

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2016/1117/P	Emma Yates	Flat 6 Rosea House 4 Boulcott St London E1 0HR	06/04/2016 21:23:07	OBJ	Hello, as a resident of the East End with a keen interest in our canals, I object to the above development. We are in real danger of having so much housing that we end up with no green space and no haven for the wildlife that live there - all of which makes the canal so appealing in the first place. Please give real consideration to the environmental impact this will have.
2016/1117/P	Mr I Haywood	132-136 Royal College Street	05/04/2016 18:50:38	OBJ	On behalf of the Freeholder of 132-136 Royal College Street, we formally would like to raise the following objections to the above application:- 1. The proposed development will have a negative impact on the amount of natural light to the rear LGF to 2F properties within 132-136 Royal College Street. The report included within the Planning submission makes reference to a reduction in light to some windows, but fails to mention the LGF windows. The scale and mass of the proposed development will be detrimental to the amount of light to the rear of 132 - 136 Royal College street. 2. The rear elevation and rear roof terrace areas will be adversely affected by a lack of privacy due to the new proposed buildings overlooking the above areas. 3. The scale and mass of the development will be detrimental to the Regents Canal Conservation area.
2016/1117/P	John	10 Sneyd Road NW2 6AN	04/04/2016 09:25:34	OBJLETTE R	Yet another inappropriate housing project that will rob us of our amenity and heritage. The canal should provide leisure opportunities for us all not expensive housing for the few.
2016/1117/P	Greg Foxsmith	6 Hornsey Rise Gardens	03/04/2016 06:31:03	COMMNT	I oppose the development which is too large and leaves too narrow a space for pedestrian and cyclist users of the canal
2016/1117/P	Simon Kemper	32 Reachview Close Baynes Street NW1 0TY NW1 0TY	01/04/2016 11:01:17	COMMNT	The developers make repeated comparison with the Lawfords Wharf development on the next section of the canal, arguing that the gap and courtyard between the 2 new proposed buildings will provide equal benefit and access to light to the gap between the Lawfords Wharf buildings. The comparison is quite spurious however, as the highest building in Lawfords Wharf is only c 2.5 m taller than the housing next to it in Royal College Street and is only 16m wide, while the tallest building proposed for Bangor Wharf is c 8m taller than the Royal College Street housing, is only 11 m away at the closest point (and much closer to the housing at 54 Georgiana Street), and is a massive 45 m in unrelieved width. There is no valid comparison between the existing, restrained buildings at Lawfords Wharf and those proposed for Bangor Wharf.

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2016/1117/P	Eric Thirer	42 West 89th Street New York NY 10024-2047 U.S.A.	08/04/2016 12:31:31	OBJ	Should this development go ahead, even more of the limited and established natural habitat along the canal may well be lost and spoiled forever. I object to the proposed development on such a scale, in chorus with many of the local residents. Why not at least attempt to restore the original historic wharf with a view to its use in the future for transportation of goods and passengers? Surely the Canal and Rivers Trust is concerned about this proposal which is a further encroachment on our limited canal side and environmental pleasures.

I would also draw your attention to a letter from Lester May published in the CNJ concerning the plan.

