

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2015/2704/P	Lesley Baxter	16 Medburn Street Somers Town NW1 1RJ	09/02/2016 14:29:08	OBJ	<p>I strongly object to this plan for the following reasons:</p> <p>It undermines localism, local democracy, and the Somers Town Neighbourhood Forum, in their attempt to designate the 2 small parks in Central Somers Town as Local Green Space.</p> <p>Plot Ten/Polygon Road open space offers the only significant open vista across the park, Plot Ten and Regent High School. The area is already very built-up and this sense of space is good for people's mental health and well-being.</p> <p>The buildings on Polygon Road Open Space will take sunlight away from children playing in Regent High playground.</p> <p>Approximately 50% of soft landscaping is being stolen from the people of Somers Town, and replaced with hard landscaping. A nine storey block of flats facing Charrington Street Conservation area is an act of vandalism, and will spoil my and my extended family's enjoyment of living in this area.</p> <p>Several new buildings on Plot Ten open space will destroy the one very small park, playground and fitness area created in the early 1970's for the health and well being of often underprivileged people living in Somers Town.</p> <p>A 25 storey block on Purchase Street Open Park is totally out of keeping with Central Somers Town. It is significantly taller than the Crick and 5 times the height of the majority of other buildings in Central Somers Town.</p> <p>Several new buildings on Purchase Street Open Park will ruin my enjoyment of this green oasis adjacent to the diesel fumes being pumped out by the trains at St Pancras and Kings Cross.</p> <p>The footprint of several blocks of flats on Purchase Street Park stop it being a park for all residents and turn it instead into a small green area with access roads and pathways for the new estate.</p> <p>I object to the removal of any parking spaces in Somers Town. The survey was carried out during the summer holidays, which is not representative of true usage the rest of the year. Many working-class people in Somers Town are dependent on parking spaces for work, either as tradespeople, delivery drivers, taxi, mini cab and van drivers, chauffeurs etc. This will impact on their livelihoods as well as my own and my family's. We frequently struggle to find anywhere to park legally during week days.</p> <p>Removing parking bays has a detrimental effect on the health and well-being of those with registered disabled parking badges, including my Mother-in Law. This causes stress to the elderly and disabled due to distances they are forced to walk.</p> <p>I object to the removal of any mature trees that have taken decades to grow, providing improved air quality in one of the most polluted parts of Europe. The residents of Somers Town already have an</p>

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
					<p>average lower life expectancy than those in wealthier parts of the borough, and the removal of trees will further exacerbate this.</p> <p>These developments are irreversible and reduce significantly the genuinely open grassed areas, with tree canopies for children to play and people to socialise and meet seven days a week. The building of flats dwarfing this public open space will fundamentally destroy my and my extended family's use of these areas.</p> <p>If it is unacceptable to build on the public spaces and squares of Bloomsbury, Primrose Hill, etc, then it is unreasonable and unfair to consider doing this extensive over development to the detriment of the majority of residents of Somers Town.</p> <p>This over development and the building of such high blocks of flats sets a dangerous precedent for what is essentially a low-rise attractive residential area.</p> <p>As the developer and authorising planning body, London Borough of Camden must be seen to be above reproach and should reject this proposal.</p>
2015/2704/P	Norman Furber-Frost	4 Coopers Lane London	14/02/2016 18:27:14	OBJ	<p>My main concern is losing the trees, the park, the wildlife and the sunlight. I would really be affected by loss of light, privacy and views if the 25-storey tower would be built. Losing sunlight means my garden will be in the shadow and will suffer as a consequence. Living near Brill Place means that I am already affected by poor air quality. The air pollution is bound to increase by adding further buildings to the park. I intend to sue for compensation for the right of light.</p>

