

**CHESTER GATE GARDEN APPLICATION REFS. 2016/1479/P & 2016/1776/L
RESPONSES TO COMMENTS RECEIVED
1 JULY 2016**

NO.	DATE	NAME / ADDRESS	COMMENT	RESPONSE
1	13 May 2016	Lord Heywood-Clarke / Chester Gate	As a resident of Chester Gate I do strongly object to this application. My reasons are that parking facilities have been reduced to a minimum and we do not need a garden as we have the beautiful Regents Park itself. Therefore the garden is totally unnecessary and should be rejected.	This comment is addressed comprehensively by: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Chester Gate Garden – Transport Response prepared by Caneparo Associates; and • Comments on Heritage Matters Letter dated 1 July 2016 prepared by Montagu Evans.
2	13 May 2016	Dr Ian Owen / Nash House, 3 Chester Terrace	<p>I am the leaseholder and resident of Nash House, 3 Chester Terrace. Curiously, our property actually faces Chester Gate and is significantly impacted by this proposal. Our comments are:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. We are in favour of the garden reinstatement in principle. The proposed garden will greatly enhance the outlook from our property. 2. The parking survey is flawed. Our property is allocated 2 parking permits and by arrangement with CEPC we park on Chester Gate outside our front door. The report fails to capture this. Moreover, our property was unoccupied during the entire period covered by the survey whilst major refurbishment works were undertaken to the property. Now that we are resident, we often struggle to find parking on Chester Gate with the current number of parking spaces, let alone a reduced number. 3. Whilst we support the garden reinstatement in principle, we remain concerned by the way that Chester Gate is used as a "rat run" and would request that particular attention is paid to implementing further traffic restriction measures. <p>In summary, we would be happy to support this application provided our requirement for two parking places on Chester Gate immediately outside our front door is properly addressed and that further consideration is given</p>	Please refer to Paragraph 8 and 9 of the Chester Gate Garden – Transport Response which addresses this comment.

			to more traffic restrictions.	
3	23 May 2016	7 Chester Terrace	<p>As long-time residents of Chester Terrace, my husband and I would like to register strong opposition to the plans for the garden in front of Mr Candy's property on the corner of Chester Gate and Cambridge Terrace.</p> <p>Mr Candy's building works already encroach on the roadway in Chester Gate causing back-ups in the traffic. This will become a permanent feature unless the full width of the roadway and pavement are re-instated. There will be a constant line of traffic sitting in Chester Gate, and queuing back from Albany street, waiting to turn left or right onto the Outer Circle. This is likely to be exacerbated for the next 15 years by the planned road closures for HS2 and the ill-considered cycleway proposals.</p> <p>The amount of footage seized by Mr Candy is negligible in relation to the benefit of keeping the traffic from building up in Chester Gate and safeguarding pedestrians from danger when crossing the road. The plants in his garden will also thank him for returning to the status quo.</p>	Please refer to Paragraph 6 of the Chester Gate Garden – Transport Response which addresses this comment.
4	23 May 2016	J McLaren / 30 Chester Court, Albany St	<p>I have four concerns that I hope will be considered and lead to this application being refused.</p> <p>Firstly, 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.</p> <p>Both of these will have a marked impact in increasing traffic onto Albany St. Any move therefore that reduces a current two way highway to single lane will impact on this creating an even bigger bottleneck that would occur under the existing conditions.</p> <p>My second concern is about the loss of current public space and it being given over to a private user.</p>	<p>Please refer to Paragraphs 18 & 21 of the Chester Gate Garden – Transport Response which addresses this comment.</p> <p>Please refer to Paragraph 5 of the Chester Gate Garden – Transport Response which addresses this comment.</p>

Despite the applicants' claims that they are in some way doing a public service by re-instating an Historic garden, all they are actually doing is taking land that the public currently have a right of access to and given 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 the handling of it by those employed by the applicant. Their submissions summarising the consultation that took place gloss over the key fact that, throughout their colourful brochures and hoardings they forgot to mention that the "historic garden" would be private property and that a public right of way would be removed. Hence, the casual observer would summarise 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 even more 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 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.