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2016/1117/P	Ian Shacklock	29 Monsell Road N4 2EF	08/04/2016 00:00:45	OBJ	Dear Jonathan McClue, I am writing on behalf of the Friends of Regent's Canal to object strongly to the latest Bangor Wharf redevelopment plan (Application Number 2016/1117/P). The proposed buildings will cause harm to the canal and its environment in many ways. The most obvious harm will be the overshadowing of the canal and surrounding area by excessive bulk of the proposed blocks and I have no doubt that many of the neighbouring residents will have already brought this to your attention. The less obvious harm will be the undermining of the canal as a transport system by the squandering of a strategic wharf. I understand that this site has been chosen by the council as an opportunity for providing housing but since it is so accessible to the canal and road networks it must also be considered as a water transport asset. Please refer to the Blue Ribbon policies in the London Plan. A sensible proposal would maximise the site's benefit as a wharf as well as a medium scale housing development, but the current proposal achieves neither of these aims. The high buildings will cast a shadow across the canal and onto the towpath and premises opposite. This will clearly affect the quality of life of the neighbouring residents and will reduce the enjoyment of Camden's many visitors who are attracted to this open sunny stretch of the canal. It will also have a negative impact on the wildlife in and around the canal. Our researchers have advised that water reflects at least half of the light falling upon it, so the overall loss of light is much greater once the canal falls into the shade. This will affect humans, birds and plants alike. According to the council's Site Allocation Plan, any development on this site will be expected to: 1. Maximise the potential of the site to provide new housing (including affordable housing) while minimising potential conflicts between residential and other uses 2. Provide flexible employment space 3. Contain an active frontage to Georgiana Street. 4. Be of a form and scale which is appropriate to the Regents Canal Conservation Area and respond to the open character of this part of the canal and to surrounding listed buildings 5. Take opportunities to utilise the canal for the transportation of goods and materials, both during construction and in the operation of the development 6. 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 7. Provide active frontage to the canal and to Georgiana Street, in order to improve the relationship between the site and the public realm and to enhance the appearance and safety of the surrounding street scene 8. Provide infrastructure for supporting local energy generation on site and/or connections to existing or future networks where feasible The current proposal fails to meet most of these expectations. In particular the fifth point, which requires the development to utilise the canal throughout the lifetime of its operation. In fact, it does the

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
					<p>opposite, because the proposed frontage contains only a tiny quayside with no provision for any loading or unloading of boats.</p> <p>Please note that I have cited only a handful of our reasons for objecting but I hope that the above information is sufficient to persuade the council that this badly designed proposal will affect many thousands of people and future industries as well as the neighbouring residents.</p> <p>Regards,</p> <p>Ian Shacklock Chair, Friends of Regent's Canal. http://friendsofregentscanal.org/</p>
2016/1117/P	Jacob Kenedy	The Prince of Wales 1a Sudeley Street N1 8HA	04/04/2016 09:13:08	OBJ	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The proposal is seriously out of scale with the surrounding buildings (especially Georgiana Street) and visually unsympathetic to the Conservation Area. The tallest of the buildings is effectively seven storeys above towpath level. It negatively impacts the character and functionality of the local amenity, to the detriment of the Open Space 2. The whole scheme will seriously overshadow the Canal to the detriment of wildlife and general amenity. 3. The architectural character oppressive; massing and height unsympathetic to the surrounding buildings and amenity 4. Though the daylight and sunlight study claims otherwise, a considerably reduced Sky Factor will clearly result in loss of daylight, serious loss of sunlight and considerable overshadowing, especially to the ground level flats, which are five storeys lower than the proposed high block and three lower than the lower block. It will reduce visible sky and light to public users of the towpath, and boat users of the canal 5. This section of canal offers potential for improvement of road-waterway connectivity, and of the waterway for boats. The proposed development will not only fail to offer such improvement, but make it impossible in the future 6. the proposed development will reduce available green space, trees and wildlife habitat on an important waterway environment, that currently enhances the local area and the city at large
2016/1117/P	Annick Petersen	140 Royal College Street Alp London NW1 0TA	03/04/2016 16:22:21	OBJ	Project is too high and will reduce the light to our property

