

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2017/1230/P	Penny Gamez	16 Reachview Close Baynes Street London NW1 0TY	01/04/2017 16:27:09	OBJ	<p>I oppose this planning application for the following reasons:-</p> <p>Height of proposed buildings</p> <p>According to the Heritage section in Planning Policy and Proposal Compliance: 'proposals should be sympathetic in form and scale to protect and enhance the significance of heritage assets'.</p> <p>According to the Regent's Canal Conservation Area Appraisal and Management Strategy 2008: 'Each of the sections bracketed by the bridges has its own distinct appearance.' 'It is the Council's intention to preserve and enhance the existing character of the canal.'</p> <p>According to Camden Development Policy: Respecting Local Character (DP24.12): Designs for new buildings should respect the character and appearance of the local area and neighbouring buildings. Within areas of distinctive character, development should reinforce those elements which create the character'.</p> <p>Six storey buildings are not the norm in the immediate vicinity along the canal. The height of this development is out of context with its locality. It will detract from the characteristics of the conservation area and it will not reinforce or enhance the period buildings in close proximity e.g. Eagle Wharf and Royal College Street. Eagle Wharf is a listed Victorian warehouse and part of the rich heritage of canal buildings. It is only 3 storeys in height and will be totally dwarfed by the height and bulk of the proposed development at Bangor Wharf. The proposed building right next to Eagle Wharf will be twice as high as Eagle Wharf. How can this enhance the significance of a heritage asset such as Eagle Wharf?</p> <p>The terraced houses in Royal College Street are mostly 3 storeys high above ground with a basement below. Even 'stepping' the rear of the proposed buildings will not alter the looming and overbearing effect that they will have on Royal College Street. The residents there will look out on a wall of brick just at the end of their small gardens. There is nowhere in the immediate vicinity where residential property is overshadowed by higher buildings – let alone, twice as high.</p> <p>Size and density of proposed buildings</p> <p>With reference to the diagram and photograph of Lawford's Wharf on Page 31 of Bangor Wharf Design and Access Statement:-</p> <p>The two buildings proposed occupy virtually the whole site. The gap between them is compared to the gap between the buildings at Lawford's Wharf but although the gap near to the canal may be the same width, this is not the case further away from the canal. The buildings on either side of the gap at Lawford's Wharf are much shallower in depth than those proposed at Bangor Wharf so that whereas the gap further away from the canal at Lawford's wharf increases so that the smaller houses in Lyme</p>

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

**Comment:**    **Response:**

Street are not affected, the gap further away from the canal at Bangor Wharf remains the same as next to the canal and the buildings have a much larger footprint. They are much closer to the terraced houses in Royal College Street. When viewed from the opposite side of the canal at an angle or when walking along the canal from Gray's Inn Bridge, the gap between the buildings at Bangor Wharf will not be visible so the two buildings will appear to be one solid block. Urban design objectives should not mean producing an unacceptably adverse impact on the amenities and historic importance of the properties immediately adjacent to the site.

With reference to the Design and Access Statement, Page 24

It can be seen from these 3D images that the size and density of these buildings are extremely large and totally dwarf the surrounding period buildings. One of the alleged improvements the developers have made to reduce the massing is to decrease one building by one storey, but, at the same time, they have increased the other building by one storey and they have presumably increased the height of both buildings by replacing the original flats with commercial units which will have higher ceilings.

In Section 3.04 of the Design and Access Statement the Chair's review recommended 4 storeys. The developers' response was that fewer storeys would mean no affordable housing. Aren't they are obliged to provide affordable housing in a development of this size? As it is, they are only providing 6 affordable flats. So, was this an empty threat?

Overshadowing of neighbouring properties and right to light

In the Daylight and Sunlight report (revised on 17th March, 2017) There are inaccurate diagrams of Amenity Space. The first two show the existing buildings but the canal towpath - that is labelled as such - is the canal itself. According to these two diagrams the canal doesn't exist. The next two diagrams show the proposed buildings but there is no indication of overshadowing of the canal which is presumably an amenity space.

In the previous application made by One Housing in March 2016 there were detailed diagrams showing the detrimental shadowing effect of such high and large buildings on the canal, nature reserve, and the towpath on the opposite bank. The effect of the overshadowing was shocking and a real threat to the biodiversity of the canal, nature reserve and towpath.