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

The public benefits provided by the proposed development are:

- The proposals will enhance the visual amenity of both adjacent residential occupiers and members of the public;
- The proposals will restore / complete Nash's original plans for Cambridge Terrace;
- The proposals will result in a significant enhancement to the character and appearance of the Regents Park Conservation Area and setting of the Grade I listed Cambridge Terrace and nearby terraces as well as the Grade I Registered Regent's Park;
- The proposals will provide private amenity space for a family dwelling which will exceed London Plan and LB Camden requirements;
- The proposed planting and landscaping is appropriate to the character of the area;
- The proposals will enhance the biodiversity and wildlife habitat across the Site;
- The proposals will introduce permeable surfaces which will assist with surface water drainage; and
- The proposed reduction in lanes at the junction of Chester Gate and the Outer circle will remove the hazard of two vehicles waiting at the stop line side by side and potentially impairing each other's sight lines.

5	26 May 2016	Dr Wayne Phillips / 2 Chester Terrace	I am very concerned about driving out from Chester Terrace btr narrowed roadway could cause accidents with vehicles from Albany St especially if TfL close other entrances to the park.	Please refer to Paragraph 17 of the Chester Gate Garden – Transport Response which addresses this comment.
6	31 May 2016	Gaudio / 36-37 Chester Terrace	This will significantly impact on traffic flow out of Chester Gate. Having only one lane of traffic exiting Chester Gate will therefore impact on exiting Chester Terrace.	Please refer to Paragraphs 4-7 of the Chester Gate Garden – Transport Response which addresses this comment.
7	31 May 2016	S A Berman / 1 Cambridge Terrace	On behalf of the residents of Cambridge Terrace. We have no formal objection to the proposals provided that the reinstatement of the gardens fronting Cambridge Terrace are strictly in accordance with our wishes.	
8	4 June 2016	Chester Close South Residents Company Ltd	I am writing on behalf of the Board of Directors of Chester Close South Residents' Company Ltd, which is owned exclusively by the lessees of the 33 flats comprising Chester Close South. The company holds a long term head lease from the Crown Estate. As you will be aware Chester Close South has direct access from the southern end of the Close into Chester Gate. We object to the proposals for the following reasons: 1. The narrowing of Chester Gate, with the inadequate sightlines, will exacerbate the hazards involved when vehicles exit onto the Outer Circle, particularly when turning right. 2. The proposals will increase the hazard and restricted difficulty of movement for vehicles turning right out of Chester Terrace into Chester Gate. 3. The proposals will result in delay to vehicles safely exiting at the	Please refer to Paragraph 16 of the Chester Gate Garden – Transport Response which addresses this comment. Please refer to Paragraph 11 of the Chester Gate Garden – Transport Response which addresses this comment.

			<p>junction with the Outer circle, will cause congestion along the length of Chester Gate, backing up into Albany St.</p> <p>4. The proposals will increase congestion in Chester Gate resulting in excessive increased pollution and noise.</p> <p>5. The proposals are immature as the impact cannot be determined prior to a decision on the TfL proposals for the Cycle Super Highway.</p> <p>6. The proposal is immature as the impact cannot be determined prior to a realistic assessment is made of the implications of vehicle movements generated by works in connection with the HS2 project which are currently planned to involve Rovert st and Albany St.</p>	<p>Please refer to Paragraph 5 and 6 of the Chester Gate Garden – Transport Response which addresses this comment.</p> <p>Please refer to Paragraphs 18 & 21 of the Chester Gate Garden – Transport Response which addresses this comment.</p>
9	4 June 2016	Richard Simpson for Regent's Park CAAC	<p>1. The Advisory Committee noted that, despite claims to an extensive local consultation, the RPCAAC had not been approached for pre-application consultation on this application.</p> <p>2. The Advisory Committee agreed that the main issues in considering this application were</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> (1) the privatization of public space in Chester Gate (2) the duty of the LPA to seek to preserve or enhance the character and appearance of the conservation area (3) in those terms the impact of the application on the setting of the surrounding Listed Buildings (4) similarly, the impact of the application on the Historic Park, and (5) the impact on the character and appearance of the conservation area. <p>3. On the privatization of public space in Chester Gate the Advisory Committee would object on principle to the loss of public space to private use. The reduction of publicly accessible space is too often a characteristic of current development and diminishes the citizen's sense of place: the sense of enhancing accessible space is one of the historic characteristics of Regent's Park, and of its significance. We understand from the application that the proposal is for the privatized space to be inaccessible to both public and other residents of the terrace: this we see as harmful to the historic significance of the Park, and of the character and</p>	<p>It is our view that the ownership of the Site is not a planning consideration.</p>