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2016/1117/P	Fiona Russell	26 Reachview Close London NW1 0TY	04/04/2016 16:23:07	COMNOT	<p>This planning application is inappropriate and insensitive for the following reasons:</p> <p>HEIGHT AND SIZE</p> <p>According to the Camden Site Allocations: Local Development Document (Sept 2013), the development at Bangor Wharf should, '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 surrounding listed buildings.'</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The development comprises a 6-storey block (although with higher ceilings for the ground-floor offices it will seem more like 7 storeys) and a 5-storey block. The locally listed houses on Royal College Street, however, are only 3 storeys, as is the Constitution pub and the historic warehouse on Eagle Wharf, both of which are positive characteristics. Six storeys is twice as high as these existing buildings. 2. The size and scale of the development is insensitive in comparison with new developments in the locality. The Design and Access Statement refers to heights of buildings and the local urban context on the canal, yet it fails to mention the following: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Lawfords Wharf sensitively staggers down to 1.5 storeys so as not to hide the listed buildings and backs of the terraced houses on Lyme Street. • The new building on Camden Road lowers to 3 storeys to match the height of the houses behind on Bonny Street. • Star Wharf is only 3 storeys at Gray's Inn Bridge. 3. Sites along the canal should be considered individually rather than as a whole. DP24.10: 'In the borough, a site may be suitable for a tall building while adjacent sites are not, due to impact on either views, conservation areas or listed buildings. Indeed, in some cases, suitability for a tall building differs across a single site.' 4. According to the Regent's Canal Conservation Area appraisal, 'It is the Council's intention to conserve and enhance the existing character of the canal', yet the height of the buildings will create an oppressive sense of enclosure on what is an open and light part of the canal, a site historically occupied by low buildings. The effect will 'close' the canal and harm its setting as a designated heritage asset. The Local Development document says, 'The character of this section of Regent's Canal is fairly open so any development should avoid excessive bulk and massing along the canal...' <p>OVERSHADOWING AND LOSS OF LIGHT</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Appendix B of the Sunlight and Daylight Report illustrates the loss of direct sunlight and overshadowing of the canal water, the towpath, the nesting area for waterfowl, the nature reserve on the bank beside the towpath, and many of the windows in surrounding properties. 2. The above report shows that on 21 March, 50% of the canal and towpath will have sunlight for only two hours; currently, there would not be any significant shadowing of the canal or towpath until

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

Comment: **Response:**

1700hrs on 21 March. The Design and Access Statement describes this as ‘good levels of sunlight and daylight’, but clearly this is not the case.

3. The loss of sunlight to surrounding homes and the towpath will affect the health and wellbeing of visitors and local residents. DP26: ‘The Council will protect the quality of life of... neighbours by only granting permission for development that does not cause harm to amenity.’

4. At 118-138 Royal College Street, 13 out of 37 windows fall below BRE guidelines (Daylight and Sunlight Report 8.5.2). Windows across the canal at Reachview Close will be greatly affected in winter when the sun is low, and the proposed buildings will obscure the windows of the adjacent fashion showroom (Rainbow Wave) at Eagle Wharf, which wasn’t included in the consultation and requires natural light for its business. As the kind of creative industry that gives Camden its edge, the Council should be protecting this employment at Eagle Wharf, which offers as many jobs as the proposed mixed-use site at Bangor Wharf. In addition, they have very attractive studios that are of visual interest from the canal towpath.

VISUAL AMENITY

1. The applicant’s Heritage and Townscape Appraisal says the development will ‘enhance the setting of the adjacent locally listed buildings on Royal College Street’, yet the reality is that the rooflines and historic pattern of window openings, as positively referred to in the Regent’s Canal Conservation Area appraisal, will be hidden when viewed from along the towpath. The 3D diagram in Appendix B of the Daylight and Sunlight Report shows how the height, bulk and massing of the development, with cantilevered balconies protruding into the courtyard area, will harm the setting of the Royal College Street terrace, a non-designated heritage asset.

2. This historic warehouse at Eagle Wharf is a positive characteristic of the Regent’s Canal Conservation Area, but its eastern façade will be obscured by the development, creating a loss of visual amenity from the towpath.

PUBLIC OPEN SPACE

According to the Local Development Document, the proposal should, ‘Provide active frontage to the canal... in order to improve the relationship between the site and the public realm.’

1. Active frontage to the canal will be limited. The area in front of the 5-storey block comprises private terraces; while the 6-storey block has a full-height bay that extends to the canal edge in front of offices.

