

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2016/1117/P	Jonathan Arnold	140B Royal College St NW10TA	24/03/2016 15:02:57	INT	<p>* The terraced houses on Royal College Street are locally listed heritage assets, partly due to their 'unbroken roofline'. They provide a historic setting and the roofline should be visible from the towpath, yet the massing of the development coupled with the location of the gap between the buildings will hide most of the roofline.</p> <p>* The height will create a 'wall', which will 'close' the canal and harm its setting as a conservation area and heritage asset. According to the Regent's Canal Conservation Area appraisal, 'Each of the four sections bracketed by the bridges has its own distinct appearance'; 'It is the Council's intention to conserve and enhance the existing character of the canal'</p> <p>* The development is supposed to provide access to the canal edge for the public, yet with offices on one side and flats with private terraces to the canal edge on the other, access is limited. Both the gap and the courtyard space are shaded almost year-round.</p> <p>OVERSHADOWING AND LOSS OF LIGHT</p> <p>* Appendix B of the Sunlight and Daylight Report, submitted as part of the planning application, illustrates the loss of light and overshadowing of the canal, the towpath, the nature reserve in front of Reachview and a number of our windows. In winter, lower flats at Reachview will not enjoy the levels of light they currently enjoy.</p> <p>NB: In the Daylight and Sunlight Report, it is considered acceptable that on 21 March more than 50% of the canal area will get at least 2 hours of direct sunlight.</p> <p>* This open and sunny section of the canal will experience the overshadowing of a 'closed' section, and negatively affect the wellbeing of local residents and visitors.</p> <p>* Of the Royal College Street windows that back onto the development, 13 out of 37 are below recommended BRE daylight guidelines, unless flexibility is applied to the figures.</p>

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2016/1117/P	Penny Gamez	16 Reachview Close Baynes Street London NW1 0TY	24/03/2016 13:21:24	OBJNOT	<p>I oppose this planning application for the following reasons:-</p> <p>Height of proposed buildings</p> <p>According to the Heritage section in Planning Policy and Proposal Compliance: 'proposals should be sympathetic in form and scale to protect and enhance the significance of heritage assets'.</p> <p>According to the Regent's Canal Conservation Area Appraisal and Management Strategy 2008: 'Each of the sections bracketed by the bridges has its own distinct appearance.' 'It is the Council's intention to preserve and enhance the existing character of the canal.'</p> <p>According to Camden Development Policy: Respecting Local Character (DP24.12): Designs for new buildings should respect the character and appearance of the local area and neighbouring buildings. Within areas of distinctive character, development should reinforce those elements which create the character'.</p> <p>According to the Planning Statement and earlier discussions with the Council Planning Officer: 'Despite the Applicant providing justification to support the height proposed. Officers advised, 'there is no townscape case for the site to be considered a 'gateway' or 'marker' site and there are important differences between the context of this site and the examples provided of other taller canal buildings'.</p> <p>Six storey buildings are not the norm in the immediate vicinity along the canal. The height of this development is out of context with its locality. It will detract from the characteristics of the conservation area and it will not reinforce or enhance the period buildings in close proximity e.g. Eagle Wharf and Royal College Street. Eagle Wharf is a listed Victorian warehouse and part of the rich heritage of canal buildings. It is only 3 storeys in height and will be totally dwarfed by the height and bulk of the proposed development at Bangor Wharf. One of the proposed buildings will be twice as high as Eagle Wharf.</p> <p>The terraced houses in Royal College Street are mostly 3 storeys high above ground with a basement below. Even 'stepping' the rear of the larger building will not alter the looming and overbearing effect that it will have on Royal College Street. They will look out on a windowless wall of brick just at the end of their small gardens. There is nowhere in the immediate vicinity where residential property is overshadowed by higher buildings – let alone, twice as high.</p>

Size and density of proposed buildings

Application No: **Consultees Name:** **Consultees Addr:** **Received:** **Comment:** **Response:**

With reference to the diagram and photograph of Lawford's Wharf on Page 27 of Bangor Wharf Design and Access Statement:-

