



Mr Peter Higginbottom
Planning Development Management
Camden Council
Judd Street
London
WC1H 8ND

Dear Mr Higginbottom

I write to object to the proposed development reference 2013/7646/P.

I am writing to object to this proposal, not only based on the fact that the height and mass of the proposals are totally out of scale with most of the surrounding area, but also because of the direct impact on my home (12 Bonny Street). This has been ignored in the biased report commissioned by the developer. My home has a different aspect from most on Bonny Street and several windows will lose significant portions of the sky view. City designers have chosen not to refer to this in their report.

The developer has indicated their desire to avoid public consultation by submitting the application at a time when many residents and councillors were on vacation. This is not the first time that they have attempted to avoid consultation.

New Development Issues

The developer claims to have carried out a significant amount of community consultation and indeed to have taken action on the comments received. The initial scheme presented in April 2013 was ludicrously high and clearly done so the developer could easily reduce the height so as to be seen to be responding to community concerns.

The second consultation in July 2013 showed a reduction in Block B with an imperceptible reduction to Block D. At this exhibition the community again stated concern that the building was too high and should be reduced in both height and massing.

The currently proposed Block C tower is nine storeys in height, and is shown even exceeding the duct level of Shirley House. This building must be reduced to have a parapet height lower than the height of the Shirley House parapet. I believe this is already established as a Planning Principle in this location.

The currently proposed Block B is 5-storeys' and should be reduced by at least 1 storey. Block A should be reduced by 1 storey to align with the parapet of the listed terraced houses at 2-8 Bonny Street. Block D should not exceed the 37.98 parapet as noted on the proposed elevation that aligns with the adjoining block of the recent Regents Canalside development.

The cumulative impact of a number of residential developments has not been addressed. Regents Canalside, 79 Camden Road, Hawley Wharf, and Agar Grove are adding a huge number of residences with no additional GP Surgeries or school places. There only GP Surgery taking patients from this post code is off Leighton Road in Kentish Town. The new housing proposed here will displace current residents from school places that are already in short supply.

There is only a very small number of affordable housing units in the proposals with no lift being proposed to this block and no access to amenity space.

Local Planning Policy : Heritage Assets and Visual Impact

Policy CS14 requires that development is of the highest standard of design and that it respects local context and character. It also ensures that Camden's heritage assets and their settings, including conservation

areas, listed buildings, archaeological remains, scheduled ancient monuments and historic parks and gardens are preserved and enhanced and promotes high quality landscaping and works to streets and public spaces.

Paragraph 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 importance of maintaining a 'sense of place' by the use of traditional architectural styles and materials is also stressed.

The proposed development does not achieve these policy requirements as the design does not respect the local context and character of Regents Canal CA, Jeffrey's Street CA or Camden Broadway CA.

If constructed as proposed it will be visible from all these areas causing a negative impact.

The developer has employed a consultant to prepare a report that takes a subjective view of the impact of the proposed development. The author of the report is not a local resident and is of course being paid by the developer to support their proposals.

I have the following comments on Citydesigners Report dated 10 July 2014:

6.1 They state that the developers proposals *enhance the character and appearance of the Regents Canal CA and also enhances the setting of the immediately adjacent Jeffrey's Street CA*. I disagree as the proposal is too high for this area closing in on the canal and towering over neighbouring buildings.

7.1.14 I disagree that the proposed development has been designed to relate to the scale and proportions of Bonny Street as it is significantly higher and no in keeping with Bonny Streets character.

7.2.6 I disagree that Block A has been carefully designed to relate in terms of scale to the listed buildings at 2-8 Bonny Street. The proposed Block A is too high and does not relate to the parapet of the listed buildings.

7.2.20 I disagree that nos 3-11 Bonny Street require greater enclosure. One of the nice qualities of Bonny Street is that it is open and in scale with its surrounding buildings both within Bonny Street and also across Camden Street.

7.2.26 Citydesigner ignores the fact that the height of the building at Camden Bridge. In our view detailed architecture is no mitigation for the height of Block A and so will Block A will be detrimental to the setting.

8.7 I believe the height and massing of the proposal does harm to the Regents Canal CA and to the listed buildings on Bonny Street.

8.9 I disagree that the scale of the proposed development provides the best response to CABE/DETR's 'By Design' (2000).

8.25 I disagree that the development satisfies policy CS14 as it fails to respect the local context and character, does not enhance the public realm around the site and does not provide lift access to Block A (affordable housing block).

8.28 I disagree that the proposed development satisfies DP24 as it does not properly consider the setting, character and form and scale of neighbouring buildings, not all building blocks have amenity space and block A has no lift.

8.30 I disagree that the proposed development satisfies DP25 as the proposal does not preserve or enhance the Regents Canal CA, the Jeffrey's Street CA or the listed buildings in Bonny Street. It causes harm to all of these due to it height and massing.

8.36 I disagree that CPG 1Section2 has been met as I do not accept that the proposed development is well considered in the context of its surrounding area due to its height and massing.

9.0 View 1 – outside 11 bonny Street (page 44). I disagree that the effect of the proposed development is beneficial. The view from 11 Bonny Street is better as it is currently for those who live in the area and the change to the view is major.

View 2 – Corner of Camden Gardens. I disagree that the impact of Block C is beneficial. The height and massing of the building is detrimental to the area and out of character with other buildings in Camden Street. Note omg earlier point about Shirley House having a detrimental effect on Regents Canal CA.

View 5 – on Kentish Town Bridge. We disagree that the effect is beneficial. Block C once again imposes itself on our skyline.

View 6 – on Grand Union Towpath by Hawley Lock. I disagree that the visibility of the proposed development will be a virtue. It will add to the enclosure of the canal and views along the canal when the Hawley Wharf development begins.

View 10a – on the corner of Camden Street and Camden Road. I disagree that the residual effect is beneficial due to the height and massing of the proposed development. Shirley House is too high and the proposed new Block C is much higher.

View 11 – on Camden Street, outside Sainsbury's. I disagree that the residual effect is beneficial due to the height and massing of Block C. It is out of character and context with the surrounding buildings.

View 12 – on North Road Bridge. I disagree that the residual effect is beneficial due to the height and massing of Block C. It is out of character and context with the surrounding buildings and encloses the canal in an overpowering way.

View 15 – on Grand Un on Towpath, by North Road Bridge. I disagree that the residual effect is beneficial due to the height and massing of Block C. It is out of character and context with the surrounding buildings and encloses the canal in an overpowering way.

Conclusion

The development remains too high for this site. There is precedent that any new development should not exceed the height of the Shirley House parapet. Eve this is unreasonable given the CA' comments on Shirley House.

The developer has paid a consultant to state that all aspects of their proposals are positive and beneficial to our area. This view is subjective and should not hold weight when the local community clearly have a different opinion.

Camden has approved 100% residential development at 79 Camden Road/100 St Pancras Way and change of use for Shirley House to become 100% residential. Given these recent planning approvals it seems inappropriate to insist that this site be mixed use if by making it 100% residential the height could be reduced by 2-storeys by locating residential in the lower ground and ground floors as approved for 79 Camden Road/100 St Pancras Way.

I urge you to reject this application as it currently stands and would seek a local working group to be assembled to work alongside the developer to agree a suitable scheme for this site.

Yours sincerely



Andrew Campbell

12 Bonny Street

NW1 9PG