2. As illustrated in Appendix B of the Daylight and Sunlight Report, the canal frontage and public courtyard will be shaded year-round; even on 21 June, the canal and courtyard are never free of shade. The path of the sun moves behind Bangor Wharf for most of the day, which is why tall north-facing buildings will cast vast shadows on the landscape in front.

3. A shady courtyard with hard landscaping is not an inviting prospect for canal visitors. Overlooked by flats and offices, it would not give the impression of being accessible to the public. The quality and

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

Comment: **Response:**

desirability of the public realm provided has to be questioned. As a local resident, I have observed over the past 13 years that people enjoy sitting near the water in the sun.

CONSERVATION AREA STATUS

1. The planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990, as referred to in the Heritage and Townscape Appraisal, says decision-makers with respect to any buildings or other land in a conservation area should pay 'special attention... to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character or appearance of that area.' Preserving the conservation area should mean that the characteristics in this section of the canal (the two bridges, the Constitution pub, Eagle Wharf, the willow tree, the rooflines, and open planting on the opposite bank) provide a sense of place. The applicant, however, through the Townscape appraisal, says the development will provide the 'sense of place' and 'create new views' and a signage for people to navigate the area, in a development that is 'deliberately dense', with a scale that is 'deliberately more than that which exists at the moment in order to achieve important urban design objectives'. This suggests the dominance of the scheme, developed to the max, despite its setting.

BIODIVERSITY

According to the Local Development Document, the proposal should, '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.'

1. The green nature of the canal in this section between Gray's Inn and College Street bridges will be forever changed with the cutting down of every tree and shrub along Bangor Wharf's edge. This includes the weeping willow, despite the applicant's Report on Trees classing it as Category B (retention desirable), providing 'visual amenity in an area dominated by built structures' and having 'clearly identifiable conservation or other cultural benefits'. Conversely, the report says 'the location is highly unsuitable for the tree'; however, the Regent's Canal Conservation Area appraisal says, 'Trees located adjacent to bridge abutments... are considered to make a positive contribution to the appearance of the area.' DP24: Development will not be permitted which fails to preserve or is likely to damage trees on a site which make a significant contribution to the character and amenity of an area.'

2. It is recommended in the Tree Report that the trees will be replaced with only 2-3 specimens, with 'small leaves to minimise maintenance issues'. This, coupled with hard landscaping in the courtyard, will change what is currently a green corridor in the summer.

3. The Ecological Appraisal classes the willow as Category 1 for bat habitat due to a hole in the trunk and given its location on the canal. It is suggested that further expert inspection is required.

4. The bird nesting area in front of Bangor Wharf, much loved by canal visitors, children and the local community, was removed ahead of seeking planning permission, in mid-February. The variety of waterfowl that was once here was unlike anywhere else on the canal and it is doubtful it will be the same again.

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

Comment: **Response:**

DESIGN

1. As referred to in the Design and Access Statement, TM Architects have taken their design influence from new developments elsewhere on the canal, rather than referencing the adjacent historic warehouse. The 5-storey building is almost identical to one of TM Architects' apartment blocks at Kingsland Wharves; the 6-storey building is similar to the design of the Plimsoll Building and Saxon Court at King's Cross; while the chosen brick is inspired by a new-build that mainly fronts Camden Road, despite Eagle Wharf having a variety of interesting brick colours (the brick stock should be of a high quality deserving of a conservation area, but there is no guarantee) and architectural features. DP24.12: 'Designs for new buildings... should respect the character and appearance of... neighbouring buildings. Within areas of distinctive character, development should reinforce those elements which create the character.'

2. The reality of glass balconies is that people's 'junk' will be on view and this will give the canal a scruffy look. This is evident further along the canal where balconies are made of glass.

3. The gap between the buildings proposes to allow 'good levels of sunlight and daylight to the water'. It is clear from Appendix B of the Daylight and Sunlight Report that this is not the case.