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2015/2704/P	Diana Foster	176 Levita House Chalon Street	08/02/2016 18:42:19	OBJ	<p>I object to aspects of this plan, namely the building density, loss of trees, building on parkland, and the height of the tower blocks. The latter is out of proportion with the rest of the area's height. The programme's impact will result in more than double the building density, turning green space to hard landscaped space in an area with little open or green space, as it is (Camden Open Space Study 2008 reports that Somers Town has the "least open space in Camden). According to Camden's Local Development Framework, this area should have "smaller scale and more incremental change" ( P.18 1.18 and Policy CS4) This proposed height of the tower, and the turning of green space into buildings or hard landscape is not incremental nor small scale. Likewise, I object to mature trees being cut down, which I understand will be done - the provision of new trees is not like for like as mature trees offer much greater protection against pollution. This will impact on health in an area bordering the Euston Road, which currently exceeded EU limits on NO2, or toxic pollutants (and many of the UK's top pollution hotspots are in this road.(see <a href="http://www.howpollutedismyroad.org.uk">http://www.howpollutedismyroad.org.uk</a>) Men die on average 10 years younger in this area - predominantly from COPD - of which pollution must be a contributing factor. The building on existing park is a problem, and contravenes Camden's policies (Camden policies CS15 (see 15.6) and DP 31 protect designated public open spaces). Many flats and residents will lose light and I object to the shadow cast by the tower, and the lack of privacy of caused by the new buildings overlooking a park. I like green space and the trees are particularly beautiful when green and are large, particularly in the corner where the proposed tower will be. It is the only vista in Somers Town where I feel this is a true park view of a bank of green - that is, the mature trees, and I cross through looking , and there is the memorial to Richard Everett, which is mentioned in the proposal but it is not clear where this will be relocated. The tower block price of a flat is beyond the reach of locals and even beyond most average paid professionals, so this will surely be open to the very rich, or investors, which in turn will change the character of this community which still exists, as there will be a disproportionate difference in income, which again is not in line with Camden's aims of minimising social polarisation' (Policy CS6, and this group is unlikely to add to our community but is likely to sit apart as a "dormitory" class who work locally or visit, and thus will not contribute to the area, and will in all likelihood be second or professional/ tourist homes. Personally I particularly dislike the overly landscaped design, which seem to have more in common with overly controlled corporate business parks, and in fact do not invite one to sit and relax on a green, as one should in a park, but rather the criss-crossing of hard landscape seems designed more in mind of surface decoration, rather than function (that is, sit/ play/ relax and breathe - the normal park use) and the big brother like signs telling the user to "Gather" etc are patronising at the very least. The layout of the new park is in narrow strips and this means there is no substantial green, as there currently is. Purchase Street Open space has a pleasant hill where children have a slide to the lower reaches of the play area and this is again the only area of Somers Town where the landscape is little less controlled, which is good for children, as they can climb and run as though in a rural location. I took my nephews there when there was a rope swing and that was their favourite (it was removed and replaced with a hard uncomfortable steel structure). In 2013 there was a sports day in the park and we were able to have a tug of war across a wide area and use the different grassy areas creatively. This will be lost when there are the new buildings and over landscaped feel. I am dismayed by the corporate feel in a residential area. Having said all this, I am in favour of some (albeit limited) development in order to improve the school and Plot 10 nursery, and I would have liked more social housing as the housing crisis is very serious. Likewise it seems the affordable housing proposed is not adequate to meet Camden's own 50% target (DP2-DP9) There are</p>

