

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2016/1479/P	Bandery Khalid (18 Chester Terrace)	18 Chester Terrace NW1 4ND Regents Park ,London. U.K	14/06/2016 16:33:19	OBJ	<p>We strongly object in as much as we strongly believe that the proposed "Private Garden" will subject us to serious Safety, Environment, and Transportation risks and problems some which are as follows:</p> <p>1- If Chester Gate is reduced to one lane it will certainly create traffic gridlock and as a result we will: a) Have great difficulty exiting the Chester terrace onto Chester Gate. b) Be experiencing huge delays in journey times due to gridlocked traffic.</p> <p>2- Safety will be in danger and may lost and will be a major concern mainly for cyclists if Chester Gate is narrowed to single lane.</p> <p>3) Many Parking spaces will be lost for the residents of Cambridge Terrace and Chester Terrace.</p> <p>4) We as the residents of Chester Terrace (and believe all other neighbors) have always been using the exit into a 2 lane Chester Gate as an integral right of our leasehold for more than a century.</p> <p>5) The creation of traffic gridlocked Chester Gate will undoubtedly substantially increase the level of air pollution in the surrounding area to the detriment of residents of Chester Terrace, Cambridge Terrace and Chester Gate as well as the cyclists and pedestrians. It will further increase the level of disturbing noises and cause annoying acoustics in the surrounding area.</p> <p>6)The use and claim of the "historic reinstatement" justification by the applicant is not accurate and as there was no garden in Chester Gate in the lifetime of John Nash and there was no cars, lorries or vans in existence in the Nineteenth Century.</p> <p>7)There is NO public benefit to the community by the creation of a "Private Garden"and reducing public highway to a gridlocked single lane. The only one who will benefit personally & financially is the applicant while the rest of neighbors will lose financially and get all negative impacts and inconvenience.</p>

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2016/1479/P	Niall Curran & Susan Reid	3b Chester Gate	14/06/2016 09:39:04	OBJNOT	Dear Ms Phillips

We strongly oppose this application on the grounds that it is misleading and factually incorrect on several important points.

1. The covering letter (bottom of page 3) states that there will be “no loss of permit holder space” for resident parking. This is not true. The application document states there will be a reduction from 12 spaces to 7 spaces on Chester Gate, but the transport statement states that the existing 12 parking spaces on Chester Gate will be reduced to 4 or 5 (which is consistent with the proposed site plan). Any decision to allow Chester Gate residents permits to park on adjacent streets would be determined by the Crown Estate Paving Commission and Max Jack of the CEPC has confirmed to us that there is no plan to reallocate the lost spaces. Therefore, the parking provision for Chester Gate residents will be reduced from 12 parking spaces to 4 or 5 if planning consent is granted, which is a loss of 7 or 8 permit holder spaces to existing residents.

The covering letter (page 4) goes on to state that the planning application complies with Policy DP18 of the Development Policies but omits to consider Policy DP19 on “Managing the impact on parking”, which requires that the removal of parking spaces should not “cause difficulties for existing users, [including] nearby residents”. The loss of permit holder space evidently will cause difficulty for existing residents of Chester Gate. If the CEPC does decide to reallocate spaces then this is an issue that affects all our neighbours.

2. The transport statement relies on parking data compiled while the construction hoardings have been in place for the redevelopment of 6-10 Cambridge Terrace, which has reduced the available parking spaces on Chester Gate and so the data relating to “unoccupied spaces” is misleading and irrelevant.

More specifically, like some other residents, we were not resident on the dates cited in the transport statement and so the assessment of parking spaces needed does not reflect ongoing needs for resident parking spaces.

3. The transport statement does not address safety concerns for cyclists and pedestrians arising from the narrowing of Chester Gate to a single lane, which will bring them into much closer proximity to moving and parked vehicles. Certainly the proposal does not meet Camden’s aim for its road hierarchy in DP21 “to improve conditions for pedestrians and cyclists”.

Narrowing Chester Gate will make turning out from Chester Terrace and Cambridge Mews much more difficult and hazardous and the application drawings show that this will be very tight indeed (see transport statement swept path analysis – 9m refuse vehicle). Large vehicles will also have difficulty exiting a narrower Chester Gate with resulting hazards to cyclists turning into or indeed already on the Outer Circle. These drawings also take no account of cars parked on Chester Gate and surrounding streets, which will further restrict access and turning space.

4. The situation for cyclists also needs to be addressed in conjunction with Transport for London’s proposal for Cycle Superhighway 11, as indeed does the overall issue of traffic and congestion. The proposal to keep Chester Gate as one of only four of the eight Gates open to traffic in Regents Park

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

Comment: **Response:**

would inevitably bring more traffic through Chester Gate, increasing congestion, pollution and hazards for cyclists if the road width were to be restricted to a single lane.

5. The transport statement states that HS2 is not a material consideration for this application, but there is no detail to support this sweeping assumption. Currently, it would seem difficult to predict the impact of HS2 works, but the disruption to neighbouring Albany Street is likely to be significant and no doubt Chester Gate will be impacted, with more traffic routing through to avoid Albany Street. Any narrowing of Chester Gate at such a time will only add to pollution and congestion, which is contrary to Camden Council's stated objective to "protect the lives and livelihoods of residents during the HS2 construction".

6. The creation of traffic gridlock by the narrowing of Chester Gate will substantially increase air pollution levels to the detriment of cyclists, pedestrians and residents in Chester Gate and Chester Terrace. This effect would contravene Camden's Policy DP22 relating to "Promoting sustainable design and construction by reducing air pollution" and also the Mayor of London's Air Quality Strategy.

7. The application has been represented as the "reinstatement of a historic garden", but there is no evidence that any such garden has ever existed in Chester Gate, which is a longstanding right of way. Moreover, there is no precedent for a large private garden in the vicinity of Regents Park, which is a beautiful and public environment. This proposal is actually for the redevelopment of Chester Gate for purely private benefit, a fact that is not transparent from the proposal documentation and which is material to the consultation process. The proposal presents no public benefit and instead reduces what has always been a public right way of way, causing inconvenience to residents' parking and access and to a much wider public, who cycle, walk or drive through Chester Gate, Albany Street and the Outer Cycle.

Yours sincerely
Niall Curran and Susan Reid
3b Chester Gate