			<p>appearance of the conservation area. We advise that any proposed garden should be accessible on the same basis as the other shared terrace gardens in the Park, and should be managed by the CEPC. This would preserve that aspect of the character and appearance of the conservation area.</p> <p>4. We do not object to the narrowing of Chester Gate to motor vehicles in the context of wider traffic calming proposals under active consideration by the RPA. This narrowing should be part of a 20 mph zone for the Park roads.</p> <p>5. The proposed landscape scheme for the gardens is an opportunity to re-create the picturesque landscape which was fundamental to the larger concept of Regent's Park. This the present proposals notably fail to do. The proposed enclosure of the garden by a boundary hedge would block views into the garden from the outside – this is directly contrary to the principles of Picturesque planting which used planting in 'clumps' to allow views, sometimes glimpses, through the landscape, with informal, natural, planted forms rather than the sterility and artificiality of the clipped yew hedge as proposed. We note that the historic forms are clear from the Mayhew Survey of 1834-35, which the applicants have chosen to go against. The current proposals for the landscape would harm the character and appearance of the conservation area, and the setting of the Listed Buildings by creating a false and misleading landscape which harms the significance of the relationship between planted landscape and buildings which is fundamental to Regent's Park.</p> <p>The Advisory Committee confirms its objection to the current proposals, but would also be happy to advise on revisions which addressed our objections.</p>	<p>Please refer to Paragraphs 1.2 and 1.3 of Comments on Heritage Matters Letter dated 23 June 2016 prepared by Montagu Evans which addresses this comment.</p>
10	7 June 2016	Paul Faiman / 19 Chester Terrace	<p>The proposed works will narrow the roadway in Chester Gate. Currently traffic flowing through this road does not block the exit from Chester Gate.</p> <p>There are delays exiting Chester Gate however, only in "rush hours". A permanent narrowing will make exiting Chester Terrace difficult much more often. This situation will be greatly aggravated if any of the other</p>	<p>Please refer to Paragraph 6 of the Chester Gate Garden – Transport Response which addresses this comment.</p>

			<p>gates in Regents Park are closed as proposed. Traffic flow through Chester Gate may increase ten fold.</p> <p>Furthermore vans leaving Chester Terrace will have great difficulty turning around a tight right hand corner. Currently only long vehicles have difficulty. Today a van delivering chairs to our house could not get into the terrace due to parked vehicles on the north end of Chester Terrace. Therefore the driver parked in Chester Gate and walked the goods to our house. If the road is narrowed it would not have been possible to unload the van in Chester Gate. Scaffolding vehicles reverse up the Terrace from Chester Gate as the northern end is too narrow. for access. They require the full width of the present Chester Gate to gain entry to the Terrace as would a FIRE ENGINE or any other RESCUE VEHICLE.</p> <p>It would be a very dangerous and retrograde step to narrow Chester Gate. I understand the proposal is to reinstate a possibly fictitious historical garden from a time when we all travelled by horse and Range Rovers or SUVs did not exist. However in reality, it is to facilitate the formation of a private garden for substantial individual in Cambridge Terrace. To allow this to proceed ignoring the needs of and putting at risk the many tenants in Chester Terrace is totally unthinkable.</p>	<p>Please refer to Paragraph 11 of the Chester Gate Garden – Transport Response which addresses this comment.</p>
11	10 June 2016	Susan Fleming / 5 Colosseum Terrace	<p>From all that I have read and heard, this is an unwise application from many points of view. I hope that the Council will turn it down.</p>	
12	12 June 2016	Professor Colin Blakemore / 55B Albany St	<p>Objection enclosed</p>	<p>This comment is addressed comprehensively by:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Chester Gate Garden – Transport Response prepared by Caneparo Associates; and • Comments on Heritage Matters Letter dated 1 July 2016 prepared by Montagu Evans.
13	12 June 2016	Julian and Catherine Milner / 65C Albany St	<p>As residents of 65C Albany St, we object strongly to this planning application. The creation of the garden will be a disaster for the area as it will significantly narrow the public highway of Chester Gate, causing increased congestion in an area already suffering from excessive traffic.</p>	<p>Please refer to Paragraphs 5, 6, 7, 11, 13 and 15 of the Chester Gate Garden – Transport Response which addresses this comment.</p>

