

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2024/1205/P	John Clute	20/09/2024 10:24:11	COMMNT	<p>We copy previous statement objecting to the proposed pavement installation outside our residence, 221 Camden High Street. Previous applications include 2023/2990/P and 2024/1453A. We copy here our modified representation as of 14 May 2024. We see no reason to think any of our objections have been heeded in the new application. We register these objections anew.</p> <p>In the current application before the Council, we see a line headed Development Type: "Obs to adjoining, GPDOs" We were unable to decode this information, and have not therefore taken it into account below.</p> <p>We also note that the telephone kiosk previously applied for has been renamed "Communication hub unit." We were unable to find any description to fit this renaming, unless the term "etc" in the Proposed Land Use description.</p> <p>As we say below, once again there are no discoverable documents submitted by Mr Nathan Still etc in support of the application.</p> <p>STATEMENT OF OBJECTIONS follows below -----</p> <p>As residents of the maisonette at 221B Camden High Street, whose front windows directly overlook the existing telephone kiosk, we are very concerned about the nature of any replacement to that current structure. That existing structure, which was installed weeks after Camden completed widening the Camden High Street pavement to facilitate pedestrian flow, has been an objectionable presence for many years now. In the highly predictable absence of any significant use of the kiosk as a public telephone, now that mobile phones are almost universal, its owners/operators have used it from the beginning almost solely as an advertising hoarding, which stretches athwart the line of pedestrian traffic, impeding it. As we believe local police can confirm -- and can absolutely assert that local retailers will confirm if asked -- a primary use of the interior of the kiosk has been as a venue to conduct drug trades.</p> <p>Prima facie, there seems no reason for the Council not to order its immediate destruction.</p> <p>The idea of replacing this kiosk must rest upon an awareness of these problems. Sadly, the application now before the Council has been submitted without any description of the proposed replacement. You will note that the relevant field: "Documents for this application: View drawings, comments and other documents for this application" opens to a statement that "There are no public documents for this application." If there is a hidden route to documents we do not know it.</p> <p>Any application to replace the current kiosk/advertising hoarding should satisfactorily deal with certain obvious criteria that affect the area in general, and us in particular.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1) the height must not be increased so as to impede our line of vision (our front windows are at most 20 feet from kiosk).</li> <li>2) there must be no generator within the kiosk audible within a residence (unlike the generator earlier installed on the high street in the almost entirely unused kiosk immediately across the road).</li> <li>3) there can be no facility for incoming telephone calls of the sort that afflicted the neighbourhood after installation of the kiosk over the road. The managers of that kiosk insisted that the volume set for the incoming ring was unalterable. That ring is in fact as loud as our own domestic phone. Incoming calls are less frequent</li> </ol>

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

**Comment:**    **Response:**

than in earlier years, and rarely answered; call attempts are usually made between midnight and 5am. No similar facility or enablement can be tolerated adjacent to a residence. We hope that increasing awareness on the Council's part of the problems of noise pollution will be useful with the current application.

4) there can be no lighting visible within the line of site of any neighbouring residence.

5)in general, the licencing of advertising hoardings that mpede pedestrian traffic on public pavements does very little to uplift this neighbourhood: indeed the reverse.

----

As of the date of this message we have been unable to access any supporting documents for this application at the Camden website. We were able to see that reasons for refusing the initial application ddescribed the new hoarding as a "sequential series of static digital images [in] proximity to an existing kiosk". Without being able to view any detailed description or drawing, we must say that this description confirms our objections as expressed above. A constantly changing digital intrusion of this sort, adjacent to our front windows, is of course deeply objectionable to us.

---