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
					<p>aspects of the scheme that are attractive. This was proposed by the Neighbourhood Forum in 2015, who collaborated with the teams, but has been overlooked. I would suggest that a new community centre is inappropriate as the area has several already, and these are TRA centres, so this idea overlooks the structure of the area. I have suffered from building works noise, disruption and pollution from the building of opposite my flat - from the British Library and the Francis Crick. So the view from my 4th floor window (once a beautiful view of spires of St Pancras and to a distance over Kings cross) is now one of buildings and I object to the light pollution at night. This tall tower will add to the obstruction to my view and further to light pollution.</p>
2015/2704/P	Gail Murphy	47 Cecil Rhodes House London NW1 1UG	14/02/2016 18:30:41	OBJ	<p>I live in the Kings Cross conservation area and the tower block and 9-storey block at the end of Charrington Street will spoil my views.</p> <p>We had years and years of building works going on: British library, CTRL, Regents High, the Crick. The endless works putting in the heating pipes.</p> <p>It has been non-stop. The noise and dust is terrible it is really affecting my quality of life. As soon as I clean I have to do it again. I have asthma and sometimes I find it difficult to breathe. These works will result in loss of trees and poorer air quality it will make the situation worse.</p> <p>I often care for my grandchildren. I also work with young children. I am worried about the split between ages in the reduced playground space. One is fenced, the other is not. Families often have children of both ages and find it difficult to look after children safely in two different areas.</p> <p>I am a dog owner the area provided is inadequate. It has a hard surface. And I will be worried about dogs barking next to people's homes.</p>
2015/2704/P	Rosanna Garau	5 St. Joans House Phoenix Road London NW1	14/02/2016 18:23:32	OBJ	<p>I object to the planning application because this area is already a building site, it is not anymore a liveable place. My health is degrading, as everybody else's. The level of stress that a building site of this size would create is overwhelming. They forget that there is a community here and they are messing on top of the community. When the trees have gone, they will never come back. We have to look about the quality of the environment, not just the profit.</p>
2015/2704/P	Kenneth Macleod	71 Monica shaw court	05/02/2016 16:39:37	OBJ	<p>I oppose the proposed buildings on the park because firstly, I think the park should stay. In an urban sprawl at least it is somewhere one can go to relax and try to get onto a different spiritual plane if even for only a few moments. Secondly it is somewhere where children and dogs (not equating them!) can and should play (and so space is needed for that and the park is only small).</p> <p>In the case of dogs, I came across a guy recently who had two dogs in St Pancras international station, and they went for anyone who looked in their direction. A public place is NOT the place for dogs - even on leads, and so a safe place for dogs to be able to run around is needed and a place without dogs, including a children's area.</p> <p>The community garden should be large and the dogs area too, big enough for dogs to run around including big dogs. There will not be enough space with these buildings.</p>

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2015/2704/P	Andrew Whitaker	24 Walker House Phoenix Rd NW11EN	07/02/2016 22:15:47	INT	<p>I am concerned about the loss of light, The Crick has had a massive effect, this new block will certainly take away even more light. The CIP brochure and meetings have never given any figures apart from minimum impact, etc which means nothing.</p> <p>Purchase Street Open Space is on the Local Asset List as well as a Designated Public Open Space as the council are committed to fighting any development on public open space I do not understand why they are making these proposals.</p> <p>I am also concerned about wind at present the Crick creates a wind tunnel along Phoenix rd and another one along Midland road. The winds are so strong they destroyed my umbrella. This new building will only make things worse. Again no figures were ever given about wind speeds etc and how they will change.</p> <p>This 25-storey tower is completely out of character and scale with the area and essentially destroys the low-rise aspect of surrounding estates</p> <p>The CIP configuration of parkland is a magicians illusion, there will not be one continuous park. Purchase Street will still run between the two parks and CIP is taking private open space from Coopers Lane estate, Plot 10 and Edith Neville School. Overall there is going to be less open space and more people in the area living in these new homes plus more pupils etc.</p> <p>The new buildings on the parks need to be accessible to emergency vehicles and will require wide paths taking away green areas from the parks.</p> <p>I understand the new 25 story block will have air purifying equipment, if this building needs it then so do the existing buildings and as there are no plans to provide air purification for all surrounding building the new air quality must be filthier than now. Not the same as claimed by CIP.</p> <p>CIP claim to be giving Coopers Lane a bigger hall but the plans require this hall to be manned so how are they going to afford to run it with the council shedding jobs. The proposed CIP idea is not possible in this economic climate.</p> <p>CIP are taking away parking spaces and bringing more people in including disabled people. It does not add up.</p> <p>I have attended many CIP meetings and they do literally consult but they do not have to listen, quote from Louise. Basically they have changed their plan so often that each time it is a new scheme not minor changes. It is obvious that the Council want this to happen and happen it will. At no point has there ever been a minimum impact plan offered by CIP. The end result is a mish mash with many ill thought out ideas with an overall negative impact on the community.</p>

