



Dear Sirs,

I would like to object to the above proposal and would ask for the planning application to be refused.

I have a number of concerns.

First, the application's assumptions on the traffic impact take no account of two major forthcoming changes to traffic on Albany Street; the introduction of the Cycle Super Highway and the proposed routes for construction traffic for HS2.

Both of these will have a marked impact in increasing traffic onto Albany Street. Any move that reduces a current two lane road to single lane will impact on this creating a bottleneck as people transfer from Albany Street to the Outer Circle.

My second concern is about the loss of current public space and it being given over to a private user. Despite the applicants' claims that they are in some way doing a public service by re-instating an Historic garden, they are acquiring land that the public currently have a right of access to and giving it to those who own 6-10 Cambridge Terrace. The garden will be entirely private with no public right of way. There is therefore no public benefit to this application.

My third objection is to the application itself and its handling. The submissions summarising the consultation that took place gloss over the key fact that, throughout their colourful brochures and hoardings they did not mention that the 'historic garden' would be private property and that a public right of way would be removed. The implication, unless you investigated closely, was that this application was in some way giving the public something back rather than taking away a public right of way.

Likewise, it was only at the end of the consultation that a few of the consultation materials were amended to make clear that, despite how it had been presented, the Crown Estate was not in favour of this proposal. Things that were said at the consultation meetings and which were reflected in the pre-amended website implied that the Crown Estate were in support of the application. For example at the consultation meeting, Mr Tim Simpson (a representative of the Candy's) said that the idea was the CEPC's and had their backing.

I genuinely believe that, if these two facts had been explicit from day one, there would have been stronger objection to the proposal. Indeed their failure to quantify the level of support in the consultation suggests that opposition may have outweighed support in the consultation as was.

My final objection to this proposal is that it will create a genuine safety risk for cars and pedestrians through the narrowing of the public right of way. Cars parked in the garages under Albany St that need to exit onto Chester Gate (as I do) will have even less view than they do now and what is already a very narrow stretch of road will lose a significant amount of its sight and space. We also risk being caught up in queues and delays to access the Outer Circle, a route I have no choice but to use.

Please do not hesitate to contact me if you require any further information.

Thank you

**Alison Crosland**

