

Application No:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2013/7646/P	17/12/2013 11:09:24	COMMNT	<p>I have visited the plans for this development, and been appalled at the crowded nature of this 8-storey potential building, with such very small outside areas, the central courtyard presumably in shade except for midday on midsummer's day.</p> <p>Parking needs to be built in to this scheme, as residents are likely otherwise to cheat in the way others in this area already do, to get parking places through local residents.</p>
2013/7646/P	22/12/2013 19:11:46	COMMNT	<p>I am concerned at three aspects of the proposal:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li data-bbox="1070 419 2085 603">1. The development states that local NHS GP and Dentistry services are fully capable of servicing the additional residents of the new development but this does not tally with my experience, as a local resident, that these services are highly stressed. A theoretical calculation of the ratios of GPs or dentists to patients, as quoted in the proposal, takes no account of the demands of the population for these services. Most practices are very selective about the addresses from, which they will accept new patients and so I do not believe all the practices listed in the proposal would accept patients from the new development. <li data-bbox="1070 643 2085 730">Furthermore, it does not take into account the increasing demand from other developments, such as at Hawley Wharf, Agar Grove and Twyman House, which will increase the pressure on local services, nor the real threat to the nearby Ivy House dental practice on Kentish Town Road. <li data-bbox="1070 770 2085 826">It therefore follows that the development should include some provision for increasing the capacity of local health services to match the increased demand it will bring. <li data-bbox="1070 866 2085 986">2. The development continues the unsatisfactory use of Rochester Place for refuse collection. Rochester Place is a narrow cobbled mews entirely unsuitable for such large vehicles, which currently can only negotiate it by mounting the pavement. The development should provide for alternative more satisfactory arrangements. <li data-bbox="1070 1026 2085 1074">3. No provision is made for the delivery of large items such as furniture or removal vans, which is an issue because St. Pancras Way and Camden Road are both red routes.

Application No:

2013/7646/P

Received:

19/12/2013 18:09:34

Comment: Response:

COMMNT I wish to object to the proposed development at 79 Camden Road and St Pancras Way.

I note that this development is 100% residential, I object that there is no employment space. Being 100% residential the development gives absolutely nothing to the local community. The development is driven entirely by developer greed and has nothing to benefit people who live around it.

The development is massive, far too large and far too high in comparison to what is around it. Indeed, the design does nothing to integrate with the style and scale of what is already here.

The development is surrounded by conservation areas and this development is not at all sympathetic to the case, but extremely detrimental to the idea of enhancing conservation areas.

There is a huge problem in Camden Town with its scarcity of public services, particularly GP surgeries and school places. This development together with recent ones Camden planning department have already given the go ahead (Twyman House, Hawley Wharf, Agar Grove) and shortly 140 Camden Street will greatly increase the density of population in relation to the public services that Camden makes available. We have no tube station on Sundays because of the market and the buses are packed. The tube at Camden Town is often dangerously overcrowded.

The design of the top part of the building is really hideous and draws attention to its height towering over everything else around.

The plan involves removing a perfectly healthy plane tree. This tree must be protected.

The use of the roof as a recreation area for the development's 500+ residents will cause a lot of noise problems to people already living in proximity to it. There is no other amenity space provided by the development.

I understand that the Council owes the site and the Council will decide on whether to build the development. There is no proper diplomacy here and no segregation of duties to the public good. This situation is unacceptable.

Application No:

2013/7646/P

Received:

18/12/2013 17:11:53

Comment: Response:

OBJ

I strongly object to this proposal. My objections to the planned development are as follows:

1. The building is of architectural significance and was being considered for listing – and now it about to be demolished? It should be preserved and refurbished rather than a generic Barratts highrise building going up like those throughout other boroughs – such as the Dalston Square development.
2. The proposed 8-storey (with basement) building for 170 housing units would be markedly higher than the building there now. What about neighbours' loss of sunlight? The height of the building will take sunlight from the 'council' houses in Rochester Mews and Camden Road.
3. The volume of people that will be housed in the block will affect local residents dramatically – most notably the additional noise that will be produced by more than 270 additional people and their visitors – and parking,
4. What community benefits – extra facilities, affordable housing etc. are Barratts giving the local community? A surgery, new library, health clinic, nursery? Their token gestures of the few so called 'affordable' residencies are, quite frankly, an insult.
5. This application has no transparency, with London Borough of Camden being both the owner and the decision maker on the proposed development.

Personally, as a resident of Rochester Terrace for over 50 years, I find it quite shocking that the council would even consider such a proposal without looking at the wider aspects of the proposal and without any significant engagement with those who it would affect the most. It seems that the profit to be made from such a large development needs to be fed back into the community, rather than going to one of the largest property developers in the UK. The council needs more properties on their own books – why not take this on rather than handing it over to Barratts for them to make profit from? This is a short-sighted and misguided proposal and should in no-way go forward.

2013/7646/P

17/12/2013 11:33:54

COMMNT

I live opposite the site in Rochester Place.

1. If there are 5 storeys along Rochester Place towards the back of the site (i.e. away from Camden Road) Light will be blocked out from my flat. I would prefer a building of the same height as mine (3 storeys) at that point.
2. If there are to be retail units along the ground floor it would be good if there were a small local supermarket and a coffee shop as the other eateries around here are of the greasy spoon variety.
- 3 What happened to the idea of a school or nursery in this development?
4. Do you propose to widen the alley and the pavement to set the new buildings back compared to the current outer wall of 79 Camden Road I do hope so.

Application No:

2013/7646/P

Received:

19/12/2013 15:16:25

Comment: Response:

COMMNT

Camden's LDF 2010 seeks mixed use developments - this is solely residential. The massing is too heavy and high. It's building line is being pulled out. It will cause negative impact to 4 CAACs. They intend to excavate a basement area. There is no precedent for this locally. The occupancy will be circa 500. The implications on local services do not take note of the other close developments (Agar Grove, Twyman House and Hawley Wharf). There are no GP's accepting new patients in this area. The occupants will displace existing residents from local school places. The materials on the top floors accentuate its height and bulk. All sides of the site have unique character yet there is one palette of materials. The developer is maximizing the number of units so pushing the disabled parking to one side of the building providing difficulties maneuvering vehicles. This is not inclusive. Policy CS14 requires that development is of the highest standard of design and that it respects local context and character. Para 2.3.5 'Retaining and enhancing the traditional and historic character of the area' stresses the importance of maintaining links with the past, especially in those areas which have sustained great change in the past and high levels of growth. The proposals do not achieve this. The pre-app consultation involved few local residents. The site was not presented by LBC in its strategic site review and was sold without consultation. House prices are projected to rise by circa 11%. To develop this site as 100% dense housing is a cynical proposal by a commercial developer with no benefit to the local community. Camden owns the site that they are selling and are judging the application. This is a conflict of interest. LBC are taking a short term view of how Camden is developed.