	N/A	Additional Objection from Julian and Catherine Milner	<p>Road users on Albany St will find it harder to enter Chester gate, traffic would consequently back-up down Albany Street, air pollution and noise would rise, and maneuvering of vehicles (including those of the Council itself) would become hazardous and dangerous, and would potentially cause serious harm especially to the thousands of pedestrians, cyclists and joggers who use Chester Gate on a daily basis.</p> <p>Rarely has a single scheme been presented to you that offers absolutely no benefit for the general community and residents whilst bringing enjoyment only to one self interested household. It should be rejected.</p> <p>As residents of Albany St, we are deeply disturbed by the Candy Application to significantly narrow the public highway of Chester Gate in order to create a private garden. It is quite astounding that the safety of the public will be severely compromised by this proposal, which will benefit just one household. May we point out that traffic will find it virtually impossible to turn right from Chester Gate onto the Outer Ring, especially for larger and emergency vehicles, since the consequential removal of the left hand lane will mean that traffic will unable to turn right as there is a large pedestrian island in the way. This pedestrian island itself exists as a safety measure for joggers, cyclists, pedestrians etc in order to cross the busy road.</p> <p>The many thousands of people (no exaggeration) that use Chester Gate to access either the Park or the Outer Ring will be put at even greater risk if this narrowing of the PUBLIC HIGHWAY goes ahead. We shudder also to think about the build up of traffic, with all the additional congestion and pollution that this will entail.</p>	
14	12 June 2016	Mrs A Gouws / 24 Chester Terrace	<p>Our objections are:</p> <p>The park is planning two main projects at the moment:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - super cycle highway - reinstating of gardens at Chester Gate. <p>If both theses go ahead we will have problems with traffic and around the Chester Terrace area. Chester Terrace will be used as a 'cut through'. It is</p>	Please refer to Paragraph 5 of the Chester Gate Garden – Transport Response which addresses

			<p>impossible to agree on both changes and therefore we strongly object to any changes at Chester Gate.</p> <p>I have read all further documentations and objections and we fully support them.</p>	<p>this comment.</p>
15	14 June 2016	Bandery Khalid / 18 Chester Terrace	<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:</p> <p>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 neighbours) 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>Please refer to Paragraphs 5, 6, 7 and 10 of the Chester Gate Garden – Transport Response which addresses this comment.</p> <p>Please refer to Comments on Heritage Matters Letter dated 23 June 2016 prepared by Montagu Evans which address this comment.</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 neighbours will lose financially and get all negative impacts and inconvenience.</p>	<p>The significant public benefits of the proposals have been set out in response to comment No. 4.</p>
16	14 June 2016	Niall Curran & Susan Reid / 3b Chester Gate	<p>We strongly oppose this application on the grounds that it is misleading and factually incorrect on several important points.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>If the CEPC does decide to reallocate spaces then this is an issue that affects all our neighbours.</p> <p>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.</p>	<p>Please refer to Paragraph 10 of the Chester Gate Garden – Transport Response which addresses this comment.</p> <p>Please refer to Paragraph 8 of the Chester Gate Garden – Transport Response which addresses this comment.</p>

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 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".

Please refer to Paragraphs 11-14 of the Chester Gate Garden – Transport Response which addresses this comment.

Please refer to Paragraphs 20, 21 and 24 of the Chester Gate Garden – Transport Response which addresses this comment.

Please refer to Paragraph 21 of the Chester Gate Garden – Transport Response which addresses this comment.

