

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2014/4679/P	Mark Murray	4 Bonny Street Camden Town London NW1 9PG	05/09/2014 12:10:47	OBJLETTE R	<p>I write to object to the proposed development reference 2014/4676/P</p> <p><b>Background</b></p> <p>The proposed development located at 140-146 Camden Street is within the Regents Canal Conservation Area and on the boundary of the Jeffery's Street Conservation Area. It represents a step change in the height and mass on the site and introduces a significant number of residential units on a site that is currently 100% commercial use.</p> <p>The proposed building is a full basement rising to 9-storeys" on Camden Street (Block C), 5-storeys on the corner of Camden Street and Bonny Street (Block B), 4-storeys' on Bonny Street (Block A) and 3-storeys' on Regent's Canal (Block D).</p> <p><b>Area Appraisal</b></p> <p>Shirley House (BTP Headquarters - 25 Camden Road) is defined in the Regents Canal Conservation Area Management Plan as "a building that harms the CA due to its height and massing".</p> <p>The elevation of Shirley House is drawn as though it has an additional storey. The parapet level is 52.23 level. Everything above this is ductwork, set well back from the facade. When Twyman House replacement 2011/2072/P went to committee, the height was reduced at Committee "not to exceed 52.23, the parapet level of Shirley House". In practice, construction has led to it being slightly below this. This building is seven storeys above street level.</p> <p>The buildings adjacent on Bonny Street, Nos 2-8, are Listed. The buildings opposite on Camden Street are set back from the road and are 3-storeys in height.</p> <p><b>New Development Issues</b></p> <p>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.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>The currently proposed Block C tower is nine storeys in height, and is shown AS exceeding the duct level of Shirley House. This building must be reduced to have a parapet height no greater than 52.23, the height of the Shirley House parapet. We believe this is already established as a Planning Principle in this location.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>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</p>

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
					<p>residents from school places that are already in short supply.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>Conclusion</p> <p>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.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>I also have concerns that very few affordable houses are being created in the area and those that are do not cater for those with disabilities and who need to use a wheelchair. This fact that the needs of these members of the community are not being addressed by either the developer or by Camden Planning is disturbing to me.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>Yours sincerely</p>

Mark Murray

---

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2014/4679/P	Edward Hutchinson	21 Ivor Street Camden Town NW1 9PJ	05/09/2014 11:28:00	OBJ	<p>T Hutchinson 21 Ivor Street Camden NW1 9PJ</p> <p>Planning Department, London Borough of Camden 2nd Floor, 5 Pancras Square c/o Town Hall, Judd Street London WC1H 9JE</p> <p>05 September 2014</p> <p>Attn: Peter Higginbottom</p> <p>Commentary / objection to proposal 2014/4679/P I write to object to the proposed development reference 2014/4679/P.</p> <p>Background The proposed development located at 140-146 Camden Street is within the Regents Canal Conservation Area and on the boundary of the Jeffery's Street Conservation Area. It represents a step change in the height and mass on the site and introduces a significant number of residential units on a site that is currently 100% commercial use.</p> <p>The proposed building is a full basement rising to 9-storeys" on Camden Street (Block C), 5-storeys on the corner of Camden Street and Bonny Street (Block B), 4-storeys' on Bonny Street (Block A) and 3-storeys' on Regent's Canal (Block D).</p> <p>Area Appraisal Shirley House (BTP Headquarters - 25 Camden Road) is defined in the Regents Canal Conservation Area Management Plan as "a building that harms the CA due to its height and massing".</p> <p>The elevation of Shirley House is drawn as though it has an additional storey. The parapet level is 52.23 level. Everything above this is ductwork, set well back from the facade. When Twyman House replacement 2011/2072/P went to committee, the height was reduced at Committee "not to exceed 52.23, the parapet level of Shirley House". In practice, construction has led to it being slightly below this. This building is seven storeys above street level.</p> <p>The buildings adjacent on Bonny Street, Nos 2-8, are Listed. The buildings opposite on Camden Street are set back from the road and are 3-storeys in height.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>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</p>

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
					<p>should be reduced in both height and massing.</p> <p>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 no greater than 52.23, the height of the Shirley House parapet. We believe this is already established as a Planning Principle in this location.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>There are 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.</p> <p>Local Planning Policy: Heritage Assets and Visual Impact</p> <p>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.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>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 disagree with the conclusions of the Heritage and Impact Report.</p> <p>Conclusion</p> <p>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.</p> <p>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 has a different opinion.</p> <p>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.</p>