BLUE RIBBON NETWORK AND SUSTAINABILITY

According to the Local Development Document, the proposal should, 'Take opportunities to utilise the canal for the transportation of goods and materials, both during construction and in the operations of the development.'

1. The Regent's Canal is part of the London Plan's Blue Ribbon Network policy, yet this has been overlooked. According to section 4C of the policy, '...policies should make the most of sustainable and efficient use of space in London, by protecting and enhancing the multi-functional nature of the Blue Ribbon Network so that it enables and supports those uses and activities that require a water or waterside location.' Canal-boat users – many of whom live on the canal as a means of affordable housing – have not been guaranteed a water tap and bin facilities at Bangor Wharf. There is an infilled dock between Bangor Wharf and Eagle Wharf that could have been restored for the use of the boating community, and as a point of historic interest for visitors.

2. With good road access, Bangor Wharf could be partly used for sustainable transport, or be kept for this use in the future. DP20.3: 'The Regent's Canal provides the potential for more sustainable, lower impact waterborne movement of freight. It is the only navigable waterway in Camden...'

Conclusion

The benefit of providing only 13 affordable homes (2 x social rent, 7 x affordable rent and 4 x shared ownership) does not outweigh the harm the development will do to this historic conservation area and the public benefit in terms of the enjoyment of the canal. Two large sites nearby of up to 7 times the size of Bangor Wharf, at Pratt Street and Royal College Street, both outside of the conservation area, are also allocated for development and are more suitable for schemes of this density. There is no shortage of new flats to buy in Camden and neighbouring King's Cross. Many remain on the market

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2016/1117/P	Katy MacMillan	66 Conway Road N14 7BE	03/04/2016 13:03:51	OBJ	<p>because Londoners cannot afford them. With 33 of the 46 flats at Bangor Wharf at ‘unaffordable’ market prices, this scheme does not address the ‘much needed’ housing issue. And given the high cost of new housing in the borough, the so-called affordable properties will be beyond the reach of many. Bangor Wharf is too close to residential properties and its overdevelopment will have a devastating effect on the daylight and sunlight levels on the canal water and towpath. This will be a great loss for future generations, and for the thousands of Londoners and visitors who use the canal and its towpath for leisure, and those who do not have balconies, terraces and gardens.</p> <p>Given the constraints of the site at Bangor Wharf, and the height and massing right on the canal edge, it has to be questioned whether this site is suitable for intensive development. The courtyard design needs a rethink – it serves no purpose as public open space as it is shaded and set back from the water’s edge. The proposed development only meets 50% of the Site Allocations guidelines – the very terms under which the site was agreed after public consultation – and it seems flexibility has to be applied to many planning and housing policies in order to make it viable.</p> <p>I would urge councillors and planners to look at the long-term affect this development will have on the canal, one of London’s great assets, and to consider my comments when you make your decision.</p> <p>Please also inform me of the date of the committee meeting.</p>

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2016/1117/P	Beryl Windsor	6 Pear Tree Close Shirley SOLIHULL West Midlands B90 1LP	05/04/2016 16:41:44	OBJ	<p>BANGOR WHARF, CAMDEN. Objection to development</p> <p>As a boater with a home mooring at St Pancras Basin for 23 yrs, I would like to object to the proposed development of Bangor Wharf, Camden for the following reasons:</p> <p>The size and positioning of the proposed building will put the canal in the shade for a large part of the day robbing the water of light and putting local wildlife at risk. The reflective quality of light on water will also be lost. Homes on the opposite side of the canal will also be put in the shaddows.</p> <p>The towpath will also be in the shade and robbed of light. One of the benefits of the canal and towpath is that it encourages people to exercise, both walkers and runners can be seen daily, also cyclists. Sunlight is beneficial to us all and to deliberately block it out is an injustice.</p> <p>Similar developments have been allowed on the Regents Canal which has created rows of tall buildings close to the water's edge which block out the light and create a dark canyon as can be seen in the narrow streets of the City of London.</p> <p>To go on making the same mistakes, borough after borough, is a disaster.</p> <p>Please reconsider the plans.</p> <p>Beryl Windsor. 07973 504212 0121 244 8439</p>