The two buildings proposed virtually occupy the whole site. The gap between them is compared to the gap between the buildings at Lawford's Wharf but although the gap near to the canal may be the same width, this is not the case further away from the canal. The buildings on either side of the gap at Lawford's Wharf are much shallower in depth than those proposed at Bangor Wharf so that whereas the gap further away from the canal at Lawford's wharf increases so that the smaller houses in Lyme Street are not affected, the gap further away from the canal at Bangor Wharf remains the same as next to the canal and the buildings have a much larger footprint. They are much closer to the terraced houses in Royal College Street. When viewed from the opposite side of the canal at an angle or when walking along the canal from Gray's Inn Bridge, the gap between the buildings at Bangor Wharf will not be visible so the two buildings will appear to be one solid block.

With reference to Drawing 213 in Appendix B in the Daylight and Sunlight Report:-

It can be seen from this 3D image that the size and density of these buildings is extremely large and totally dwarfs the surrounding period buildings. The developers state: 'the site is deliberately dense and the scale is deliberately more than that which exists at the moment in order to achieve important urban design objectives...' Urban design objectives should not mean producing an unacceptably adverse impact on the amenities and historic importance of the properties immediately adjacent to the site.

Overshadowing of neighbouring properties and right to light

According to DP26: Managing the impact of development on occupiers and neighbours – 'The Council will protect the quality of life of...neighbours by only granting permission for development that does not cause harm to amenity'.

DP26.2: 'Development should avoid harmful effects on the amenity of existing and future occupiers and to nearby properties.'

With reference to Drawing 204 in Appendix B in the Daylight and Sunlight Report

It can be seen from the new buildings' shadow at 1600h on 21st March that the shadow cast by the buildings is very large and reaches right across the canal and up the opposite bank. The proposed courtyard between the two new buildings will be in shade the whole time, all year, except for between 1400h and 1600h in the summer. The backs of the houses in Royal College Street will also be badly affected.

The developers claim that: 'windows to the rear of properties in Royal College Street will continue to enjoy good levels of daylight and sunlight'. Yet in the 'Daylight and Sunlight Report' it is stated 5 rooms out of the 34 habitable rooms at the rear of Royal College Street houses will achieve the

Application No: **Consultees Name:** **Consultees Addr:** **Received:**

Comment: **Response:**

numerical values set out in the BRE Guidelines with regard to daylight and they go on to say: 'Taking into account the urban location of the site, the close proximity of these properties to the site boundary and the under developed nature of the site the BRE guidelines need to be applied flexibly. It is therefore considered that with 26 of the 34 rooms analysed achieving the numerical values set out in the BRE Guidelines, the aims of the guidelines are achieved'.

Would the occupiers of the houses in Royal College Street agree with the developers' interpretation of the aims of the guidelines?

In another section of the same report, the developers state that 13 out of 37 windows will not achieve a VSC of at least 27% or 0.8 times the existing. Is this also considered acceptable?

Effect of overshadowing and the bulk and height of development on Regent's Canal

According to the Planning Policy & Proposal Compliance: The development will be expected to be of a form and scale which is appropriate to the Regent's Canal Conservation Area and responds to the open character of this part of the canal and to surrounding listed buildings.

It also states the need to: 'ensure that the design and layout of the development responds positively to its canal setting, and contributes to the biodiversity and green nature of the canal.' In addition, the impact of any overshadowing of the canal should be minimized.

Between College Street Bridge (Royal College Street) and Gray's Inn Bridge (St Pancras Way) is one of the largest open planted sections of the canal. The proposed buildings will be only 1.5 metres away from the canal edge. The developers claim that the gap between the buildings will allow light through to the water but the shadow cast by those buildings is considerable and at times reaches right across the canal and up the opposite bank. This will seriously affect the biodiversity of not only the canal itself but also of the bank and nature reserve on the other side. The towpath opposite is widely used by the public as a sunny open space but this will be affected by the reduction in hours of sunlight and there will no longer be a feeling of open-ness.

