



GLIAS

Vice-President: Dr. Denis Smith

Company No. 5664689 England
Charity No. 1113162

Greater

London Industrial Archaeology Society

Please reply to : MT Tucker, 9 Blythwood Road, London N4 4EU, tel 020 7272 7160

Neil McDonald
Development Control
London Borough of Camden
Town Hall Extension
Argyle Street
London WC1H 8ND

12 Aug 2014

BY E-MAIL

Dear Mr McDonald,

**101 Camley Street and 102 Camley Street, London NW1 0PF,
Application Nos. 2014/4385/P and 2014/4381/P**

GLIAS is worried by these proposals, which would completely change the character of the Regent's Canal and King's Cross Conservation Areas in their vicinity.

This area is a characterful one for industrial archaeology. Oblique Bridge marks the crossing point of the Regent's Canal with the former driveway to the residence of William Agar, the litigious landowner who caused a significant deviation in the canal's line. The Agar family later developed Agar Town, the notorious slum, using the line of the driveway as its main street, now Camley Street. The Midland Railway added many features to the landscape. The former poor-law hospital and parish burial grounds, centred on the old church, are significant as features of social interest.

This is therefore an area redolent of history, attracting visitors for that reason, as well as those who go there solely for enjoyment and recreation. The physical remains are important evidence and the setting in which they are studied is important for their appreciation. This is all a part of the justification for the canal and the area to its south being included in the conservation areas which meet at this point, for their conservation.

The proposals would change the appearance and character of the conservation area to a very marked degree, imposing a wedge of tall and dense building up to 13 storeys high [not 12 as described in application 2014/4385/P], that would project across the canal and southwards where no such buildings had been before. Oblique Bridge would be in a canyon

although originally it was a point of relative prominence, where the road climbed to pass over the diverted canal. The canal would have an enclosed and subordinated feeling where at present it is open and evocative of an earlier landscape. The high buildings would dominate the area, while their density and urban detailing at ground level would remove much of the existing informal greenery.

The proposals employ architectural ingenuity in order to shoe-horn so much accommodation onto a small area and respond to all the other requirements for high-density housing, which is then given a tailored, urban dress. The applicants may have equated that to the 'excellent design quality' that your policies call for in situations of high density, but to change the character of a conservation area so radically and detrimentally shows no sensitivity, as is also required.

Your policy CS14 requires respect for local context and character in developments within conservation areas, but that is noticeably absent. Your Policy DP25 (b) will only permit development within conservation areas that preserves and enhances the character and appearance of the area, which this will not. Therefore the proposals should be rejected.

We would add that when these sites do come to be redeveloped they should be archaeologically investigated for evidence of the former Agar Town

Yours sincerely

Malcolm Tucker

Case Worker
for the Greater London Industrial Archaeology Society.