2016/1117/P	Dohne Arnold	26 Noel Road Islington London N1 8HA	04/04/2016 14:22:50	OBJLETTE R	<p>I wish to object to this application for the following reasons:1)it is much too high and bulky and will block out sunlight to the canal and the adjoining buildings. It will destroy the character of the conservation area and block out the roof line of the buildings behind which are of special character. 2)the proposed buildings should be set back from the canal from the canal to allow a public towpath and for boats to moor. The canal is an important recreational area and provides accommodation and community uses .3) the architecture should have some reference to the traditional character of waterside buildings not a square box. I was at Ebley Mill in Stroud in Gloucestershire recently and the new buildings along the canal between Stroud and Stonehouse reflected the industrial nature of the area and the canal itself has been restored. There was a café on the towpath where the buildings were set back allowing the public to sit and enjoy the canal.</p>
-------------	--------------	---	---------------------	---------------	---

2016/1117/P	Dohne Arnold	26 Noel Road Islington London N1 8HA	04/04/2016 14:22:35	OBJLETTE R	
-------------	--------------	---	---------------------	---------------	--

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2016/1117/P	Beverley Dean	18 Haverstock Street Islington London N1 8DL	03/04/2016 16:40:23	OBJEMAIL	<p>Demolition of trees: - existing willow may be providing a roost for bats all self seeded sycamores - loss of greenery</p> <p>Light - how can the reduction in light so that post development only 50% of the area will benefit from direct sunlight for approximately 2 hours a day be acceptable? This popular section of the canal is well used and valued by all because it is open light and airy.</p> <p>Mass - the proposed buildings are both too high and too dense. The two main buildings will be at least twice the size of existing buildings and the development is much too close to the canal. The development is overbearing and dominant.</p> <p>Boats - Loss of opportunity to improve the use of this stretch of canal for boats.</p> <p>Public Space - The proposals for open space being offered for public access are lamentable. Most of the time this area will be in shade. It will be a harsh uninviting urban setting with very restricted views and little or no suitable softening planting. The walkways are too narrow. There will be a significant loss of public amenity.</p> <p>I am an Islington resident, a member of The Angel Association (I served on the Committee for 12 years), The London Wildlife Trust and FORC. I have lived in Islington for 31 years and know the canal well.</p>
2016/1117/P	Georgina Doble	23 Reachview close Baynes street Camden	08/04/2016 23:35:01	OBJ	<p>I have a strong objection to this development due to the overbearing height and design of the proposal. It is much bigger than the surrounding buildings and would strongly impede the views and light of the surrounding area including the residents of Reachview Close. Due to this alone I feel that the development as it stands cannot be considered. There also needs to be more consideration into the planned public space and the public access to the canal frontage.</p>
2016/1117/P	Garrie Naden	Second Time Around Wenlock Basin 56a Wharf Rd London N1 7RX	02/04/2016 08:59:54	OBJ	<p>I object to these proposals on these grounds: (1) the size of the development is overpowering for the neighbourhood causing a serious loss of natural light for surrounding residents, businesses and those using and enjoying the canal (2) the proposal is grossly bias towards open market flats meaning most of what will be built will be not be available to average (even well above average) earning Londoners (3) as a regular user of the Regents Canal on my narrowboat, development along the canal in London is turning it into a dark corridor with the canal as a water feature to put a premium on the price of the overhanging flats, it is simply not right to continue to develop London's biggest of one of the most beautiful and well used open spaces in this way (4) nature is being displaced, several mature trees including a lovely wilow go with only a gesture to replace with two small ones, whilst the canalbank wildlife will be unable to thrive once developed, indeed the floating bird nests have already been moved. Overall this development is a massive blot on the city canal landscape, casting shade and darkness on a beautiful area enjoyed by many. I hope the planners can take these factors into account when considering what will be irreversable once built.</p>