<b>Application No:</b>	<b>Consultees Name:</b>	<b>Consultees Addr:</b>	<b>Received:</b>	<b>Comment:</b>	<b>Response:</b>
2014/4679/P	Anthony Richardson	The Regents canal Conservation Area Committee 31 Oval Road London NW1 7EA	05/09/2014 15:09:02	OBJEMAIL	The Regents Canal Conservation Area Advisory Committee OBJECT to this application . The lower block on Camden Street damages the townscape setting and terraced continuity of the houses in the street on the \north side of Bonny Street . The block on Bonny Street is too high and damages the listed buildings in this street .

---

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2014/4679/P	Edward Hitchinson	21 Ivor Street Camden Town London NW1 9PJ	05/09/2014 11:23:56	OBJ	<p>T Hutchinson 21 Ivor Street Camden NW1 9PJ</p> <p>Planning Department, London Borough of Camden 2nd Floor, 5 Pancras Square c/o Town Hall, Judd Street London WC1H 9JE</p> <p>05 September 2014</p> <p>Attn: Peter Higginbottom</p> <p>Commentary / objection to proposal 2014/4679/P I write to object to the proposed development reference 2014/4679/P.</p> <p>Background The proposed development located at 140-146 Camden Street is within the Regents Canal Conservation Area and on the boundary of the Jeffery's Street Conservation Area. It represents a step change in the height and mass on the site and introduces a significant number of residential units on a site that is currently 100% commercial use.</p> <p>The proposed building is a full basement rising to 9-storeys" on Camden Street (Block C), 5-storeys on the corner of Camden Street and Bonny Street (Block B), 4-storeys' on Bonny Street (Block A) and 3-storeys' on Regent's Canal (Block D).</p> <p>Area Appraisal Shirley House (BTP Headquarters - 25 Camden Road) is defined in the Regents Canal Conservation Area Management Plan as "a building that harms the CA due to its height and massing".</p> <p>The elevation of Shirley House is drawn as though it has an additional storey. The parapet level is 52.23 level. Everything above this is ductwork, set well back from the facade. When Twyman House replacement 2011/2072/P went to committee, the height was reduced at Committee "not to exceed 52.23, the parapet level of Shirley House". In practice, construction has led to it being slightly below this. This building is seven storeys above street level.</p> <p>The buildings adjacent on Bonny Street, Nos 2-8, are Listed. The buildings opposite on Camden Street are set back from the road and are 3-storeys in height.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>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</p>

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
					<p>should be reduced in both height and massing.</p> <p>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 no greater than 52.23, the height of the Shirley House parapet. We believe this is already established as a Planning Principle in this location.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>There are 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.</p> <p>Local Planning Policy: Heritage Assets and Visual Impact</p> <p>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.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>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 disagree with the conclusions of the Heritage and Impact Report.</p> <p>Conclusion</p> <p>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.</p> <p>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 has a different opinion.</p> <p>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.</p>

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2014/4679/P	Jon Corpe	1 Prowse Place	07/09/2014 10:01:59	COMMEM AIL	<p>I object to the above application on the following grounds;</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Whilst there are no contextual drawings counting 140-146 Camden St appears to be one storey higher than Shirley House and Regent Canalside. For consistency, they should be the same height to make three pins on the bend of the canal.</li> <li>2. The proliferation of these tower blocks is based on them being the only affordable way to comply with Part M of the Building Regs (Access for Disabled). The lifts make every floor Part M compliant by effectively making every unit a 'bungalow'. However, the social housing is four storey walk-up and contrary to Building Regs and therefore should be rejected.</li> </ol>
2014/4679/P	Jon Corpe	1 Prowse Place	07/09/2014 10:02:20	COMMEM AIL	



Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2014/4679/P	Jean Hutchinson	21 Ivor Street Camden Town NW1 9PJ	05/09/2014 11:29:41	OBJ	<p>T Hutchinson 21 Ivor Street Camden NW1 9PJ</p> <p>Planning Department, London Borough of Camden 2nd Floor, 5 Pancras Square c/o Town Hall, Judd Street London WC1H 9JE</p> <p>05 September 2014</p> <p>Attn: Peter Higginbottom</p> <p>Commentary / objection to proposal 2014/4679/P I write to object to the proposed development reference 2014/4679/P.</p> <p><b>Background</b> The proposed development located at 140-146 Camden Street is within the Regents Canal Conservation Area and on the boundary of the Jeffery's Street Conservation Area. It represents a step change in the height and mass on the site and introduces a significant number of residential units on a site that is currently 100% commercial use.</p> <p>The proposed building is a full basement rising to 9-storeys" on Camden Street (Block C), 5-storeys on the corner of Camden Street and Bonny Street (Block B), 4-storeys' on Bonny Street (Block A) and 3-storeys' on Regent's Canal (Block D).</p> <p><b>Area Appraisal</b> Shirley House (BTP Headquarters - 25 Camden Road) is defined in the Regents Canal Conservation Area Management Plan as "a building that harms the CA due to its height and massing".</p> <p>The elevation of Shirley House is drawn as though it has an additional storey. The parapet level is 52.23 level. Everything above this is ductwork, set well back from the facade. When Twyman House replacement 2011/2072/P went to committee, the height was reduced at Committee "not to exceed 52.23, the parapet level of Shirley House". In practice, construction has led to it being slightly below this. This building is seven storeys above street level.</p> <p>The buildings adjacent on Bonny Street, Nos 2-8, are Listed. The buildings opposite on Camden Street are set back from the road and are 3-storeys in height.</p> <p><b>New Development Issues</b> 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.</p> <p>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</p>

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
					<p>should be reduced in both height and massing.</p> <p>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 no greater than 52.23, the height of the Shirley House parapet. We believe this is already established as a Planning Principle in this location.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>There are 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.</p> <p>Local Planning Policy: Heritage Assets and Visual Impact</p> <p>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.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>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 disagree with the conclusions of the Heritage and Impact Report.</p> <p>Conclusion</p> <p>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.</p> <p>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 has a different opinion.</p> <p>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.</p>

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2014/4679/P	Fiona Foster	14 Bonny St	03/09/2014 09:24:35	OBJCOMP AP	<p>I wish to object very strongly to the above planning proposal.</p> <p>Firstly, I'd like to object on the grounds that what is proposed is far too high (even higher than the ugly anomaly that is Shirley House, the British Transport Police HQ on the corner of two main roads) and totally out of keeping with the area. Shirley House is defined in the Regents Canal Conservation Area Management Plan as "a building that harms the CA due to its height and massing". This would be worse.</p> <p>A nine storey tower, which will dwarf everything around it and overshadow those people living opposite it in Camden Gardens, will detract from the townscape and affect the quality of life of those who live in it rather than adding to it.</p> <p>The drawings of the proposed plans do not tell the true story. The elevation of Shirley House is drawn as though it has an additional storey. The parapet level is 52.23 level. Everything above this is ductwork, set well back from the facade. When Twyman House replacement 2011/2072/P went to committee, the height was reduced at Committee "not to exceed 52.23, the parapet level of Shirley House". In practice, construction has led to it being slightly below this. This building is seven storeys above street level.</p> <p>A sensible precedent has therefore been set and should be stuck to. As 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 no greater than 52.23, the height of the Shirley House parapet. We believe this is already established as a Planning Principle in this location.</p> <p>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</p> <p>One way to bring the height of the proposed monstrous tower down by two storeys would be to rid the project of the commercial space proposed on the ground floor. This has clearly been included to appease the council's policy on this, but as we all know from the fruitless struggle to let Twyman House before it was demolished, as well as the building these plans are to replace and also the soon to be residential flats on Royal college St/Camden Rd, there is simply no demand for this. Why is the council forcing developers to go upwards to achieve something so pointless?</p> <p>I urge you to reject this application as it currently stands.</p>

