From: McEllistrum, Richard

Sent: 16 May 2013 13:18

To: Planning

Subject: FW: Objection (2013/1598/P) Cartwright Gardens Development Plans

Follow Up Flag: Follow up Flag Status: Orange

From: David & Margaret Sent: 15 May 2013 12:11 To: McEllistrum, Richard

Co: McEllistrum, Richard

Subject: Cartwright Gardens Development Plans

Dear Mr EcEllistrum.

I have seen the comments that Debbie Radcliffe of 91 Judd Street has submitted to the Planning Dept of Camden Council with reference to the London University's proposed developments of the student accompatation block in Cartwright Gardens, I wish to add more comments in support of her erudite paper.

I have lived in this area for nearly 50 years and have been a member of the Environmental Action Group and Joint Secretary of the Judd Street Residents' Association and member of the Jessel House Residents' Association. I am now a member of the Marchmort Association. The local residents have supported the diversity of the small shops and community activities such as street parties, and the website. We welcome visitors, new residents and tourists alike and there is a sense of belonging to an interesting community.

This development is just too big and clurnsy, out of keeping with the architecture of the Georgian buildings to the west of the public space of Cartwright Gardens and over-towering these buildings. By all means, adapt to the needs of the University to provide residential accommodation for more students, but that should not be at the expense of the existing diverse residents. For instance some residents of Sandwich Street will lose their light for most of the day and the demolition process with lorries using our narrow streets to removing and bringing in building materials makes very uncomfortable consideration.

The University will need to work harder to foster cooperation. The residents and local businesses need to feel part of the process and to know that their views are indeed being taken into account.

I am a supporter of English Heritage but I'm disappointed by their lack of sensitivity to the history of the area and their support for an institutional development at the expense of an existing residential community. An interesting area is being seriously affected by these proposals.

We would like to informed of future Planning Meetings when these proposals are being discussed.

Yours sincerely, Margaret Scholev-Hill