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2016/1117/P	Hazel Catalan	37 Stileman House Ackroyd Drive London E3 4AS	06/04/2016 22:54:08	OBJ	<p>I have looked at the plans for Bangor Wharf on the Regent's Canal and am writing to register an objection. The proposal is a massive over-development on a public amenity which is one of the fast decreasing sites remaining giving public access to really enjoy the Canal for the vital respite it gives from the less pastoral realities of urban life.</p> <p>By providing accommodation beyond the means of ordinary Londoners (I understand the affordable housing element is disproportionately low), it gives no benefit back to enhance the community asset canal which is virtually being drowned out by poorly designed developments created by those with a business interest that outweighs other considerations.</p> <p>Specifically:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The proposal is seriously out of scale with the surrounding buildings (especially Georgiana Street) and visually unsympathetic to the Conservation Area. The tallest of the buildings is effectively seven storeys above towpath level. 2. The whole scheme will seriously overshadow the Canal to the detriment of wildlife and general amenity. 3. The architectural character is much too formal and pretentious for a canal side building. 4. Low-cost housing would be welcome, but the loss of the light industrial wharf use of the site is a serious drawback - the use should be reconsidered. <p>I ask you to reject the application in the interest of existing and future generations. The enjoyment of the canal should be available to all with developments considered only for parts of the canal that serve no current or feasible future community purpose, and then should only be considered when of a scale and style that fits their surroundings.</p>
2016/1117/P	Miss Fiona M Cullen	7 Coombs Street London N1 8DJ	05/04/2016 14:33:51	OBJ	<p>I would like to object to the proposed planning application. The objection is based on:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Loss of light to this part of the canal which houses both wildlife and green space with accompanying natural foliage 2. The nature of the building design - both tall and hence blocking out the sunlight plus it is yet another 'concrete jungle' which is out of keeping with the historical nature of the canal itself 3. the residents in this area will have their light reduced by an estimated 30% of what it is today.

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2016/1117/P	richard jolley	8 Reachview Close Baynes St london nw1 0ty	08/04/2016 23:47:17	OBJ	<p>I have been a resident of Reachview Close, on the opposite side of Regents Canal to Bangor Wharf, for roughly 30 years. Location was and still is the main draw. For about half that time I have maintained and developed the gardens that look out over the Bangor Wharf area.</p> <p>One Housing"s proposition is for two swollen masses of brick and glass that show no respect for the location. The canal frontage, with its picturesque willow, its historic cobbled walkway and miniature bird reserve, looks set to be squeezed, shaded out and reduced to an irrelevance (see the "Proposed 3d View" of 18-02-2016). There is no suggestion they want to offer any facilities to canal users.</p> <p>The willow itself they wish to remove, despite it being placed in the second highest category [B], meaning "retention desirable", by their own advisors. It is easily viewed and touched from the Grays Inn bridge - this affords it additional amenity value - and it offers extensive opportunities for nesting birds and bats. It forms part of a chain of willows that punctuate this section of the canal.</p> <p>The plans do a matching disservice to the houses on Royal College St, many of whose bedroom windows will be badly overlooked, and of course to Eagle Wharf, a truly elegant survivor from the canal era. The opportunity to reinstate the old dock adjacent to Eagle Wharf has not been embraced.</p> <p>The buildings look set to be as high as they are wide, so casting significant shadow over the canal, canal towpath and many neighbouring buildings (including Reachview, Eagle Wharf, and the Royal College St terrace). The canalside nature reserve and Reachview"s own back garden will have their ecosystems put out of kilter.</p> <p>Pushing right up against every boundary, these proposed buildings at best appear functional. But why spoil a truly lovely location? Camden has over the years built up a reputation for innovative housing solutions. It would be great if we could have something of beauty for Bangor Wharf.</p>

