

Application N	Consultees Name	Recipient Address	Received	Comment	Response
2025/1301/P	Paul Braithwaite	42 Bartholomew Villas Kentish Town NW5v 2LL	24/04/2025 15:31:20	WREP	<p>I was the local ward Councillor in 2006 when the existing children's play area was designed with imagination and agreed.</p> <p>It has served generations of children since admirably. I have live just a half mile away since 1979 and I walk through the gardens every week. It pleases me to see how very popular the children's area is. It's well used. And particularly the sand pit.</p> <p>For this reason I oppose the proposed replacement with a Padel Court. It would largely serve the ward's affluent adults but be a considerable loss to families from all social classes.</p> <p>Of course the Lawn Tennis Association favours more facilities but I wish the children's sand pit and playground to be retained.</p>
2025/1301/P	Roger Winfield	24 Patshull Road London NW5 2JY	24/04/2025 13:10:55	OBJ	<p>Mine is an objection to this planning application. The application contravenes Camden's Draft Local Plan Chap 10 Supporting Camden's Communities - Protection of Open Spaces. Clause B iii requires the Council to resist development that would be detrimental to the setting, use and enjoyment of designated open spaces. There can be no argument that this proposal is detrimental.</p> <p>Clause B vi the need for the padel court does not outweigh the loss of community space. If this application, which is made by Camden itself, is granted the important and well-used space that is the sand pit and climbing rock will be lost and Camden would be acting in contravention of the provisions of its own Local Plan. These facilities would be lost permanently as there is no provision for them to be relocated within Cantelowes Gardens.</p> <p>By way of additional remarks, it is strange, not to say ridiculous, to say that the works of construction, in the unlikely event of the application being granted, are scheduled to take place throughout the summer holidays when children are most likely to use them. Further, the picnic area between the sandpit and the playground would be lost and the relaxed and comfortable atmosphere of the playground would be negatively affected by the padel court built up against it, making the playground a less enticing facility for parents, grandparents and carers to take their children.</p> <p>I write as as parent and grandparent whose children and grandchild have enjoyed these facilities over many years. In addition, they provide an outlet for these groups to get out of the 'house' and offer their children enjoyable outdoor facilities where they can play with other children.</p>

Application N	Consultees Name	Recipient Address	Received	Comment	Response
2025/1301/P	Marlene Winfield	24, Patshull Road NW5 2JY	24/04/2025 17:27:31	OBJ	<p>I understand Camden's need for income to maintain its green spaces. I understand the growing popularity of Padel Ball. There could well be a way of meeting those needs while not sacrificing existing amenities, but this application has not found it. In fact by this application, Camden is showing a disappointing and rather surprising disregard for the many very young users of Cantelowes Gardens and their parents/carers.</p> <p>Having initially been told that the sand pit and climbing stones (that two generations of my family have enjoyed) would not be completely lost, they are nowhere in the new plan. Also lost are the picnic tables well-placed to enable parents to keep an eye on children using the playgrounds and the sand pit.</p> <p>As a local resident for several decades, I have been impressed up until now with the care Camden has taken to maintain Cantelowes as inclusive green space. I am not against a Padel Court in principle, but in this application the loss of existing amenities, particularly for very young children, is too high a price. Camden needs to rethink it in order to preserve what is already well- used and loved.</p>

---

Application N	Consultees Name	Recipient Address	Received	Comment	Response
2025/1301/P	Dr A Sachs	81 Bartholomew Road	24/04/2025 17:00:06	OBJ	<p>I'd like to express my strong objection to this proposal.</p> <p>Cantelowes Garden is a well-loved focal point of the local community, serving multiple needs and used by people of all ages. It was designed with care: it is very pretty, with many trees and undulating (not flat) grassy areas and it has a good balance of green space to enjoy and have picnics on, play areas, sports facilities, dog enclosure and (perhaps most importantly) a good open space right at the centre of the park where people simply speak to each other.</p> <p>Considering its smallish size, the harmonious balance of all these aspects is really brilliant, and should be preserved with care and respect.</p> <p>The padel tennis court proposal will harm the park in many ways:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-it will replace some of the green, play and open space (the sand-pit is a particularly beautiful, organic structure right at the centre of the park, next to trees and sitting for parents) with an enclosed court, surrounded by 7 ft tall fence, which will break the flow of the community open space. It will also cause felling at least one mature tree (as per the plan).</li> <li>-the work to build the court will disrupt the use of the park for weeks.</li> <li>-both 1&amp; 2 are environmentally detrimental.</li> <li>- it is not obvious that the new court will be of use to the community. Out of all the existing facilities, the one least used is the largest- the football pitch. Surrounded by high fences, it is the ugliest feature in the park. Perhaps because it's use requires booking and payment, it is empty most of the time. It has the benefit that when it is in use, it serves many people. The new proposed space will only serve 4 people at a time, but will cause even more disruption...</li> <li>- the 'consultation' re. the new proposal, such as it was, made no effort to reach the community. It put forward the total of four A4 sheets, attached to the fence of the park, and allowed very short time for responses. It then concluded that it had a mandate to go ahead based on a majority of 0.5%- when the total response was only about 200 people. The park is used by thousands. I can hardly see how a majority of one person (0.5% of 200) can amount to a mandate to create a fundamental change to a loved community asset. Since that inadequate consultation, just through word of mouth, 84 more local residents have responded- almost all of them negatively. Not wishing to malign the proposal submitters by suggesting a deliberate 'park-grab', I think it will be fair to say that prior to any work a proper consultation is due.</li> <li>-Even if a good number of residents were keen to have a padel-tennis facility, there are less disruptive, cheaper and environmentally sound ways to do so: A. the football pitch could accommodate portable equipment for tennis on certain days. B. Camden Square has such court-disused- which could be refurbished. Have these options been explored?</li> </ul> <p>We love the park. It will be wrong to harm it without serious reasons.</p> <p>Respectfully,</p> <p>Dr. A. Sachs 81 Bartholomew Road</p>