Application No:	Site Address:	Case Officer:	Consultees Name:	Received:	<b>Comment:</b>
	Lond to must of Dougl Moil	Dishand MaEllistmus	Manaharta barlar	19/07/2012 15.12.00	ODI
2013/3807/P	Land to west of Royal Mail	Richard McEllistrum	Mr robert r hanlon	18/07/2013 15:12:09	OBJ
	Sorting office bounded by				
	Phoenix Place, Mount				
	Pleasant, Gough Street &				
	Calthorpe St. Camden WC1.				

10/07/2013

Drinted on:

00.02.02

## **Response:**

Density is too high, poor design not fitting with exhisting residential property the site is predomanantly surrounded by, car parking still not resolved for this development of over 700 units, poor light and further light loss to existing housing on Calthorp St basement flats. No soil contamination tests carried out, few tenants received notice of comment letter, notices placed on south side of Gough St(no residents live there), no notices in Pakenham St, no site investment in eductional with use of say CIP(this is a perfect site for a secondary school to be included in the development and not Wren St, as this is too small a site(a reason given in earlier meetings by CAmden council for refusing to build on Wren St!) at a cost of losing very productive artisan workshops. The density on Phoenix side is greater than FArrindon Rd side which sits on greater floor space, less green site on Phoenix side leading to greater light loss through out that side of development.

No proper site tests carried out to determine environmental contamination of residents living clostest to site being CAlthorpe ST residents. 15 storey/tower block is sited in a poorly lit junction, would be better suited at the junction of CAlthorpe St and Farringdon Rd opposite HOliday Inn. Or the floor levels reduced along with all of the towers, therbye reducing density, which in all honesty this community facilities cannot support. Also the report makes a mention of Clerkenwell fire station(who ever did the report did not do their homework) this station is to close.!

That during the meeting regarding the siting of a school south of Euston, this site was mentioned. Therefor should have been sent out by CAmden on their site finding agenda to Royal Mail over two years ago.

				Printed on: 19/	0//2013 09:05:05
<b>Application No:</b>	Site Address:	Case Officer:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:
2013/3807/P	Land to west of Royal Mail Sorting office bounded by	Richard McEllistrum	Miss Daniella Boon	18/07/2013 09:10:47	COMMNT

n · . . .

10/05/0010 00 05 05

## **Response:**

IT IS TOO HIGH

Parts of the Islington side of the development, particularly along Farringdon Road, Calthorpe Street and Mount Pleasant, are too high, compromising light, views, and streetscape, and creating pollution. This height negatively affects the surrounding Conservation Zones. It is incompatible with the character, scale and context of the neighbourhood, all of which are highlighted as important factors in the SPD – the early planning document that introduced the scheme.

IT DOES NOT HAVE ENOUGH AMENITIES AND OPEN SPACE

Phoenix Place, Mount Pleasant, Gough Street & Calthorpe St. Camden WC1.

There are little or no new amenities for the neighbours and for the newcomers who are expected to inhabit the blocks. There needs to be more green public space in this urban area – not just a planted thoroughfare that will be compromised by the almost permanent shadow cast by the tall buildings along its southern face (called Block F in the planning proposal).

THERE IS LITTLE CONSIDERATION OF THE IMPACT OF NEW RESIDENTS

With approximately 2000 new residents potentially on site, I am concerned about the impact on the wider infrastructure, from pressure on parking and increased traffic, to local doctors' surgeries, schools and public transport.

THE DESIGN IS INWARD FACING

I believe that the design is too inward facing and fortress-like, favouring the views of the inhabitants - especially in the 'Meadow', by the Royal Mail building and the central 'Block H', which remains very high on its outer north and east faces, towering over the neighbours.

THE PLANNING APPLICATION PROCESS IS TOO SHORT

And launched in the summer lull. If local residents are to give meaningful responses to this large and complex application, I believe we should be given more time to assess the proposal.

THE BUILDING PROCESS IS TOO LONG

The neighbours will suffer from the building process, which is stated will reach until 2020. I believe the building period should be kept short to minimise disruption.