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2016/1117/P	Jennifer Chan	5 Paradise Passage N7 8NT	08/04/2016 16:53:01	OBJ	<p>I write as a regular canal tow-path walker living in Islington.</p> <p>I am very concerned about this proposal, which will take away natural light from the area, because of the size and height of the proposed buildings, some of which will be twice the size of any existing buildings. Not only natural light will be lost but also the existing splendid views which make a walk along by the canal so attractive at present.</p> <p>Furthermore, access would be restricted because the proposed buildings are so close to the edge of the canal that the walkways would inevitably have to be made much narrower than at present.</p> <p>Not only would the buildings make this popular light and airy section of the canal much darker for walkers, but also there will be little natural light for wildlife and plants to thrive.</p> <p>I am also concerned that the proposals do not offer much in the way of affordable housing, let alone housing for anyone with mobility problems.</p> <p>Finally, as far as I can see from the plans, there is no provision to improve the use of the canal for boats.</p> <p>Please reconsider this proposal, which will render that stretch of the canal very unattractive and will decrease its use and value as a public amenity.</p>

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2016/1117/P	Beryl Windsor	6 Pear Tree Close Shirley SOLIHULL West Midlands B90 1LP	05/04/2016 16:42:00	OBJ	<p>BANGOR WHARF, CAMDEN. Objection to development</p> <p>As a boater with a home mooring at St Pancras Basin for 23 yrs, I would like to object to the proposed development of Bangor Wharf, Camden for the following reasons:</p> <p>The size and positioning of the proposed building will put the canal in the shade for a large part of the day robbing the water of light and putting local wildlife at risk. The reflective quality of light on water will also be lost. Homes on the opposite side of the canal will also be put in the shaddows.</p> <p>The towpath will also be in the shade and robbed of light. One of the benefits of the canal and towpath is that it encourages people to exercise, both walkers and runners can be seen daily, also cyclists. Sunlight is beneficial to us all and to deliberately block it out is an injustice.</p> <p>Similar developments have been allowed on the Regents Canal which has created rows of tall buildings close to the water's edge which block out the light and create a dark canyon as can be seen in the narrow streets of the City of London.</p> <p>To go on making the same mistakes, borough after borough, is a disaster.</p> <p>Please reconsider the plans.</p> <p>Beryl Windsor. 07973 504212 0121 244 8439</p>
2016/1117/P	Fred Wright	124a Royal College st Camden town Nw1 0Ta	07/04/2016 19:51:19	OBJ	<p>Noise and loss of privacy as we live directly opposite they will have a direct view into our garden and multiple rooms.</p> <p>Loss of sunlight. the plans I have seen look larger then the current building and will cut what light we do get.</p> <p>please consideration our objections when deciding the application</p> <p>Best Regards Fred Wright.</p>

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2016/1177/P	N Davidson	17 Eton Villas NW3 4SG	10/04/2016 00:53:10	COMMNT	The developer has had over 15 months to finalise plans for this development. Varying wording to conditions 5 and 11 suggest they are not in a position to commit to a final layout. These conditions were intended to ensure that the resident community would have an uncompromised design in place prior to demolition and therefore the wording should not be changed.
2016/1177/P	N Davidson	17 Eton Villas NW3 4SG	10/04/2016 00:53:32	COMMNT	
2016/1177/P	Ruth Fletcher	Flat 8 Wellington House 30 Eton Road London NW3 4SY	04/04/2016 18:12:29	COMMNT	I object to the Variation of Conditions Nos 5 and 11 (2013/7887/P). These original conditions required that these works have to be submitted in full before the site is cleared so that final full layout of the plans showing all the relevant details of the landscaping and more importantly the waste storage and removal of the effluent. We feel very strongly that this is a ploy for the Synagogue to get all what they want without any consideration for the planning laws that should govern all developments that affect their neighbours and our environment. The past performance of the Synagogue Board has led us to believe that submitting these works after the actual existing building has been demolished will put them in a superior bargaining position against the Council's planning authority.