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2014/4679/P	Andrew Gemmell	3 Ivor Street Camden Town	02/09/2014 09:13:32	OBJ	<p>Commentary / objection to proposal 2014/4679/P</p> <p>I write to object to the proposed development reference 2014/4679/P.</p> <p><b>Background</b></p> <p>The proposed development located at 140-146 Camden Street is within the Regents Canal Conservation Area and on the boundary of the Jeffery's Street Conservation Area. It represents a step change in the height and mass on the site and introduces a significant number of residential units on a site that is currently 100% commercial use.</p> <p>The proposed building is a full basement rising to 9-storeys" on Camden Street (Block C), 5-storeys on the corner of Camden Street and Bonny Street (Block B), 4-storeys' on Bonny Street (Block A) and 3-storeys' on Regent's Canal (Block D).</p> <p><b>Area Appraisal</b></p> <p>Shirley House (BTP Headquarters - 25 Camden Road) is defined in the Regents Canal Conservation Area Management Plan as "a building that harms the CA due to its height and massing".</p> <p>The elevation of Shirley House is drawn as though it has an additional storey. The parapet level is 52.23 level. Everything above this is ductwork, set well back from the facade. When Twyman House replacement 2011/2072/P went to committee, the height was reduced at Committee "not to exceed 52.23, the parapet level of Shirley House". In practice, construction has led to it being slightly below this. This building is seven storeys above street level.</p> <p>The buildings adjacent on Bonny Street, Nos 2-8, are Listed. The buildings opposite on Camden Street are set back from the road and are 3-storeys in height.</p> <p><b>New Development Issues</b></p> <p>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.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>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 no greater than 52.23, the height of the Shirley House parapet. We believe this is already established as a Planning Principle in this location.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>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</p>

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
					<p>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.</p> <p>There are 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.</p> <p>Local Planning Policy: Heritage Assets and Visual Impact</p> <p>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.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>I have the following comments on Citydesigners Report dated 10 July 2014:</p> <p>6.1 They state that the developer's 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.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>7.2.26 Citydesigner ignores the fact that the height of the building at Camden Bridge. In my view detailed architecture is no mitigation for the height of Block A and so will Block A will be detrimental to the setting.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>8.9 I disagree that the scale of the proposed development provides the best response to CABA/DETR's 'By Design' (2000).</p> <p>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).</p>

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
					<p>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.</p> <p>8.30 I disagree that the proposed development satisfies DP25 as the proposal does not preserve or enhance the Regents Canal CA, the Jeffery's Street CA or the listed buildings in Bonny Street. It causes harm to all of these due to its height and massing.</p> <p>8.36 I disagree that CPG 1Section2 has been met, as we do not accept that the proposed development is well considered in the context of its surrounding area due to its height and massing.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>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 my earlier point about Shirley House having a detrimental effect on Regents Canal CA.</p> <p>View 5 – on Kentish Town Bridge. I disagree that the effect is beneficial. Block C once again imposes itself on our skyline.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>View 15 – on Grand Union 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.</p> <p>Conclusion</p> <p>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.</p> <p>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 has a different opinion.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>I urge you to reject this application as it currently stands and would seek a local working group to be</p>

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2014/4679/P	Jennie Bird	1B Bonny Street	07/09/2014 21:27:08	OBJ	<p>assembled to work alongside the developer to agree a suitable scheme for this site.</p> <hr/> <p>I am writing to object to this application. Quite simply it is far too big. The height and design does not reflect the nature of buildings in the neighbourhood, and will overshadow this characterful part of Camden on the edge of the conservation area. It will be a monstrous edifice resulting in loss of privacy and light for many residents, and it will place a huge burden on the local infrastructure.</p> <p>Residents have not been consulted on this proposal within the last year. The previous consultation seems to have been merely a 'box ticking' activity for the developers. There is no evidence of issues raised by local residents at earlier consultation having been acted upon or taken into any consideration at all. In addition, the timing of this application in the summer holidays, when many residents are away on holiday suggests a cynical manner in which this project is being managed. It sadly seems yet another example of greedy, excessive enterprise, railroading the views of local people and their quality of life.</p> <p>I am very concerned that yet another development is being proposed within our very small, quaint locale. Local residents have already been besieged by development. Surely the council can recognise the detrimental effect on local people and the local area itself both now and for the future. Short-term gain for the very few will result in long-term financial and environmental burdens for local people and the local council.</p> <p>Yours sincerely,</p> <hr/>