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2015/2704/P	Steve denholm	2avigail house 25 Chalton st. Nw1 1je	08/02/2016 20:37:12	COMMNT	Loss of light,loss of green space,along with hs2 and cross rail this will mean years of construction with all the attendant problems to residents,loss of trees which are the only protection against the appalling air pollution from midland road.
2015/2704/P	Semhar Girmay	13 Somers Close London NW1 1RT	14/02/2016 18:10:23	OBJ	<p>I have children and I am not happy that the playground will be smaller, because my children use it a lot.</p> <p>I object to the loss of parking spaces.</p> <p>I worry about the loss of trees because I think it will create health problems due to a poorer air quality.</p>
2015/2704/P	Jo Hurford	Flat 71 30-40 Grafton Way WC1E 6DX	13/02/2016 20:54:10	COMMNT	25 floors is far too high, buildings should not be higher than others nearby. No green space should be lost, all trees must be retained.
2015/2704/P	Dervilla Carroll	52 Cecil Rhodes House Goldington Street London NW1 1UG	08/02/2016 21:56:53	COMMNT	<p>I object to private development on public space and the loss of amenity that this will represent for the community.</p> <p>The high level of market housing proposed will polarise the community in Somers Town.</p> <p>The planning proposals do not include adequate provision for social housing, which we need in Somers Town.</p> <p>A 25-storey tower is completely inappropriate for Somers Town. It is totally out of character and out of scale in relation to the existing buildings.</p> <p>I live in a conservation area and the tower will interfere with my view.</p> <p>The air quality is bad and further developments will exacerbate an already unhealthy situation.</p> <p>Purchase Street Open Space and Polygon Road function like a little green lung for me, which is hugely important in an inner city area. I enjoy both spaces and have used them for relaxation and recreation. The new parks will not provide the same quality of experience and will no longer be an inviting place to relax and chat to fellow residents.</p> <p>The bad air quality is recognised as being at a dangerous level and this is extremely worrying. This development will add to the poor air quality by the removal of mature trees and construction related pollution. This scheme will clearly contravene the council's policy CS16 policy of improving Camden's health and well-being.</p> <p>The scheme suggests more hard surfacing and less grass. Changing the nature of our parks and open spaces flies in the face of CS15 Camden's duty to protect and improve parks and open spaces.</p>