The overshadowing diagrams submitted - late - with the new application are very unclear. The main height difference between the two applications is that the two buildings on the edge of the canal have changed places - the higher building is now on the right - as seen from the opposite towpath - and the lower one is on the left. The shadowing of the canal would now be greater on the right. It should be noted that the net amount of shadowing will presumably have increased in the second application as both buildings will be higher. The ground floor flats have been replaced with commercial units which have higher ceilings.

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

**Comment:**    **Response:**

The developers say in the Statement of Community Involvement that their re-application ‘does not represent a significant departure from the initial proposals’. (These proposals were of course rejected on 18 grounds.)

Therefore, we can presumably assume that the previous clearer analysis of overshadowing is still relevant – taking into account the reversed positions of the canalside buildings. With reference to these documents, it can be seen from the new buildings’ shadow at 1600h on 21st March that the shadow cast by the buildings is very large and reaches right across the canal and up the opposite bank. The proposed courtyard between the two new buildings will largely be in shade the whole time, all year, except for between 1400h and 1600h in the summer. The backs of the houses in Royal College Street will also be badly affected. The biodiversity of the canal will be adversely affected and so too will the Baynes Street nature reserve.

According to DP26: Managing the impact of development on occupiers and neighbours – ‘The Council will protect the quality of life of...neighbours by only granting permission for development that does not cause harm to amenity’.

According to the Planning Policy & Proposal Compliance: The development will be expected to 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 to surrounding listed buildings.

It also states the need to: ‘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.’ In addition, the impact of any overshadowing of the canal should be minimized.

Between College Street Bridge (Royal College Street) and Gray’s Inn Bridge (St Pancras Way) is one of the largest open planted sections of the canal. The proposed buildings will be only 1.5 metres away from the canal edge. The developers claim that the gap between the buildings will allow light through to the water but the shadow cast by those buildings is considerable and at times reaches right across the canal and up the opposite bank. This will seriously affect the biodiversity of not only the canal itself but also of the bank and nature reserve on the other side. The towpath opposite is widely used by the public as a sunny open space but this will be affected by the reduction in hours of sunlight and there will no longer be a feeling of open-ness.

In addition to the negative impact of the shadowing on the water, the sheer bulk of this development will change the whole atmosphere of this stretch of the canal. Other areas have lost this and it is a precious heritage that should be preserved. Once lost, it cannot be replaced.

The public space between the proposed buildings will be in shade for much of the time and so will the narrow access area to the canal. There will be no ‘sense of openness at the canal edge’, as the developers claim, since there will be overbearing buildings around. It will not be much used by the public as they have much better access to the canal from the opposite side. The entrance to this ‘public’ space will be from Georgiana Street and through some kind of tunnelled walkway. Currently, there are few pedestrians in Georgiana Street so, apart from the residents of Bangor Wharf, how will the public

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

**Comment:**    **Response:**

know there is a way to the canal and even when they do find it, why would they want to go and sit in almost permanent shadow in the middle of overpowering buildings?

DP26.2: 'Development should avoid harmful effects on the amenity of existing and future occupiers and to nearby properties.'

The developers claim that their analysis demonstrates that the proposed development would not materially affect the daylight and sunlight amenity received to the neighbouring properties. The residents of Royal College Street will certainly be affected not only by the loss of daylight but also by the overpowering size and height of the buildings which will be within a few yards of their houses or back instead of looking out on an open space with low buildings, they will be looking up at a huge building with windows, balconies and terraces towering above and overlooking Royal College Street houses. In addition to the consequent loss of light, it will feel extremely claustrophobic.

Right to Privacy

Lawford's Wharf on the other side of College Street Bridge was described as follows:- 'The scheme responds to building heights constraints, sensitively proportioning new development to prevent overlooking of neighbouring dwellings'. The same cannot be said of the proposed development at Bangor Wharf.

As already stated the development at Bangor Wharf will loom over the houses in Royal College Street and will affect the amount of daylight and sunlight they will receive. In addition, it will also affect their privacy. At the back and round the side of the higher building (the northern one) there are private terraces at first floor level. There are also windows on every floor. There is another terrace on the top floor. There are balconies down the side of the buildings. It is unclear the exact height of the boundary wall as it apparently varies, but at one point it is 1.8m high so anyone standing there will be able to look over it into the Royal College Street rear gardens and also into the back windows of the houses. To sum up, the privacy of the residents of Royal College Street will be invaded from all these viewing points.