The public space between the proposed buildings will be in shade for much of the time and so will the narrow access area to the canal in front of the largest building. There is no public access to the canal in front of the smaller building. There will be no 'sense of openness at the canal edge', as the developers claim, since there will be overbearing buildings around. It will not be much used by the public as they have much better access to the canal from the opposite side. The entrance to this 'public' space will be from Georgiana Street and through some kind of tunnelled walkway. Currently, there are few pedestrians in Georgiana Street so, apart from the residents of Bangor Wharf, how will the public know there is a way to the canal and even when they do find it, why would they want to go and sit in almost permanent shadow in the middle of overpowering buildings?

In addition to the negative impact of the shadowing on the water, the sheer bulk of this development will change the whole atmosphere of this stretch of the canal. Other areas have lost this and it is a precious heritage that should be preserved. Once lost, it cannot be replaced.

Application No: **Consultees Name:** **Consultees Addr:** **Received:** **Comment:** **Response:**

Right to Privacy

Lawford's Wharf on the other side of College Street Bridge was described as follows:- 'The scheme responds to building heights constraints, sensitively proportioning new development to prevent overlooking of neighbouring dwellings'. The same cannot be said of the proposed development at Bangor Wharf.

As already stated the development at Bangor Wharf will loom over the houses in Royal College Street and will affect the amount of daylight and sunlight they will receive. In addition, it will also affect their privacy. Above the first floor the largest block is set back from the buildings in Royal College Street but at first floor level there is a roof garden with a play area at the rear of the block (Block C). From this area it will be possible to see into the gardens of the houses. The developers say they will screen the play area/roof garden with deep planters but that is dependent on the plants being looked after adequately, and, if they form a screen, they will cut off even more light from the houses behind. There are also private terraces in the new development at ground level. It is unclear the exact height of the boundary wall as it apparently varies, but at one point it is 1.8m high so anyone standing there will be able to look over it into the Royal College Street rear gardens and also into the back windows of the houses.

Choice of brick colour

According to the Design section in the Planning Policy & Proposal Compliance the 'main facing brick will be a multi stock that will complement the variety of brickwork to be found in the immediate vicinity'. That should mean that the colour of the brick will blend with the brick colour of Eagle's Wharf but in actual fact it means that it will be the same colour as the building with the Costa coffee café on the corner of Camden Road and the canal – opposite Lyme Terrace. This is not a heritage colour. It is very dark and stark and will stand out unfavourably in a heritage and conservation area. Why should a new building match a modern block which mainly fronts a busy road and has no connection with the local character of the Regent's canal and Eagle Wharf.

Is this choice of this unsuitable brick colour dictated by price? Is the modern dark brick a cheaper option than the softer more traditional yellow London Stock brick? The bricks used for the building at Eagle Wharf which is right next to the development are probably Yellow London Stock. I believe they are expensive but surely there is a modern equivalent that would blend in with Eagle Wharf better than the brick the developers intend to use?

Conclusion

The height and footprint of this development is totally out of keeping with this open, planted and sunny stretch of the Regent's Canal. It will dominate the area and will have an overbearing effect on the

Application No: **Consultees Name:** **Consultees Addr:** **Received:** **Comment:** **Response:**

much smaller houses in Royal College Street as well as depriving them of sunlight, daylight, and privacy. The shadow produced by these buildings will have a serious effect on the biodiversity of the canal and the opposite bank. The claim that access to the canal will improve is probably a meaningless one as the access is very poor and through a completely shadowed courtyard. This development will not preserve and enhance the existing character of the canal nor will it reinforce or complement the heritage buildings around it.

I oppose this planning application for all the above reasons. Please notify me of the committee date.