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2015/2704/P	Dorothea Hackman	Camden Civic Society Basement Flat 39 Mornington Terrace NW1 7RS	08/02/2016 18:25:39	OBJ	<p>Camden Civic Society's (the Society's) pro tem detailed comments for submission on 8th February concerning the Somers Town Central application 2015/2704/P</p> <p>The Society will submit further comment when the additional views required by Historic England have been provided and the blimp requested by the Society and the CAACs of Kings Cross and Bloomsbury has been flown. It will then be possible to assess the impact of the proposed tower on lines of sight and on 'kinetic' views, particularly in relation to St Pancras station.</p> <p>Summary</p> <p>Camden Civic Society strongly objects to</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. the proposed 25 story tower on Brill Place, as this is not in keeping with the setting of Somers Town with its maximum of six stories, is to be built on green space, reduces light and intrudes on the historic St Pancras setting.</li> <li>2. the reduction in the public green space of the Purchase St open space and loss of trees as a public health issue in an area of high pollution, and for the loss of public amenity, narrow walkways and bisecting paths.</li> <li>3. the use of the need to rebuild Edith Neville Primary school as a justification for reducing scarce green space, to the detriment of the children's health.</li> <li>4. the proposed 9 story block in Charrington St, as this is not in keeping with the setting of three story terraces and the historic view along Charrington and Ossulston streets.</li> <li>5. the proposal to build housing on the Coopers Lane community gardens, further reducing open green space.</li> <li>6. the HE views not yet having being provided nor the blimp having been flown.</li> </ol> <p>Introduction</p> <p>The Camden Civic Society strongly objects to these proposals, particularly to the 25 storey tower and the impact it will have on the area, and to the reduction in size and amenity of the Purchase Street Open Space. Camden's Community Investment Programme for improving school buildings and increasing the amount of affordable and social housing would seem to be predicated on generating funds through the sale of "luxury" housing, however it is not acceptable for the luxury flats to reduce the amenity of existing residents.</p> <p>A recent example of where the amenity of existing residents is undermined is on the Regent's Park Estate where the proposal to hold out for the termination of leases on the Albany St Police station and Stanhope St parking was rejected by Camden itself in favour of new tall buildings on the scarce remaining green space near the Hampstead Rd. This may have seemed expedient to fit in with High Speed 2, but in the Society's view it is that it is a very short-sighted decision with repercussions for future generations, particularly as HS2 is delayed as could be expected of any major infrastructure project. There is no possible justification for the local authority to reduce the amount of public green space and number of mature trees in inner London, where pollution is already at unacceptably high levels impacting on public health.</p> <p>The Central Somers Town project is predicated on the idea that funding is needed to rebuild Edith Neville School, St Aloysius nursery, the play centre and improve any remaining open space. We believe that it is preferable to minimise the plan and utilise the s106 and CIL monies from all the works planned in Somers Town, including 42 Phoenix Road, Maria Fidelis, HS2, Crossrail2, British Library</p>

Application No:      Consultees Name:      Consultees Addr:      Received:

Comment:      Response:

extension and St Pancras hospital. In addition, there are still funds banked from the Unison and Crick s106 agreements. The school, like St Mary St Pancras and Netley, could also contribute by, for instance, putting housing on top.

1. The proposed 25 story tower of luxury flats on Brill Place

Camden Civic Society strongly objects on a number of grounds to the proposed 25 storey tower.

a) While a tower of this sort might be acceptable amongst a group of tall buildings it is completely out of place in the maximum six story context of Somers Town. Camden's proposed tower is visually highly inharmonious with both the Crick buildings and St Pancras station. The model of the proposed development provided shows neither the whole of the Crick building nor any part of the original St Pancras station, which conceals this issue.

b) The proposed tower may intrude into important views of St Pancras, particularly its train shed, thereby damaging the setting of this Grade I building. The sole visualisation given in the application is not accurate; this must be corrected. St Pancras station is not only a masterpiece of Victorian architecture, and a monument of the railway age, it is of great significance in the history of the conservation movement as the point at which ordinary people's voices managed to put a stop to the widespread destruction of the 1960s including the demolition of Euston Station and St James Hampstead Rd. The Society is also concerned about the effect of the proposed tower on views of the British Library. The one visualisation given looks up to the gate, masking the tower behind. It is likely that the tower would be visible from nearby viewpoints.

c) It is absurd to suggest that a tall modern building in this position can create an 'intentional dialogue' with the St Pancras clock tower (ref. p36 of the Brill Place Tower DAS, vol 3 application Design and Access) The St Pancras clock tower performs a dual function as landmark and clock on a street which has been London's most important highway since the 18th century. The 'dialogue' has already been provided by the clock tower at the British Library, another landmark building of international importance. The proposed tower on Brill Place has no function other than as a container for residential units and is in a place where no landmark is in any way required.

d) In the planning application, the number one justification given for positioning the tower on Purchase Street Open Space is that it is within the Central Activities Zone (CAZ). In fact, the CAZ border is Brill Place, a border drawn up to reflect the low-level residential nature of that part of Somers Town.