Consultation – or rather lack of it

As the developers do not consider the new application represents a significant departure from the initial proposals – in spite of the addition of a storey to one of the buildings and an increase in the number of commercial units – they decided they did not have to carry out another consultation process. So they delivered a glossy leaflet two days before the actual planning application was submitted. This leaflet was not delivered to all the affected households. As far as we can judge, very few of the residents in Royal College Street received these leaflets. On the Planning Application website there are big claims that they consulted local residents thoroughly with drop-in sessions, feedback forms etc. There are

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
					<p>numerous impressive pie charts to back this up. But all this evidence refers to the consultations carried out prior to the application in March 2016 and this is not made very clear in the current application. The first time the local residents heard about the latest planning application was when they received the glossy leaflet – if they were lucky enough to get one.</p> <p>Safety – in case of fire</p> <p>The fire engines will not be able to drive into the courtyard as there is no vehicular access. The taller building (northern) will only be protected by sprinklers and the developers add: ‘if necessary’. If they decide not to bother with the sprinklers – and anyway, sprinklers are not always reliable – then how will a fire be extinguished?</p> <p>Conclusion</p> <p>Undeniably Camden needs more housing and Bangor Wharf is an unused site but the height and footprint of this development is totally out of keeping with this open, planted and sunny stretch of the Regent’s Canal. It will dominate the area and will have an overbearing effect on the much smaller houses in Royal College Street as well as depriving them of sunlight, daylight, and privacy. The buildings are too close to the canal and should be no more than 4 storeys high. The shadow produced by these buildings will have a serious effect on the biodiversity of the canal and the opposite bank. The claim that access to the canal will improve is probably a meaningless one as the access is very poor and through an almost completely shadowed, gated courtyard. This development will not preserve and enhance the existing character of the canal nor will it reinforce or complement the heritage buildings around it.</p> <p>I oppose this planning application for all the above reasons.</p>
2017/1230/P	Anne Gerulat	142A Royal College Street London NW1 0TA	22/03/2017 12:56:13	OBJ	I am objecting to this application. 6-floor modern buildings are out of character for the Royal College Street area and would certainly affect the the light on the adjoining and close by terraces and gardens of the Royal College Street properties (and also the canal path in the afternoon). The proposed buildings are too close to the property line of adjoining properties and, as already mentioned, too high, and will lead to the existing properties losing their right of privacy, as there will be a direct and close up view from the windows of the proposed property into existing properties, which is not acceptable. I am asking you to reject this application. I am looking forward to hearing your response.
2017/1230/P	Sarah Gaffney	142A Royal College Street NW1 0TA	28/03/2017 10:14:08	OBJ	I object to these plans as it will cause the nearby houses to be overlooked and it will block their light. It will be extremely disruptive for residents during the building work as well.