			<p>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.</p> <p>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.</p>	<p>Please refer to Paragraph 7 of the Chester Gate Garden – Transport Response which addresses this comment.</p> <p>Please refer to Comments on Heritage Matters Letter dated 23 June 2016 prepared by Montagu Evans which address this comment.</p>
17	15 June 2016	Stephen Warren & Ros Oakley / 59A Albany Street	See enclosed objection.	<p>This comment is addressed comprehensively by:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Chester Gate Garden – Transport Response prepared by Caneparo Associates; and • Comments on Heritage Matters Letter dated 23 June 2016 prepared by Montagu Evans.
18	17 June 2016	Killiane Limited / 1 Cambridge Gate	<p>We are very much against this proposal as:</p> <p>it would reduce the already limited parking options available for residents;</p> <p>the garden is completely unnecessary as the property is right next to Regent's Park so the disadvantages that would result for residents completely outweigh the benefit of a new garden;</p> <p>the road lanes will be reduced meaning even more traffic congestion thus</p>	<p>The public benefits of the proposals are set out in response to comment No.4.</p> <p>Please refer to Paragraph 7 of the Chester Gate</p>

			<p>more disturbances to residents in the area;</p> <p>the traffic will inevitably move into surrounding areas thus posing even further congestion in areas which already suffer from increased traffic.</p>	Garden – Transport Response which addresses this comment.
19	20 June 2016	R & E Marcuson / 67A&B Albany Street	See enclosed objection.	This comment is addressed comprehensively by the Chester Gate Garden – Transport Response prepared by Caneparo Associates.
20	N/A	E.G. Embiricos / 32 Chester Terrace	<p>I am writing to oppose the planning application for Chester Gate Garden, which would result in Chester Gate becoming a single lane road.</p> <p>Chester Gate is already significantly congested with traffic. Turning Chester Gate into a single lane road will adversely affect the existing condition.</p> <p>Furthermore, the proposal to close Regent Park gates, for much of the day, will mean that Chester Gate will serve one of the main access routes to the Outer Circle both for the residents of Regent’s Park and for service providers. This is not consistent with a proposals that will result in Chester Gate becoming a single lane road and would result in unacceptable congestion.</p>	Please refer to Paragraphs 5 and 7 of the Chester Gate Garden – Transport Response which addresses this comment.
21	N/A	Kevin McKenzie / 83B Albany St	<p>I am the leaseholder of 83b Albany St which is my home.</p> <p>The bedroom of my property directly overlooks Chester Gate. I am particularly concerned about the issue of traffic noise and pollution which would be involved by the significant narrowing of the road which Chester Gate comprises which would necessarily be entailed by this planning application.</p> <p>I wish also to second the wider objection as made by Professor Colin Blakemore and the Chester Terrace Residents Association.</p> <p>I can see no possible amenity or advantage to the local residents which this proposed planning application would provide. It appears to be motivated purely by the desire to increase the value of the small number</p>	<p>The public benefits of the proposals are set out in response to comment No.4.</p> <p>This comment is addressed comprehensively by:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Chester Gate Garden – Transport Response prepared by Caneparo Associates; and • Comments on Heritage Matters Letter dated 1 July 2016 prepared by Montagu Evans.

			of private properties which will be able to use this intended private garden. I see no reason why this garden should not be designed in a manner whereby the existing roadway is not impacted at all – in other words, whereby the garden does not encroach on the existing roadway.	
22	N/A 16 June 2016	Dr Geoffrey Tyack Dr Geoffrey Tyack	See enclosed report. See enclosed comment.	Please refer to the Comments on Heritage Matters Letter dated 23 June 2016 prepared by Montagu Evans which comprehensively address the report and the accompanying comments.
23	8 June 2016	Motion Transport Consultants	See enclosed statement.	This is addressed comprehensively by the Chester Gate Garden – Transport Response prepared by Caneparo Associates.
24	19 June 2016	M Francesca Corderio / 35 Chester Terrace	See enclosed objection.	This comment is addressed comprehensively by: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Chester Gate Garden – Transport Response prepared by Caneparo Associates; and • Comments on Heritage Matters Letter dated 23 June 2016 prepared by Montagu Evans. <p>The public benefits of the proposals are set out in response to comment No.4.</p>
25	16 June 2016	Max Jack / Crown Estate Paving Commission	See enclosed comment.	We note that the CEPC has not objected to the proposals and it's acknowledgement that the proposals, <i>'offer a unique and welcome opportunity for the park in terms of increased heritage value'</i> . The remainder of the comments within CEPCs response are comprehensively addressed by: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Chester Gate Garden – Transport Response prepared by Caneparo Associates; and • Comments on Heritage Matters Letter dated 1 July 2016 prepared by Montagu Evans.