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2014/4679/P	North Camden Twon Neighbourhood Forum Steering Group	3 Ivor Street Camden Town NW1 9PL	02/09/2014 09:17:47	OBJ	<p>Commentary / objection to proposal 2014/4679/P</p> <p>I write on behalf of the NCTNF Steering group to object to the proposed development reference 2014/4679/P.</p> <p><b>Background</b></p> <p>The proposed development located at 140-146 Camden Street is within the Regents Canal Conservation Area and on the boundary of the Jeffery's Street Conservation Area. It represents a step change in the height and mass on the site and introduces a significant number of residential units on a site that is currently 100% commercial use.</p> <p>The proposed building is a full basement rising to 9-storeys" on Camden Street (Block C), 5-storeys on the corner of Camden Street and Bonny Street (Block B), 4-storeys' on Bonny Street (Block A) and 3-storeys' on Regent's Canal (Block D).</p> <p><b>Area Appraisal</b></p> <p>Shirley House (BTP Headquarters - 25 Camden Road) is defined in the Regents Canal Conservation Area Management Plan as "a building that harms the CA due to its height and massing".</p> <p>The elevation of Shirley House is drawn as though it has an additional storey. The parapet level is 52.23 level. Everything above this is ductwork, set well back from the facade. When Twyman House replacement 2011/2072/P went to committee, the height was reduced at Committee "not to exceed 52.23, the parapet level of Shirley House". In practice, construction has led to it being slightly below this. This building is seven storeys above street level.</p> <p>The buildings adjacent on Bonny Street, Nos 2-8, are Listed. The buildings opposite on Camden Street are set back from the road and are 3-storeys in height.</p> <p><b>New Development Issues</b></p> <p>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.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>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 no greater than 52.23, the height of the Shirley House parapet. We believe this is already established as a Planning Principle in this location.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>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</p>



Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
					<p>with no additional GP Surgeries or school places. There only GP Surgery taking patients from this postcode 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.</p> <p>There are 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.</p> <p>Local Planning Policy: Heritage Assets and Visual Impact</p> <p>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.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>We have the following comments on Citydesigners Report dated 10 July 2014:</p> <p>6.1 They state that the developer's proposals enhance the character and appearance of the Regents Canal CA and also enhances the setting of the immediately adjacent Jeffrey's Street CA. We disagree, as the proposal is too high for this area closing in on the canal and towering over neighbouring buildings.</p> <p>7.1.14 We 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.</p> <p>7.2.6 We 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.</p> <p>7.2.20 We 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.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>8.7 We believe the height and massing of the proposal does harm to the Regents Canal CA and to the listed buildings on Bonny Street.</p> <p>8.9 We disagree that the scale of the proposed development provides the best response to CABA/DETR's 'By Design' (2000).</p> <p>8.25 We disagree that the development satisfies policy CS14 as it fails to respect the local context and</p>

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
					<p>character, does not enhance the public realm around the site and does not provide lift access to Block A (affordable housing block).</p> <p>8.28 We 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.</p> <p>8.30 We disagree that the proposed development satisfies DP25 as the proposal does not preserve or enhance the Regents Canal CA, the Jeffery's Street CA or the listed buildings in Bonny Street. It causes harm to all of these due to its height and massing.</p> <p>8.36 We disagree that CPG 1Section2 has been met, as we do not accept that the proposed development is well considered in the context of its surrounding area due to its height and massing.</p> <p>9.0 View 1 – outside 11 bonny Street (page 44). We 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.</p> <p>View 2 – Corner of Camden Gardens. We 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 our earlier point about Shirley House having a detrimental effect on Regents Canal CA.</p> <p>View 5 – on Kentish Town Bridge. We disagree that the effect is beneficial. Block C once again imposes itself on our skyline.</p> <p>View 6 – on Grand Union Towpath by Hawley Lock. We 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.</p> <p>View 10a – on the corner of Camden Street and Camden Road. We 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.</p> <p>View 11 – on Camden Street, outside Sainsbury's. We 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.</p> <p>View 12 – on North Road Bridge. We 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.</p> <p>View 15 – on Grand Union Towpath, by North Road Bridge. We 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.</p> <p>Conclusion</p> <p>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.</p> <p>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 communities clearly have a different opinion.</p> <p>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</p>

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2014/4679/P	Paul Davis	2 Bonny Street London NE1 9PG	07/09/2014 14:02:19	OBJ	<p>approved for 79 Camden Road/100 St Pancras Way. We 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.</p> <hr/> <p>I write to object to the proposed development at 140-146 Camden street – application reference 2014/4697/P</p> <p>The Regents Canal Conservation Area Management Plan refers to Shirley House (25 Camden Road) as "a building that harms the Conservation Area due to its height and massing" and when the Twyman House replacement went to committee (2011/2072/P) the height was reduced so as "not to exceed 52.23m, the parapet level of Shirley House. The proposed development exceeds the height of both these buildings and, therefore, contravenes what the planning committee has accepted should be a reasonable height and the comments made in the Area Management Plan.</p> <p>It should be noted that these buildings, Shirley House and Twyman House, are on Camden Road which is a main thoroughfare whereas the proposed development is in the residential streets behind Camden Road where all the buildings are low rise making the proposed development particularly inappropriate. Bonny Street (2-8) are Listed and the buildings opposite on Camden Street are set back from the road and are three stories in height. The heights of the proposed blocks on Camden Street and Bonny Street should not exceed the height of the existing buildings on these streets.</p> <p>The developer held two consultation meetings in April and July 2013 where the community clearly stated its objections to the proposed height of the development which have clearly been ignored by the developer and there is a further concern that the developer has submitted these plans in August when members of the community will be on holiday and therefore will not be able to repeat their already expressed objections to the height of the development.</p> <p>The proposed development, with only a limited number of affordable housing units, will put increasing strain on existing services such as schools, health centres, public transport and traffic levels to the detriment of existing residents.</p> <p>I consider that for the reasons set out above the proposal should be rejected.</p> <p>Paul Davis</p>