[https://www.camden.gov.uk/ccm/cms-service/stream/asset/?jsessionid=F095443E595DBB56450E12178D290ECD?asset\\_id=2998969](https://www.camden.gov.uk/ccm/cms-service/stream/asset/?jsessionid=F095443E595DBB56450E12178D290ECD?asset_id=2998969)

e) A tall building in a residential area where there were previously none is a hostage to fortune, paving the way for other tall buildings. A group of tall buildings in Somers Town would be very objectionable for the reasons given in the Society's Residential Density section below. It would also represent the northwards spread of Central London, breaking the boundary formed by Euston Road which has for so long marked a separation between the commercial centre of the city and the residential inner suburbs to the north and this opposed by the Society, as well as the majority of local residents. This should not be the intention of Camden Council and Transport for London/GLA, rather Camden Council should be protecting its citizens from the northwards march of big business and commercial property. It is true that the new buildings at King's Cross and on the Railway Lands are very large and far too few are devoted to housing. However, as the Society has argued in relation to HS2's plans for Euston, these are areas where there was a very low population previously. Somers Town is quite different, being already



Application No: Consultees Name: Consultees Addr: Received:

Comment: Response:

densely populated.

f) The tower will have a deleterious effect on the area around it: in the first place by sitting to the south of low rise housing, it will very much reduce the sunlight experienced by the inhabitants of the latter (London is at a high latitude, there is only a very short period in the year where the sun at midday is directly overhead); like all tall buildings, it will create unpleasant downdrafts, damaging in particular the amenity of the remaining area of Purchase Street Open Space; it will set up what might be called an anti-dialogue, with the segregation of “luxury” residents from council and housing association tenants and leaseholders. This undermines the integrated communities that are such a positive characteristic of Camden, providing the underpinning for inner city social cohesion.

g) Camden, HS2, Crossrail 2, TfL all want to see a strong east-west walkway between Euston and St Pancras. In July 2015, Urban Partners for Kings Cross, Euston and St Pancras unveiled London’s first designated station to station Wellbeing Walk. This initiative was supported by TfL and Cross River Partnership and was in partnership with the Somers Town community. The proposed tower block will make the route less appealing and less green.

## 2. Reduction of open spaces – Purchase Street

The Camden Civic Society objects in principle to the loss of part of Purchase Street Open Space WE object very strongly indeed to the reduction of the Purchase Street Open Space for the construction of the tower.

a) The Society objects to the use of public open space for any kind of development, particularly a privately-owned tower. It is a policy of the Society to resist the loss or reduction of any public green space. While the London Borough of Camden is generally very well provided with public open space this is not true of Somers Town, which is characterised instead by its proximity to three railway termini.

b) The Society also objects to how, in the plans, the remaining green space is bisected by large paths, creating an area with a transitional feel, not a coherent enclosed area, safe and relaxing. While the Purchase Street Open Space requires improvement, this should be based on the good points of this existing small park.

c) The community garden belonging to the Coopers Lane development, at present visually part of the Purchase Street Open Space, is currently very pleasant. What will be provided in its place is too narrow and has too little light to function as a replacement. Coopers Lane TRA are losing their garden which is currently private open space, as the replacement is needed to make up the public open space figures.

## Further Objections

3. We very much object to Camden justifying the proposed Brill Place tower on the need to rebuild and reposition Edith Neville Primary School. This cannot reasonably be used to justify the further reduction of public open space in an area in which this is so scarce.

