

**Butler, Clare**

**From:** Catherine Cinnamon [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** 23 July 2013 23:28  
**To:** Planning; planning@islington.gov.uk; patelm@parliament.uk; Robinson, Roger (Councillor); Khatoon, Samata (Councillor); Brayshaw, Peter (Councillor); Fulbrook, Julian (Councillor); Olad, Awale (Councillor); Vincent, Sue (Councillor)  
**Subject:** Mount Pleasant Development 2013/3807/P

**Follow Up Flag:** Follow up

**Flag Status:** Orange

Dear Mr McEllistrum,

I would like to add my voice to concerns raised by my neighbour Lucy Shimidzu, which I agree with. Here are my comments, but I would also like to add that I have not found the process of consultation at all accessible, and feel that many of the local residents remain unaware or unable to participate, or feel that their voice has not been heard.

I feel that the proposals reflect the changing face of London to one where the majority of people are short-term people renting accommodation on a temporary basis and that this is not good for the long-term prospects of our community and neighbourhood. I have lived in Calthorpe Street since 1981 as a key worker.

Thank you for your attention to our concerns.

**I am responding to the planning statement for the Mount Pleasant Development as a Camden resident. Thank you.**

**Design and layout** - I am still concerned about the density of the layout. There is no sense of mixed use of this land site. While I agree it should be used for housing, I think it should be low-rise, in keeping with the existing community and style of Victorian terraces. I think it will blight the area to have high-rise blocks and I want to see more independent retailers, training, health and leisure facilities in the planning stages. These were promised when King's Cross was first being developed and have never materialised. I think there will be 'massing' of buildings and reduced light.

**External appearance and materials** - I'd like these to be sustainable and attractive. For example at Rubicon in York Way they are roasting in a glass box in summer and hard to heat in winter.

**Loss of daylight, sunlight and privacy of neighbours** - a real and genuine concern, as is the likely increase in petty crime. This is a neighbourhood relatively free from incident, and it is laughable in the planning statement to read that the increased activity of a building site will reduce crime. I disagree.

**Noise nuisance** - I and my neighbours are very worried that the noise of the building and lorries will make it extremely unpleasant for those of us at home in the daytime; there are considerable numbers of elderly or retired people in the area who will suffer as a result. There is also the worry about air quality due to dust and building works; even when one or two houses in the street have been renovated this has affected some of us (myself included) with a tendency to breathing difficulties or weak lungs.

**Traffic and parking issues** - we have been assured that no new parking permits will be issued, but what about those with existing permits? I hardly like to use my car for fear of not being able to park on my return as it is; when a few spaces are out of commission for a few days because of tree or road works it is almost impossible to find a parking space. There is also the issue of safety for children and cyclists - Calthorpe Street is well used by cyclists.

**Loss of, or increase in, a particular type of use of land** - of course, it is a luxury to have open land that cannot be afforded when we are so short of housing. However it is disappointing in the extreme that so little provision for an open public space appears in the plans; all I can see is what looks like a small square between tower blocks. Which will apparently be gated. There is no need for a walkway between Gough Street and Mt Pleasant. There is a need for open space, trees, independent retailers, and things that will improve the quality of life for local people.

It is insulting to read in the planning statement that the increase of building workers will be good for the economy of the area. I have seen the (largely East European) building workers on the Post Office site with cans of coke, bags of crisps or using the workmen's cafes. To suggest this enhances the area is spurious. Incidentally as far as I am aware that building work has been carried out with the minimum of disruption to the local area.

Once more, I would like to put forward my own vision for the development of this area. I would like to see a low-rise development of quality design that will enhance the area rather than blight it. It could contain provision for artisan and craft workshops which could provide training and employment. I would like to see small groups of dwellings around courtyards, gardens, allotments or public spaces. Although it might be that there would be a lower density housed, I believe it would create a more sustainable community with better future prospects, rather than building yet more unappealing tower blocks. People may well initially be keen to be allocated, but problems will soon emerge as there is little provision for children, dogs, or general amenities or leisure facilities to absorb such a large

influx of people.

I believe this is a great opportunity to create a visionary new development that London could be proud of in this historic and well-regarded area of Clerkenwell. It does not appear that your planning statement takes into account local peoples' concerns about changes to the area, or the impact of large numbers of people, traffic etc on the local populace.

Yours sincerely,

Catherine Cinnamon