26	16 June 2016	Michael Webber / 9 Chester Terrace	See enclosed objection.	<p>This comment is addressed comprehensively by:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Chester Gate Garden – Transport Response prepared by Caneparo Associates; and • Comments on Heritage Matters Letter dated 23 June 2016 prepared by Montagu Evans.
27	N/A	Carolyn Goldhill / 12 Ulster Terrace	<p>I am a resident of Regents Park and am writing to strongly object to the proposal in planning application no 2016/1479 to reduce the width of the road in Cambridge Gate in order to provide a large private garden for a private residence.</p> <p>I frequently use Cambridge Gate as I walk or cycle to my office in Albany Street. The reduction of the width of the road would cause much worse traffic congestion in this area as Cambridge Gate is frequently used as an important link into the park – including between midnight and 7.00am when residents can only use this entrance or Hanover Gate to access their properties. I believe that the narrowing of the road to a single lane could cause a build up of traffic into Albany Street at rush hours as cars attempt to gain access. This would make it extremely difficult for pedestrians and cyclists to get through this area safely.</p> <p>Furthermore I understand that valuable parking spaces will be permanently removed, to the detriment of other residents and that the CEPC have confirmed they will not be allocating alternative spaces.</p> <p>Thinking ahead, with the advent of HS2 and Cycling Superhighway, this junction will become even more important and to restrict it by narrowing it to one lane will cause extreme disruption in the area, affecting pollution levels and thereby the safety of park users in general.</p> <p>I fail to understand why Camden is even considering a proposal such as this which is designed to benefit one person only – purely for their</p>	<p>Please refer to Paragraphs 4, 5, 6, 7, 22 and 23 of the Chester Gate Garden – Transport Response which addresses this comment.</p>

			<p>financial gain.</p> <p>Please take into account my objections when considering this application.</p>	
28		D & R Koetser / Chester Gate	<p>We object to the introduction of the garden into Chester Gate for the following reasons:</p> <p>POLLUTION ACCESS TRAFFIC FLOW PARKING</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Due to the narrow throughway which is proposed considerable pollution from backed-up vehicles will create higher levels of trapped fumes. - The subsequent traffic will make access to and from homes and garages in Cambridge Terrace Mews and Chester Terrace highly restricted at peak times, making taxi/ passenger pick-ups to stations, airports, appointments, theatres, cinemas and schools almost impossible, causing enormous inconvenience for both able and disabled residents. - Already seen during construction the traffic does not flow as smoothly as previously and large vehicles reduce manoevrability making more dangerous the passage of families with children walking from Albany street into the Park. - reducing parking places will affect not only those with Permits but also Visitors to residents. 	<p>Please refer to Paragraphs 4-7 of the Chester Gate Garden – Transport Response which addresses this comment.</p>
29	N/A	S & N Von Daehne / 33 Chester Terrace N Von Daehne	<p>See enclosed objection.</p> <p>See enclosed objection.</p>	<p>This comment is addressed comprehensively by:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Chester Gate Garden – Transport Response prepared by Caneparo Associates; and • Comments on Heritage Matters Letter dated 23 June 2016 prepared by Montagu Evans.

30	N/A	Mr & Mrs Deanfield	See enclosed objection.	This comment is addressed comprehensively by: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Chester Gate Garden – Transport Response prepared by Caneparo Associates; and • Comments on Heritage Matters Letter dated 23 June 2016 prepared by Montagu Evans.
31	20 June 2016	Mildred Kieve / 71A Albany Street	See enclosed objection.	This is addressed comprehensively by the Chester Gate Garden – Transport Response prepared by Caneparo Associates.
32	N/A	Christopher Sim / 3E Chester Gate	I am in agreement with all my neighbours to have voiced their objection to Planning Application 2016/1479P for all the reasons which they have described to you already. If you wish to take away one lane to make room for the private garden, then you should consider closing Chester Gate entrance to the Outer Circle entirely so that Chester Gate is for access for residents only in order to avoid traffic on Chester Gate.	This comment is addressed comprehensively by: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Chester Gate Garden – Transport Response prepared by Caneparo Associates; and • Comments on Heritage Matters Letter dated 1 July 2016 prepared by Montagu Evans.
33	N/A	S Sandhu / 21 Chester Terrace	See enclosed objection.	This comment is addressed comprehensively by: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Chester Gate Garden – Transport Response prepared by Caneparo Associates; and • Comments on Heritage Matters Letter dated 23 June 2016 prepared by Montagu Evans. <p>The public benefits of the proposals are set out in response to comment No.4.</p>
34	N/A	Anthony Goldstein / 81 & 85 Albany Street & 6 Chester Gate	I am writing to object to the proposed plans for the restoration of an historic garden in Chester Gate, and thereby significantly reduce the width of the entrance road into Regent's Park. I am writing as the beneficial owner of 81 and 85 Albany Street and 6 Chester Gate. I have seen the representations of the residents of Albany Street, Chester	