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2016/1117/P	Lester May	24 Reachview Close Camden Town London NW1 0TY	28/03/2016 16:42:40	OBJEMPER	<p>I sent this letter to the CNJ and an edited version was published 17 Mar 2016:</p> <p>Sir,</p> <p>Dan Carrier's article in your Property News section is timely and should be read in a national context, certainly a London context ("Vision for wharf site not "future proof"" - CNJ 10 March, p.22). The site in question is Camden Town's historic Bangor Wharf (not Butler's Wharf as in the caption for the helpful illustrations).</p> <p>Every four minutes, 24/7/365, a ship arrives at a UK port, bringing essential goods and energy supplies. Indeed, about 95% of our nation's international trade is by sea and some 24% of our internal trade is in coastal ships, plying between our busy ports and providing much-needed relief to our nation's congested roads and railways.</p> <p>Labour peer Lord Adonis of Camden Town, Chairman of the National Infrastructure Commission, has this past week made abundantly clear the need for improved transport infrastructure, particularly in the light of the rapidly increasing population we see now and that forecast in the coming decades. This is particularly acute in London which, he says, will grind to a halt if improvements to transport infrastructure are not urgently made. Our old canals have a part to play in the future movement of freight, relieving roads and railways like coastal shipping.</p> <p>The last chief executive of British Waterways was a property man and there were widely-held fears that he was undertaking large scale development of land each side of the Regent's Canal. Our urban canals would become a corridor of shadow, with little wildlife owing to insufficient sunshine, and a beautiful national resource would be lost to our children and future generations.</p> <p>The new chief executive of the Canal & River Trust (C&RT) is Richard Parry and he is a railway man, so one would hope he understands the need for better movement of freight by all modes of transport. Furthermore, one trusts that he understands the meaning of the word Trust in Canal & River Trust - the nation and canal users trust him to do his best to manage our canals, for he runs them in trust for the nation, both for today's people and tomorrow's generations.</p> <p>It is clear that Ian Shacklock, chairman of the Friends of Regent's Canal understands the wider context and one trusts C&RT does too. One Housing and Camden Council should take heed of Mr Shacklock's wise counsel.</p> <p>London's increasing population puts great pressure on infrastructure and essential services and requires huge capital expenditure. Insufficient housing for Londoners today, let alone in future years, is a key topic for the mayoral election. New transport infrastructure I've already mentioned and millions more people in our capital in the next two decades inevitably means a significant increase in internal trade, and the movement of freight and goods, to supply the needs of these new fellow Londoners.</p> <p>London's canals, part of the GLA's Blue Ribbon Network, can help to relieve the capital's already too</p>

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
					<p>congested roads and railways and it is short-sighted to lose another of the few remaining wharfage sites along the canal. In the 1960s, one plan saw the then little-used Regent's Canal as an urban motorway! Let's learn from that short-sightedness and let's approve developments that allow useful canal wharfage to remain available for future use - and future jobs, too.</p> <p>Of course much more housing is needed but industrial sites for handling goods are essential too, particularly in inner London. Housing should only be built on current canal-side industrial sites with careful thought in the wider context of future needs, and sites with good road access like Bangor Wharf should afford future use for canal freight. Fifteen years ago, nearby Lawford's Wharf changed use from industrial to housing - Bangor Wharf should not have the same fate.</p> <p>One Housing's current designs for Bangor Wharf are not only wrong for the site and for London's future requirements but they are quite out of scale in relation to the size of other buildings in the area. Furthermore, immediately alongside part of the site, London Wildlife Trust has nurtured a breeding area for wildlife on the canal and birds, ducks and waterfowl will surely dislike the permanent shadow and loss of sunshine that One Housing's plans will bring.</p> <p>Housing is urgently needed and housing certainly should be part of a mixed use development at Bangor Wharf. However, the intelligent approach, in the context of London's future needs, is a completely new design, one that "future proofs" the wharf site for loading and unloading freight between canal and road. One Housing's planning application, as submitted in its current form, must be refused by Camden Council.</p> <p>Yours faithfully,</p> <p>Lester May (Lieutenant Commander, Royal Navy - retired)</p> <p>I am also concerned about the bulk of the buildings proposed, their height and their effect on wildlife and their effect on reducing sunlight.</p> <p>I am concerned too that the organisers have not engaged properly with local people or with adjacent businesses.</p>