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2014/4679/P	Alkarim Jivani	16 Ivor Street NW1 9PJ	05/09/2014 08:35:34	OBJ	<p>I write to object to the proposed development at 140-146 Camden street – application reference 2014/4697/P</p> <p>The Regents Canal Conservation Area Management Plan refers to Shirley House (25 Camden Road) as "a building that harms the Conservation Area due to its height and massing" and when the Twyman House replacement went to committee (2011/2072/P) the height was reduced so as "not to exceed 52.23m, the parapet level of Shirley House. The proposed development exceeds the height of both these buildings and, therefore, contravenes what the planning committee has accepted should be a reasonable height and the comments made in the Area Management Plan.</p> <p>It should be noted that these buildings, Shirley House and Twyman House, are on Camden Road which is a main thoroughfare whereas the proposed development is in the residential streets behind Camden Road where all the buildings are low rise making the proposed development particularly inappropriate. Bonny Street (2-8) are Listed and the buildings opposite on Camden Street are set back from the road and are three stories in height. The heights of the proposed blocks on Camden Street and Bonny Street should not exceed the height of the existing buildings on these streets.</p> <p>The developer held two consultation meetings in April and July 2013 where the community clearly stated its objections to the proposed height of the development which have clearly been ignored by the developer and there is a further concern that the developer has submitted these plans in August when members of the community will be on holiday and therefore will not be able to repeat their already expressed objections to the height of the development.</p> <p>The proposed development, with only a limited number of affordable housing units, will put increasing strain on existing services such as schools, health centres, public transport and traffic levels to the detriment of existing residents.</p> <p>I consider that for the reasons set out above the proposal should be rejected.</p> <p>Alkarim Jivani</p>

---

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2014/4679/P	Jonathan Merrison	16 Ivor Street NW1 9PJ	05/09/2014 08:30:55	OBJ	<p>I write to object to the proposed development at 140-146 Camden street – application reference 2014/4697/P</p> <p>The Regents Canal Conservation Area Management Plan refers to Shirley House (25 Camden Road) as "a building that harms the Conservation Area due to its height and massing" and when the Twyman House replacement went to committee (2011/2072/P) the height was reduced so as "not to exceed 52.23m, the parapet level of Shirley House. The proposed development exceeds the height of both these buildings and, therefore, contravenes what the planning committee has accepted should be a reasonable height and the comments made in the Area Management Plan.</p> <p>It should be noted that these buildings, Shirley House and Twyman House, are on Camden Road which is a main thoroughfare whereas the proposed development is in the residential streets behind Camden Road where all the buildings are low rise making the proposed development particularly inappropriate. Bonny Street (2-8) are Listed and the buildings opposite on Camden Street are set back from the road and are three stories in height. The heights of the proposed blocks on Camden Street and Bonny Street should not exceed the height of the existing buildings on these streets.</p> <p>The developer held two consultation meetings in April and July 2013 where the community clearly stated its objections to the proposed height of the development which have clearly been ignored by the developer and there is a further concern that the developer has submitted these plans in August when members of the community will be on holiday and therefore will not be able to repeat their already expressed objections to the height of the development.</p> <p>The proposed development, with only a limited number of affordable housing units, will put increasing strain on existing services such as schools, health centres, public transport and traffic levels to the detriment of existing residents.</p> <p>I consider that for the reasons set out above the proposal should be rejected.</p> <p>Jonathan Merrison</p>

---

2014/4679/P	Jonathan Merrison	16 Ivor Street NW1 9PJ	05/09/2014 08:30:33	OBJ
-------------	-------------------	---------------------------	---------------------	-----

---