			<p>Gate and Chester Terrace, for which I wholeheartedly, and unreservedly concur. The proposal to reduce the width of the road, and to restore a historic garden should be rejected.</p> <p>However, it would be quite irresponsible to consider a proposal that greatly reduces the width of this important access road to the Park in isolation of the wider plans for CS11 and the consideration of the Park's access.</p> <p>So at least put back for further review once the broader arrangements have been agreed.</p> <p>However, the residents find this matter highly contentious, for all the reasons highlighted by my neighbours, I can assure you that, if this planning application is approved now, or re-applied for in the future, you shall have widespread opposition to this.</p>	<p>Please refer to Paragraphs 18-23 of the Chester Gate Garden – Transport Response which addresses this comment.</p>
35	N/A	Mr & Mrs Hussey / 73C Albany Street	<p>We wish to add our objections to the many objections already submitted by the leaseholders of Albany Headlease Limited (AHL) and agree with them.</p> <p>We are aware that you have received three detailed and considered objections prepared by Professor Sir Colin Blakemore of 55B Albany Street; Ros Oakley and Stephen Warren of 59A Albany Street and Niall Curran and Sue Reid of 3B Chester Gate. We totally endorse these comments made by our neighbours and add our voice to them.</p>	<p>This comment is addressed comprehensively by:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Chester Gate Garden – Transport Response prepared by Caneparo Associates; and • Comments on Heritage Matters Letter dated 1 July 2016 prepared by Montagu Evans.
36	N/A	Chester Close South Residents Group	<p>See enclosed objection.</p>	<p>This is addressed comprehensively by the Chester Gate Garden – Transport Response prepared by Caneparo Associates.</p>
37	N/A	Alison Crosland	<p>I have four concerns that I hope will be considered and lead to this application being refused.</p> <p>Firstly, 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</p>	<p>This comment is a duplication of Comment No. 4. Please refer to the response to comment No. 4.</p>

construction traffic for HS2.

Both of these will have a marked impact in increasing traffic onto Albany St. Any move therefore that reduces a current two way highway to single lane will impact on this creating an even bigger bottleneck that would occur under the existing conditions.

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, all they are actually doing is taking land that the public currently have a right of access to and given 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 the handling of it by those employed by the applicant. Their submissions summarising the consultation that took place gloss over the key fact that, throughout their colourful brochures and hoardings they forgot to mention that the "historic garden" would be private property and that a public right of way would be removed. Hence, the casual observer would summarise 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 even more objection to the proposal. Indeed their

			<p>failure to quantify the level of support in the consultation suggests that opposition may have outweighed support in the consultation as was.</p> <p>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 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.</p> <p>Please do not hesitate to contact me if you require any further information.</p>	
38	14 June 2016	Salah Bamakhrama	See comment No. 15.	Refer to response to comment No. 15.
39	N/A	Michael Goldhill	<p>I live in Regents Park, and am writing to object to the proposal in planning application no 2016/1479 to reduce the width of the road in Cambridge Gate solely to private additional garden space for the massive private residence it adjoins.</p> <p>As a surveyor, with more than 45 working experience, I can see absolutely no justification in planning terms to inflict additional congestion in an already restricted thoroughfare, solely to benefit some oligarch !</p> <p>Reducing the road would increase traffic congestion not only in the Outer Circle but also back up into Albany Street, an important thoroughfare with the result of endangering the lives of cyclists and pedestrians.</p> <p>Furthermore, I believe that this action would also reduce the number of parking spaces available.</p> <p>At no stage have I been able to find any justification in planning terms for this proposal and would wish for my objection to be placed before the councillors.</p>	<p>The public benefits of the proposals are set out in response to comment No.4.</p> <p>Please refer to Paragraphs 4-7 of the Chester Gate Garden – Transport Response which addresses this comment.</p> <p>Please refer to the Cover Letter submitted for both application references 2016/1479/P and 2016/1776/L which justifies the proposals in planning and heritage terms.</p>