2016/1117/P	Piotr Dedel	59 Reachview Close	28/03/2016 00:41:18	OBJ	<p>Dear Sir/Madam</p> <p>We will lose the green nature of the canal opposite Reachview with the removal of all canal side trees and shrubs. This open and sunny section of the canal will experience the overshadowing of a closed section, and negatively affect the wellbeing of local residents. Bangor Wharfs tall buildings will be twice as high as the historic warehouse and twice as high as the houses behind Royal Collage Street. The blocks opposite will lose their privacy. There will be construction noise for a year or longer.</p>
-------------	-------------	-----------------------	---------------------	-----	---

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2016/1117/P	Dr G Kambouroglou/ Miss Emma Davies	146 Royal College Street NW1 0TA	24/03/2016 13:48:57	OBJ	<p>I write to the Council as the secretary of Rainbowwave Ltd, the leaseholder of 146 Royal College Street, acknowledged neighbour of the site development.</p> <p>We are seriously concerned that the proposed development will have a detrimental impact on our showroom business which is dependant on natural light. Mrs C Brooks, showroom manger, has tried to attend meeting to raise and publisise our concerns, however was not allowed to be present.</p> <p>We have communicated the Risk posed to our business (and it's 45 employees) to the Landlords agents-Helix.</p> <p>We would like to register our objection to the proposed development whilst we consult with our agents (Monmouth Dean surveyors) and submit the necessary documentation in support of our objection. We ask the council to grant us the opportunity to do so.</p> <p>Miss Emma Davies is our acting showroom manager and co-author of this note of objection. Please note her email contact details: emma@rainbowwave.com</p> <p>We are at the Council's disposal for any further information required.</p> <p>Regards Dr Gregoris Kambouroglou</p>
2016/1117/P	Katarzyna Balata	Reachview Close 59	28/03/2016 00:37:55	OBJ	<p>Dear Sir/Madam</p> <p>We will lose the green nature of the canal opposite Reachview with the removal of all canal side trees and shurbs. This open and sunny section of the canal will experience the overshadowing of a closed section, and negatively affect the wellbeing of local residends. Bangor Wharfs tall buildings will be twice as high as the historic warehouse and twice as high as the houses behind Royal Collage Street. The blocks opposite will lose their privacy. There will be construction noise for a year or longer.</p>
2016/1117/P	Inland Waterways Association	1 Elgin Road N22 7UE LONDON	27/03/2016 17:40:56	INT	<p>The Inland Waterways Association (IWA), a registered charity, leads campaigns to conserve, maintain and restore Britain's network of canal and river waterways. With a membership of around 16,000, IWA provides a strong voice for waterways users, working with navigation authorities, local and national government and other organisations to keep all our waterways alive.</p> <p>The IWA supports the proposal for a water point at this site and suggest this is made a condition of approval. We support reinstatement and improvement to the biodiversity island. We would also support provision of permanent moorings, perhaps in parts of the site less suited to the biodiversity use.</p>

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2016/1117/P	Odette Jansen	134 Royal College Street Camden NW1 0TA	28/03/2016 13:35:16	OBJ	<p>The proposal will have a considerable impact on the existing residences on Royal College Street and surrounding area –</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none">1. it is massively out of scale with the 3 storey buildings on royal college street and disproportionate to the existing buildings on the canal side including the historic warehouse2. Bangor Wharf's tall buildings will be twice as high as the historic warehouse (Eagle Wharf) and twice as high as the houses on Royal College Street3. The height will create a 'wall' – 18m from our living room, which will block off our view of the canal and will "box in" the canal resulting in the loss of its open, spacious and sunny feel4. The impact of the loss of daylight and sunlight has not been considered suitably – the height of the building will result in a serious loss of light to our living areas and will obstruct the only sunlight that the flats receive in winter. The analysis done supports this fact further stating that light levels will be below recommended BRE daylight guidelines5. The natural habitat of the local wildlife will be destroyed and the green nature of the canal will be lost due to the removal of the existing trees and shrubs6. The additional flats in the area are welcome but it should not be at the expenses / negatively affect the wellbeing of existing residents, the local community and the wildlife – the size and height of the proposed buildings should be reconsidered to respect the character and appearance of the local area and neighbouring buildings
