Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2015/4774/P	Susan Eljack	69 Crane Court Gurnell Grove	18/09/2015 23:30:14	OBJNOT	To whom it may concern,
		London W13 0AQ			I am writing to formally object to the new planning proposals based on the following grounds.
					1. Camden Lock Market is a historical site, and part of what made it famous, is its unique quirkiness. Which is aided by the layout of the market, as it stands. If the new planning proposals are granted, then this unique layout will drastically be changed, and Camden"s world famous, independent, unique quirkiness will be lost. Instead a more commercial building will stand in its place, similar to a shopping centre, and London already has enough of those. However we do not have another Camden Lock Market.
					2. Camden Council benefits hugely from the fame of all the Camden Markets, and would lose out, by changing the market. Not only does the markets raise the borough's profile worldwide, it also brings a huge stream of people to the area, which in turn brings revenue to the area.
					3. There are an estimated 9,000 stalls in Camden, which are run by people who are self employed, or employee"s. It has not been made clear, how all these people will be re-accommodated while the work is being carried out, and later, in the new venue. Nor has it been communicated, whether the new venue can accommodate all 9,000 stall holders. Many people, including myself, may be out of a job, and have no form of income. Finding a job, in this tough economical climate, will not be easy, nor quick.
					4. The disruption to the surrounding area, including the traffic, will be hugely disproportionate, to any small benefit, that may arise from the work being carried.
					Though I agree that Camden Lock Market, needs some improvements, especially in terms of its access to those people with special needs. I do not believe that these proposed changes are the best thing for Camden Market. Improvements can be made that benefit everyone, not just a selection of people. Camden Market is a big part of London, and played a big part in much of London's culture. Therefore Camden Council should be very cautious when approving any changes to the market, and only approve changes that keeps the market's independence.

Printed on: 28/09/2015

09:05:20

					1 miled on. 28/09/2015 09.0	05.2
Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:	
2015/4774/P	Steven Stokes	53 Gilbeys Yard	24/09/2015 00:10:42	OBJEMPER	I am writing to express my concerns regarding the proposals for access to the development detailed in planning application 2015/4774/P.	
					I have submitted a separate objection to the development as a whole. However, I feel that I must submit this secondary objection in the unfortunate event that the application is approved.	
					Within the document 'Camden Market CMP single phase 120815 rev B' it is suggested that potential access to the rear of the site could be established via Gilbeys Yard (see page 22). I feel that this is unacceptable regardless of vehicle size and type.	
					Gilbeys Yard is entirely cobbled. Over the years, the increased number of commercial and, especially construction vehicles has caused several areas to sink resulting in drainage problems. Large areas of surface water no longer run to the drains creating a pooling issue. Apart from the obvious hygiene issue, these pools freeze in winter creating large areas of ice which, depending upon the weather, are long-standing. Increased commercial and construction vehicle traffic will only make this worse.	
					In addition, the underground drainage gullies are collapsed – once again, as a result of the amount of business and construction vehicles.	
					In short, the cobbles of Gilbeys Yard are in a very fragile state. As such, it would be wrong to encourage any traffic increase of any vehicle type but especially so in the case of commercial and construction vehicles.	
					Furthermore, I believe the cobbled parts of Gilbeys Yard are 'listed' in some way although I have been unable to locate the supporting documentation at this time.	
					It is my understanding that the cobbled parts of Gilbeys Yard are the responsibility of One Housing group. Having discussed the matter with them at length they have told me that they would not allow the suggested access for the same reasons as I have listed above. I also understand that they are communicating this to you directly	
					I would also like to point out that since the development of the Henson building within Gilbeys Yard, the thoroughfare to traffic has become quite narrow in places and are no longer suited to larger vehicles.	
					On page 21 of 'Camden Market CMP single phase 120815 rev B' it suggests that another potential rear access route could be established via Morrisons supermarket car park with their approval. Having discussed the matter with Morissons it is my understanding that they would not offer their consent to this.	
					Furthermore and no less important, as a resident of Gilbeys Yard I object to either of the aforementioned access routes on the grounds of disturbance.	