40	N/A	R E & H S Webb / 77C Albany Street	As owners of Flat 77C Albany Street and a Car Space in the Basement Garage space no. 61a, we would like to object to the proposed Historical Gardens, solely on the grounds of pollution and congestion. This is already a narrow and busy cut through with will only become more so and does not need this extra hassard.	Please refer to Paragraph 7 of the Chester Gate Garden – Transport Response which addresses this comment.
41	N/A	John Martin / 75 Albany Street	<p>I am the owner and resident of 75 Albany Street and have received electronic versions of the following documents (copies of which I understand have already been submitted):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • "Review of Transport Statement" dated 8th June 2016 by Peter Sturgeon of Motion • "Report by Dr Geoffrey Tyack re Chester Gate, Regents Park" dated 3rd August 2015 • "Objection to Planning Application No 2016/1479/P 'Restoration of historic garden' in Chester Gate" by Colin Blakemore <p>I believe these documents have been very well researched and there is nothing further I can add. In consideration of the above, I wish to register my objection to the proposed garden in Chester Gate for the reasons stated therein.</p>	<p>This comment is addressed comprehensively by:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Chester Gate Garden – Transport Response prepared by Caneparo Associates; and • Comments on Heritage Matters Letter dated 1 July 2016 prepared by Montagu Evans.
42	N/A	Kevin	This is to confirm my objections to the proposal in regard to Chester Gate. I believe the proposal will result in too much standing traffic in Chester Gate resulting in too much noise and pollution. If you wish to take away the extra lane then you should close Chester Gate entrance to the Outer Circle entirely so Chester Gate is access only for residents.	<p>This comment is addressed comprehensively by:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Chester Gate Garden – Transport Response prepared by Caneparo Associates; and • Comments on Heritage Matters Letter dated 1 July 2016 prepared by Montagu Evans.
43	20 June 2016	Michael Citron / 77A Albany Street	<p>I wish to register our objections to this application for the reasons set out in full in our emails sent directly to the Planning Officer. We agree with the objections raised by those who have commented through the web-portal.</p> <p>We consider that the application gives rise to major traffic congestion, pollution, danger to pedestrians, cyclists and other road users, loss of parking spaces for neighbours, only serves the interest of one property to the major disadvantage and loss of amenity to neighbours and the wider</p>	<p>This comment is addressed comprehensively by:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Chester Gate Garden – Transport Response prepared by Caneparo Associates; and • Comments on Heritage Matters Letter dated 1 July 2016 prepared by Montagu Evans.

			public. The application is misleading in its assertions and mode of presentation and should be refused.	
44	20 June 2016	Mr Hussey / 31 Hoadly Road	<p>We wish to add our objections to the many objections already submitted by the leaseholders of Albany Headlease Limited (AHL) and agree with them.</p> <p>We are aware that you have received three detailed and considered objections prepared by Professor Sir Colin Blakemore of 55B Albany Street; Ros Oakley and Stephen Warren of 59A Albany Street and Niall Curran and Sue Reid of 3B Chester Gate. We totally endorse these comments made by our neighbours and add our voice to them.</p>	<p>This comment is addressed comprehensively by:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Chester Gate Garden – Transport Response prepared by Caneparo Associates; and • Comments on Heritage Matters Letter dated 1 July 2016 prepared by Montagu Evans.
45	20 June 2016	Michael Chew / 61C Albany Street	<p>We wish to register our objections to this application for the reasons set out in full in our emails sent directly to the Planning Officer. We agree with the objections raised by those who have commented through the web-portal.</p> <p>We consider that the application gives rise to major traffic congestion, pollution, danger to pedestrians, cyclists and other road users, loss of parking spaces for neighbours, only serves the interest of one property to the major disadvantage and loss of amenity to neighbours and the wider public. The application is misleading in its assertions and mode of presentation and should be refused.</p>	<p>This comment is addressed comprehensively by:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Chester Gate Garden – Transport Response prepared by Caneparo Associates; and • Comments on Heritage Matters Letter dated 1 July 2016 prepared by Montagu Evans.