

## Dike, Darlene

---

**From:** Michael Webber [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** 05 September 2016 14:14  
**To:** Planning  
**Subject:** September 8th Planning Meeting - Planning Applications 1479/P & 1776/L

**Importance:** High

Dear Sirs

As a result of Camden's review of the two planning applications above I would like to make the following written submission opposing the applications to the Planning Committee to reflect the new information.

Would be grateful if you would kindly email confirmation of receipt & confirm that this email will be given to the Committee Members for their consideration – many thanks

Yours sincerely

Michael Webber

Under the heading of 'Traffic Consequences of these Planning Applications I would like to draw the Committee's attention to the fact that no consideration has been given by the applicant to the impact of CS11 which will create considerably increased traffic down Albany Street & because 4 gates into Regents Park are going to be closed 20 hours a day for 7 days a week there will be a material increase in traffic through Chester Gate. In fact TfL have not yet undertaken traffic modelling on this matter. There will be traffic gridlock & chaos created if Chester Gate becomes a single lane. Section 70 (2) of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 requires Camden to have regard to the 'provisions of the development plan, so far as it is material to the application, and to any other material considerations' & I believe CS11 falls squarely into this category

Under the same heading of Traffic Consequences the impact of HS2 will dramatically increase traffic down Albany Street for 16 years. Camden has already & separately expressed their concerns about HS2 & its impact on traffic.

**Allied to the CS11 traffic impact it is requested that a decision on these planning applications is postponed until the full impact of CS11 & HS2 on traffic in Albany Street & Chester Gate is known.**

Heritage Reinstatement - Dr Tyack has submitted his report to the committee & he is the leading John Nash authority in the UK. He has stated, unambiguously, that the applicant's argument regarding re-instatement does not stand up to any independent, academic scrutiny. It is surprising that, despite Dr Tyack's submission, Camden states 'Whilst the proposal may not exactly follow Nash's plan, it is considered to be generally in keeping with the original plan for the area and the wider aims of the CEPC'. It would be understandably improper if the private & separate aims of the CEPC are considered part of this planning application. The Camden statement fundamentally undermines the core justification of the applicant's 'reinstatement' claim. The CEPC's submission that "the original garden area did exist from quite early on in the development of Regent's Park" is contradicted by the detailed illustrations by Shepherd and Morris, which clearly show that it did not exist before Nash's retirement. Why is this unequivocal evidence from an expert ignored by Camden? Furthermore the detailed rates survey plan shows that, even when the 'historic' garden existed, the junction of Chester Gate with the Outer Circle was 30 feet wide with a two-lane intersection. Therefore how can the proposed single lane of traffic be considered by Camden to be a reinstatement? There was a double width carriageway even when a garden did exist for a very limited period of time. **The evidence conclusively shows that a garden did not exist in the working life of John Nash & that he never designed a garden in Chester Gate – the reinstatement claim of the applicant is therefore fundamentally invalid.** The garden was removed more than 140 years ago because of the need, for a wider public thoroughfare & this was even before the arrival of motor vehicles & huge lorries. This need for a wide thoroughfare is even more acute in 2016.

Another objection is the **severe & significant Health & Safety Risk to Pedestrians & Cyclists** that would directly follow by making Chester Gate into a single lane. The planning application does not meet Camden's aim for its road hierarchy in Camden Development Policies 2010 DP17 (Paragraph 17.4 & 17.5) & DP21 "to improve conditions for pedestrians and cyclists" (Paragraph 21.4).

The Loss of Car Parking Spaces is a further consideration for the Committee. The applicant states (covering letter - bottom of page 3) that there will be "no loss of permit holder space" for resident parking, but this is simply not true. The applicant's transport statement contradicts this assertion & states that the existing 12 parking spaces on Chester Gate will be reduced to 4 or 5. The applicant's 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 car parking spaces will create considerable difficulty for existing residents of Chester Gate, Cambridge Terrace Mews & Chester Terrace.** The applicant claims that having 4 spaces in the Chester Gate roadway is viable but bearing in mind the narrowness of the proposed roadway this is highly questionable. The suggested arrangements by the applicant for car parking spaces are contradictory, confused and unconvincing. How can private arrangements to provide car parking spaces in Cambridge Terrace Mews be taken to satisfy the expectation that the number of publicly-owned residents' parking spaces should not be reduced? What will be the legal status of this private arrangement? Could it immediately be revoked by the next owner of Cambridge Terrace?

The last issue I would like to raise is that the creation of a traffic gridlocked Chester Gate will **substantially increase the levels of Air Pollution** in the surrounding area to the detriment of cyclists, pedestrians & residents in Chester Gate & Chester Terrace. This effect would contravene Camden's Policy DP22 relating to Promoting sustainable design & construction by reducing air pollution & also the Mayor of London's Air Quality Strategy. Please note that the increased pollution will not only affect persons living in or near to Chester Gate or Albany Street but the building fabric will also be endangered. As it is, the Grade 2 listed buildings become filthy soon after they are repainted and the soot and grime, including from car pollution, would be detrimental to these heritage buildings.

In conclusion it must be clear to the Planning Committee that the motivation of the applicant is not to increase the heritage value of Regent's Park, but solely to increase the luxury and privilege of his private home.

There is also the question of who will actually occupy the building, and for what fraction of the year. Would Camden really be happy to see such a significant restriction of such an important and well-used public route into Regent's Park in order just to create a garden that is rarely, if ever, used? Would Nash have been happy with that? The private gardens that he did design were intended to be used and enjoyed by the owners of the Terraces. The Guardian article of 20th October, 2014 states that the Candy brothers declined to answer any questions by the Guardian, including whether Christian Candy, the applicant, intended to live in the property following the refurbishment.

**These two applications, before the Committee, are only about adding value and profit for the benefit of the planning applicant, at the expense of, & the health & safety of, many thousands of ordinary members of the public, who use Chester Gate & Regents Park.**