Printed on: 28/09/2015

09:05:20

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Printed on: 28/09/2015 09:05:20 Response:
					On pages 23 and 30 of 'Camden Market CMP single phase 120815 rev B' it is suggested that the Regent's Canal could be used as both a supply route and a way to remove waste from the site. No full details are given. However, I feel it would be highly inappropriate for any barges etc to use the western route to the site (by this I mean under Oval Road and into Primrose Hill). This is a particularly picturesque part of the canal with many residencies directly bordering it. This route also leads to Regent's Park and London Zoo and, as such, is a very popular tourist area.
					Thank you for your time.
2015/4774/P	Steven Stokes	53 Gilbeys Yard	23/09/2015 23:59:09	9 OBJ	Please accept this as my objection to the proposed development of Camden Lock as detailed within application 2015/4774/P.
					Despite the best efforts of the developers to make a case for the application I cannot help but feel, quite simply, why?
					Middle Yard and East Yard are the crowning glory of the markets within Camden Town. Whilst undoubtedly needing some renovation, what is not required is change. The buildings are lovely and are, I feel, genuinely fundamental is creating such a unique feel to this part of the market. It is an immeasurably more pleasurable experience than that offered by the Stables market.
					So, I go back to my original question: why? The proposed development has the feel of something Westfield shopping centre might add-on in order to be appear edgy and boutique-like without offering anything truly unique at all. Edginess and a boutique feel are exactly the qualities that Middle and East Yards already have in genuine abundance.
					Let me put it like this: nobody will say 'let's go to Camden Town because they've got a Café Rouge / Oasis / French Connection' but quite a few people will say 'why go to Camden Town – it's just full of Café Rouge / Oasis / French Connections.' I feel the 'could be anywhere' nature of the proposed development will genuinely reduce the overall appeal of Camden Town to visitors.
					Middle and East Yards are exactly what makes Camden the hugely popular destination that it is. They define Camden. If you want proof Google 'Camden Town' and see what features heavily on the first page of images. The prominence of Middle and East Yards in this list, which is drawn from searches made across the entire globe, speaks volumes.
					I had assumed that Middle and East Yards were listed or protected in some way. I am amazed that they are not. But you could protect them – and I think you should. I, the overwhelming majority of Camden residents and the many travellers who visit Camden every year would be truly indebted if you did the right thing and reject this planning application.
					Thank you for your time.

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Printed on: 28/09/2015 09:05:20 Response:
2015/4774/P	Chris gray	17 Melton place	23/09/2015 11:12:31	OBJ	I object to the bridge being constructed across the west yard going over the boats as it gives more opportunities for drunk idiots to throw items down or even item to fall from the bridge onto people below
2015/4774/P	Margaret French	58 Camden Lock Place London NW1 8AF	23/09/2015 16:42:21	OBJEMPER	For several reasons I would like to object to the proposal to build a bridge over the canal basin. 1. A successful business operates from the canal basin, employing and training many people, and has up to 8 boats moving under the proposed bridge each hour during 7 months of the year. There are problems with all bridges on the canal as they are used to drop or throw missiles/liquids onto the boats passing underneath. Many of these have been reported to the police and the last incident was 22/8/15. another bridge or walkway just gives a further opportunity for this and is more likely to happen in an area where there are many venues selling alcohol. This sort of activity makes it very difficult to retain staff. 2. A bridge at this location would be an effective enclosure of an open space, with loss of the visual amenity, and the view of the historic canal and turnover bridge impaired, reducing the value that visitors can see in the area. 3. This is a conservation area which has already been impaired by the huge number of cooking food stalls in the market. They are causing considerable air pollution as most of them are barbecueing or frying and one is burning wood. For those of us who work here this may be bad for our health. They create a lot of dirt and noise and have caused a massive increase in the rat population as well as a problem with starlings. The number of stalls (60)causes congestion for people on the ground and makes the environment very unpleasant. The plans originally showed less stalls in which case there would be no need for a bridge. 4. A bridge in a takeaway food area will have people sitting and eating and drinking on it and leaving their waste food, paper and plastic containers behind, as they do elsewhere. this will end up in the canal below or on the roofs of the passing boats. It will be difficult to clean a bridge as waste water, cleaning materials cannot be allowed to go over into the canal. With a redevelopment of the buildings to create more ground space there shoul
2015/4774/P	Rod Gray	1 Elgin Road LONDON N22 7UE	22/09/2015 12:22:34	OBJ	The Inland Waterways Association (IWA) was founded in 1946 to campaign for the use, restoration and development of Britain's Inland waterways. Personal membership is 16,000 and Associated and Corporate membership covers 250,000 people with an interest or involvement in the waterway network.
					The IWA objects to the proposed encroachment into Dead Dog Basin by a platform supporting restaurant seating. We totally support the proposed opening up of the Basin, but consider that further serious effort should be made to find a boat-related use for this unique historic space. The encroachment and restaurant use is likely to make an appropriate use for the basin more difficult to achieve.