, Billie Dainton, this will take up to two months. From experience of development and similar procedures in Kings Cross, we know that this is also</p>

Application No: Consultees Name: Received:

Comment: Response:

excruciatingly loud, making meetings and phone conversations virtually impossible. Quality of life for those that are home during the day, will be seriously impacted. It will also have a significant impact on Holy Trinity and St. Silas School.

3.1.7 – Taking down the podium, sorting and removing materials: You state that “Road closures are not anticipated”. As residents, we need reassurance that road closures will not occur. You make reference to school drop off and pick up, minimising disruption at these times. Parents are not supposed to use their cars for drop off and pick up and park illegally when they do so and yet they are being taken into consideration more than residents.

3.2 – Temporary Site Compounds

3.2.1 – With regard to the temporary site accommodation, we, as residents, need reassurance that there will be no excessive noise or anti-social behaviour emanating from this accommodation. This includes shouting, swearing and smoking.

3.2.3 - You refer to “any on street parking will be in accordance with local regulations and restrictions”. Please note that Residents Parking is from 8.00 am – 11.00 pm on weekdays and 9.00 am – 11.00 pm on the weekends. Based on this, the parking in Hadley Street and Lewis Street will be available to residents only. In addition, there will be no reduction of parking available in Hadley Street and Lewis Street to residents.

3.2.5 – We, the residents, have particular concern about access for emergency vehicles, particularly as some of my neighbours suffer from life-threatening illnesses.

3.2.6 – All residents need to see the risk assessments undertaken by the appointed contractor, with regard to the elements quoted under this point (access routes/control of potential hazards/protection of vegetation/protection of wildlife/working hours and noise levels/safety) and be able to challenge as appropriate.

3.4 – Demolition Traffic Routes and Movements

3.4.1 – “car/van movements are expected to be constant throughout” Does this refer to site vehicles or resident/delivery vehicles? If the latter, this needs to be guaranteed. If the former, this is unacceptable.

3.6 - Working Hours

3.6.1 – You state that working hours will be

- Monday to Friday, 08:00 – 18:00
- Saturday, 08:00 – 13:00
- No working on Sundays or Bank Holidays unless otherwise agreed by LBC.

To ensure respite and quality of life for residents, these hours need to be amended and restricted to 9:00 – 17:00 on weekdays, with no work on Saturdays and absolutely no work on Sundays/Bank Holidays (unless, of course, the mayor or those who run the LBA are prepared to stay on site for the duration of the project so that they might experience the hell they are attempting to put their residents through).

3.6.3 – “Out of Hours Working is not currently envisaged” This will be a non-negotiable with residents and totally unacceptable. In addition, this will not be decided by LBC who will not have to experience the disruption this will cause.

3.7 - Lighting

3.7.1 – You casually mention “night activities”. No mention has been made of these previously and due to the anti-social nature regarding noise/light will be unacceptable to all residents.

4.0 – Relevant Parties and Key Roles

4.2/4.3 – Please confirm the Contractor Team and External Agencies directly to the residents once appointed.

5.0 – Environmental Method Statements and Mitigation

Whilst mention is made of

- The London Borough of Camden

Application No: Consultees Name: Received:

Comment: Response:

- The Contractor
- The Contractor's Environmental Compliance/Liaison Officer
- Environmental Manager
- Natural England
- Environment Agency
- Environmental Health Officer

And yet no mention is made of the residents, who will be those most impacted by this demolition/development proposal.

5.4.2 (Table 5.1) – It appears residents are now being referred to as “Potential Sensitive Receptors”, thus de-personalising all those affected by the proposed demolition/development.

5.5.1 – In previous development, no mention has been made of the surface area that was previously used as a playground, something that residents have previously asked to be reinstated.

5.7 - Dust and Air Quality

Mitigation and Control Measures

“Air quality monitoring is proposed for a three-month baseline period prior to commencement the demolition works” Have these PM10 monitors been put in place or are they being delayed until planning for demolition has been approved?

There is mention of special precautions being taken “if materials containing asbestos are encountered” This is a serious consideration and residents will need reassurance that they will not be additionally impacted by this in terms of safety and time. Residents would prefer that considerable research is done concerning previous developments of the proposed site to identify whether asbestos has been used so that there is no possibility of disturbance and potential contamination of the site and surrounding area.

5.8 - Noise and Vibration

Mitigation and Control Measures

Mention is made of permitted hours of work and where working is required outside these hours it will be agreed with LBC.

This is unacceptable as it is the residents not LBC who will be impacted by this. Residents should be consulted over all anti-social decisions which will impact those living in the environs of Lewis Street, Hadley Street and Castle Road.

5.9 Ecology and Nature Conservation

The seven trees located on the pavements of Hadley Street and Lewis Street must be protected at all costs.

Should a tree be irredeemably damaged a commitment must be made to replace that tree with like for like.

Mitigation and Control Measures

No changes in ground level are to be made within the Root Protection Area (RPA) of trees without prior agreement from the Local Planning Authority AND RESIDENTS

We, the residents, wish to emphasise with some force that any decisions about trees should be taken to residents as well as the Local Planning Officer.

8.0 Communication and Co-ordination

8.4 Communications with the Public

Whilst the Campbell/Reith state that they will be proactive in communicating with stakeholders, the phrase ‘reasonable steps to engage with...’ does not fill me with confidence. Residents and stakeholders need to be afforded that same respect and levels of communication as all other organisations, whether it be the Local Authority (Camden), the Planning Officer or any other organisation officially involved in this planning application.

Application No: **Consultees Name:** **Received:**

Comment: **Response:**

As stated at the start of these comments, I strongly object to this planning application as I believe that the proposal is not value for money. The site requires too much expenditure in preparation to justify the development of houses to accommodate 14 – 20 families. In addition, how much consideration has been made to the current sites being developed in areas such as Kings Cross that will house many more families and require far less money to be spent in preparation? I do not believe that alternative and more cost-effective options for this specific site have been considered and urge that this application for planning is rejected on the grounds identified in the above comments.