4. The Society objects to the 9 story block proposed for Charrington St, which otherwise is a terrace of three story buildings. There is a lot of local opposition to the nine-storey building at the end of Charrington Street. It has long been accepted not to build higher than six storeys in Somers Town. The CIP report to the Cabinet of Dec 2013 (when an earlier version was approved) acknowledged this: “The majority of the indicative heights proposed for the new housing designs are set within the Somers Town context of buildings up to six storeys. The exception is the proposed residential block on the corner of Brill Place and Purchase Street. The maximum height proposed here would be no higher than

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
					<p>the emerging Francis Crick Institute.” Nine storeys at the end of Charrington Street would dominate the listed three-storey streetscape and destroy views into and out of the conservation area. In addition to conforming to the height of buildings in the setting, any new buildings proposed for Charrington Street must be set back to the established building line (as preserved by the original houses to the north and the old blocks to the south) and must not obtrude onto the right of way and into the long views up and down Charrington Street/Ossulston Street.</p> <p>5. We recommend that another solution be found for the housing to be provided by the blocks due to sit on the Coopers Lane community garden as this further reduces the Purchase St open space. These blocks will overlook existing housing, with the façade elevations of the new and existing buildings at one point just 12 metres away from each other.</p> <p>6. We do not consider that landscaping along Polygon Road will compensate for the loss of part of the Purchase Street Open Space.</p> <p>7. Disabled parking must be provided for the 14 homes planned for people with disabilities.</p> <p>Comment on the accessibility of the application - Fortunately the Council provided hard copy of this application in St Pancras Library. It is virtually impossible to use online as it takes over 30 minutes to download the main Masterplan document plus a further half hour to scroll through, and it is difficult to locate specific information, which may of course not even be there.</p> <p>The Society has emphasised in our recent submission to the consultation on the presentation of planning applications, that some paper copies must always be required by the council from applicants and made easily available to the public, and for committee members to view together.</p> <p>Camden Civic Society’s observations concerning residential density</p> <p>Tall buildings are not a means to increased density. As well as obtruding into well-loved views, they blight the area immediately around them, by casting shadows and causing downdrafts, and so discourage street usage and future streetscape improvements.</p> <p>Evidence that tall buildings do not lead to greater density is provided by the relative densities of various cities: in New York the average number of inhabitants is 2,050 per km<sup>2</sup>, in London 5,100, in Paris 26,000, and Barcelona Example district 36,000. (ref Guardian 16/4/15, article by Lloyd Alter, “Cities need Goldilocks housing density – not too high or low but just right”).</p> <p>The very high densities of Paris, Barcelona and Madrid occur particularly in areas developed in the 19th and early 20th century, before the impact of cars on cities and before the introduction into Europe of tall buildings.</p> <p>In London, the boroughs with the highest density are Kensington and Chelsea and Islington, both typified by a high proportion of traditional terraced housing. Kensington and Chelsea combines this high population density with a very good amount of green space, including the communal squares characteristic of the area.</p> <p>Greater density can only be successfully achieved by distributing additional housing relatively evenly, keeping as far as possible to the character of the area, and not by the intrusion of one or more out of place tall buildings.</p> <p>There are some benefits to greater density, most obviously improvements to local amenities: transport, services e.g. post offices, shops, meeting places including libraries and cafes.</p> <p>Most of these amenities will only flourish in a relatively formal setting, more particularly in traditional streets. Properly planned streetscapes are therefore essential if greater density is to be experienced to some extent as an improvement.</p>

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
					<p>Careful planning and the establishment of trust are needed to integrate additional housing into existing communities (see the study Better neighbourhoods: Making higher density work, published 2005 by CABI and the Corporation of London).</p> <p>Local authorities making “cross-financing” deals with private developers as a means of raising funds is a worrying trend. Private commercial developers will always be far more concerned with the individual buildings they themselves put up than with the area at large and the community it contains. The Society is concerned that such deals are a quick fix which will lead to the social and “affordable” housing in the same area having reduced amenity, most immediately a loss of light and views if the new private building is too high and/or too broad for the context.</p>

---