

Monica Regli (Chair)
MILAM Residents Association
Email: [REDACTED]

London Borough of Camden
Camden Town Hall
Judd Street
London WC1H 9JE

16 December 2014

Dear Angela

We appreciate the time and effort you made to respond to our letter dated 12 November 2014. We understand that with our approval you are including our letter together with your response dated 25 November 2014 as part of the planning application process for the Liddell Road proposal.

We held our first AGM last Thursday (11 December 2014). We discussed your response to our letter and the general consensus was that a number of our concerns had still not been fully addressed. I will set them out briefly below:

1. As you will have noted from Camden's consultations with the residents, there was far less objection to the previous Liddell Road proposal than the current one particularly because in the previous proposal, the height of the buildings reached a maximum of 8 or 9 storeys and the buildings would have been located by the railway lines away from Maygrove Road. In the Q&A document, Camden justified changing to the current proposal which includes an 11 storey tower block by saying that the footprint of the current proposal would be smaller than in the previous proposal. The residents made it clear in the consultations and in our letter to you that an 11 storey tower block on a raised land bank is too high, it will be an eyesore, it will set a dangerous precedent for future developers and it will be out of character with the surrounding area. Therefore, lower buildings are preferable to a large tower block even if it means there will be a greater footprint. Please confirm whether Camden will consider reverting back to the previous proposal.
2. There was no response to our suggestion of reducing the height of the proposed 11 storey block by utilising some or all of the employment space. Please can you provide one.
3. There was no further information provided which justified Camden's decision to build the proposed tower block to the West side of the site. As you are aware from the consultation meeting and our letter to you, the residents prefer the proposed tower block to be situated on the East of the site so that it is less visible. We understand from the Q&A

document that Camden is concerned that by moving the tower block to the East and therefore closer to the Iverson Road developments it would 'undermine height limits negotiated and approved' and that it could give rise 'development pressures for comparable heights on any future local re-developments such as the Network Rail signal box site'. But as set out in our letter, whether the tower block is located on the East or West of the site it would undermine height limits given that the two locations are not so far apart and this has already been proven by the fact that a developer recently resubmitted a planning application and used the current Liddell road proposal (with the proposed tower block located on the West side) as a reason for increasing the height of its own development. Please confirm whether Camden will reconsider moving the proposed location of the tower block to the East side of the site.

4. We have yet to receive an explanation as to why the land bank at Liddell Road cannot be excavated in order to lower the height of all the buildings on the Liddell Road site. Please can you provide one.
5. Whilst you confirm in your letter that the residents of the proposed new development at Liddell Road will not be allowed to obtain parking permits, you do not respond to our query regarding whether business parking permits will be freely available for the site. Given that residents already feel that there are currently too many business permit holders taking up valuable car parking space on Maygrove Road, this is a concern for us. Please confirm the position on business permits.
6. We have noted that in the current proposal, the leaflet states that the housing which Camden is proposing to build along Maygrove Road will be shielded from Maygrove Road by the retained trees. Whilst we are surprised that this will be possible given the height of the buildings, please confirm that this remains a true commitment.
7. In your response to our letter, you mention that parents will be encouraged not to use their cars for the school run. Please explain how they will be encouraged.
8. All along Maygrove Road there are speed bumps but there is a stretch of the road either side of Ariel Road which does not have one and therefore cars speed along this stretch which covers the entrance to Maygrove Peace Park. Will something be done about this as part of the traffic calming measures for the Liddell Road development?
9. We note that Camden are keen to campaign for the rights of residents in relation to the HS2 proposal, a quote from Camden in relation to HS2:

“Current proposals mean that Camden residents and businesses could be left to deal with over a decade of construction works without adequate compensation, leaving many out of pocket or with insufficient protection.”

Will this level of concern be forthcoming from Camden towards MILAM residents who will face a high level of disruption with all the Camden approved developments (at least four) currently taking place within the small MILAM area?

We look forward to hearing from you.

Kind regards

Monica Regli

Chair, MILAM Residents' Association