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2017/1230/P	Mr N Patel	126 Royal College Street	22/03/2017 15:01:43	OBJ	The light reduction survey has not been updated to reflect the changes in levels of the buildings in the new plan. The additional floor on the right hand tower when looking from the canal represents approx 20% increase in height and the consequential reduction in light for surrounding properties must be calculated. The terraces and rear windows constitute an invasion of privacy toward the Royal College Street houses. Amenities such as sewerage and drainage will be significantly undermined by the concentrated number of dwellings.
2017/1230/P	Marios Ioannou	12b reachview close nw10ty	23/03/2017 13:40:16	OBJ	A 6 storey block on the edge of the canal would overshadow the canal. Their are other blocks either side of this plot but believe the maximum they reach are 4 storeys so don't think that anything higher than this is acceptable.
2017/1230/P	Anne Gerulat	142A Royal College Street London NW1 0TA	22/03/2017 12:55:56	OBJ	I am objecting to this application. 6-floor modern buildings are out of character for the Royal College Street area and would certainly affect the the light on the adjoining and close by terraces and gardens of the Royal College Street properties (and also the canal path in the afternoon). The proposed buildings are too close to the property line of adjoining properties and, as already mentioned, too high, and will lead to the existing properties losing their right of privacy, as there will be a direct and close up view from the windows of the proposed property into existing properties, which is not acceptable. I am asking you to reject this application. I am looking forward to hearing your response.
2017/1230/P	anthony Richardson	The Regents Canal Conservation Area Advisory Committee C/O ARP Architects 31 Oval Road NW1 7EA	23/03/2017 12:35:02	OBJLETTE R	From The Regents Canal Conservation Area Advisory Committee. We object to this application its proposal is contrary to the Regents Canal C.A. Appraisal and Management plan , to the Planning Policy Framework and the Council's allocations policy
2017/1230/P	Jack Stevenson	Flat 57 Reachview Close Camden	22/03/2017 10:27:58	OBJ	I feel that if the proposed build of Bangor Wharf goes ahead the lovely walk way of the canal will be ruined. I often walk from this section towards king cross and it is one of the more open and natural areas hosting a lot of wildlife. Also the view from Reachview close is one of the best I have ever had the grace to witness and it would be a shame if this were to be blocked by flats.
2017/1230/P	rob small	22 bergholt mews nw1 0bq	30/03/2017 18:45:09	COMNOT	I strongly object to these plans for redeveloping Bangor Wharf. This is yet another redevelopment being rushed through to turn St Pancras Way into a canyon, blocking out the natural light and creating a wind tunnel. It will have the same affect on the canal restricting the light and causing gusts. There is a lot of wildlife living there too and they will obviously be pushed out of their homes. Housing needs are very pressing in London but this looks like it will end up having very little affordable homes available for the people who need them most. So many developments have a history of moving the goal posts once they are green lighted, and affordable housing ends up a token gesture. Please reject this proposal again. Thank you.

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2017/1230/P	Gabriela Hartlova	134 Royal College street Flat B NW1 0TA	29/03/2017 22:07:17	COMMNT	I want to object to the plan to bild a building due to the fact a huge building as the plan shows it will deprive me of sunlights and sky view and I will feel very claustrophobic. I won't have anymore sun wake me up in the morning through my window and enjoy the canal view with ducks and swans. It will be very sad. And also we were not aware about the new plas as we were last year., as we should be.
2017/1230/P	Emma Young	43 Reachview Close	24/03/2017 09:07:01	OBJ	Living opposite this proposed site I am very concerned at the overshadowing due to the height and scale of the proposed building which will cause lack of light in my flat and on my balcony. There has been no consulting with local residents including Reachview Close and the houses on Royal College Street backing onto the proposed site which I think is quite bad. Our current view over London will be non existent due to the height of the proposed building and also will have a lot less privacy due to new proposed building being able to look into my flat

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2017/1230/P	Renko Wright	124a Royal College Street London NW1 0TA	28/03/2017 18:58:19	OBJEMPER	<p>The huge 1st floor's flat green roof are going to be a lot of trouble for us Royal College street residents, easily invaded by luxury flat residents as a extended terrace garden and play area for kids , more so anybody can easily climb down affordable flat's balcony or communal windows.</p> <p>Summer will be the HELL for us Royal College street residents, DRUNKEN ORGY !! on top of the roof !!!</p> <p>" Deep planters as privacy screen" are INSULT.</p> <p>No plants which can plant in a planter are not taller than man.</p> <p>Anybody be able to kill off plants easily if you wish Then what! foot ball on a roof ! live music on a roof!</p> <p>Terrace and large glass patio door are unnecessary just a gimmick to sell as a luxury flats, for whom are not Camden residents !</p> <p>Affordable flats does not need so many windows for gimmick to sell.</p> <p>Royal College street traffic are clogged from top to bottom, choked by slow moving car-exhaust, for that we can not open front windows.</p> <p>Only windows we can open is back.</p> <p>To build high - rise building our back ! no privacy ! no light ! It's Hell!</p> <p>Housing association does not need to build luxury flats, there are so many empty luxury flats along Regents Canal for rich investor who left as empty.</p> <p>Over built Kings Cross and Pancras way , Bangor Wharf are only oasis of Regents Canal side that small birds and ducklings are free from cats and dogs, and give Camden residents peace, specially building work HS2 start soon building high-rise buildings Euston area.</p> <p>We Camden residents do not need more high-rise luxury flats for rich investors to invest for rent city rich.</p> <p>We do not wish to live shadow of buildings, we do need the SUN for physically and mentally as healthy living.</p> <p>We Camden residents need space of peace next 20years escape from HS2 building work,</p> <p>please do not destroy Bangor Wharf which is only bit of nature place we human and birds need.</p>



Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2017/1230/P	GB	122 Royal College Street	28/03/2017 17:08:18	OBJ	Objection for the planning as it blocks a complete view from back of my house.
2017/1230/P	VD	122 Royal College Street	28/03/2017 17:04:28	OBJ	Because it blocks the only view i have from my window.
2017/1230/P	Joshua Haagsma	134 Royal College Street London NW1 0TA	27/03/2017 06:51:35	OBJ	<p>Hello,</p> <p>I'd like to object to the proposed Bangor Wharf redevelopment.</p> <p>I'm situated at 134 Royal College Street and the windows to the rear of the property face nearly directly where the 5/6 storey tower will be.</p> <p>The window that will suffer the most will be the window in my 7 month old daughter's bedroom. The daylight that comes into that room already struggles feebly through the existing surrounding buildings. I fear that the new building will nearly eliminate the ingress of light completely. I'd also like for my daughter to be able to continue to see a small patch of sky from her room rather than the side (?) of a building.</p> <p>Aside from the impact on my daughter's room, we also enjoy a very small courtyard accessible through our kitchen. The courtyard is heavily used, for drying clothes and for barbequing all year round. The daylight that comes into the kitchen is very pleasant. Again, I strongly object to the deprivation of daylight that this proposal brings.</p> <p>Finally, it appears that balconies will overlook our windows and courtyard. This is obviously an unacceptable privacy concern. I'd also imagine that any future Bangor Wharf residents would similarly object to having to watch my underpants dry in the breeze. Jests aside, I hate the idea of having to draw the curtains while my daughter plays in her room to afford her some privacy.</p> <p>I urge you to please have the developers drastically change their proposal, swapping the pleasant ingress of daylight for the looming presence of prying eyes is hugely concerning.</p> <p>Should you wish to conduct a site visit to understand the impact the proposal will have on this property, please don't hesitate to contact me.</p> <p>Regards, Joshua Haagsma</p>

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2017/1230/P	Nic Shore	Flat 59 Lulworth Wrotham Road London NW1 9ST	27/03/2017 08:45:47	OBJ	<p>The height, scale and sheer mass will be detrimental to the character and general appearance of the canal side, plus lack of reflected light from the water and the increased wind tunnel effect by the aforementioned will give a distinctly gloomy and possibly unfriendly aspect to the towpath. Obviously the biodiversity of the will be affected by the overshadowing created.</p> <p>The proposed development fails to preserve or enhance the character/appearance of the Regents Canal Conservation Area.</p> <p>The design, layout and addition of gates also detrimental to the conservation area.</p> <p>No priority, or even a thought, has been given to the water space and to promote its use for sustainable transport during construction or looking to the future. Developers state they 'will consider ' providing a tap. No bins.</p> <p>Also, they, 'will investigate the possibility' of providing moorings, failing to note locked courtyard gates( no public access) would make this completely unrealistic.</p>
2017/1230/P	Piotr	Reachview Close 59	01/04/2017 15:36:50	OBJ	Over-shadowing of the canal so loss of one of the few light and airy canal sections remaining for leisure (and Reachview Close flats loss of light), the buildings making a continuous wall creating a canyon.
2017/1230/P	Claire Brooks	146 Royal College Street London NW1 0TA	21/03/2017 09:57:46	OBJ	<p>We strongly object to the proposed development. As a adjacent commercial property the creation of this development will severely impact on both the light levels and our aspect. Not only will we be overlooked the proposed development could have a detrimental affect on our current business. As a showroom and presentation space it is key for our business to have a light and airy space where our products can be shown off to best advantage. I believe that the proposed development will block a large portion of light and create a completely different space one of which is unworkable for our business. I think the proportions of the proposed development do not fit in with the size of the site.</p>
2017/1230/P	Gabriela Hartlova	134 Royal College street Flat B NW1 0TA	29/03/2017 22:07:23	COMMNT	<p>I want to object to the plan to bild a building due to the fact a huge building as the plan shows it will deprive me of sunlights and sky view and I will feel very claustrophobic.</p> <p>I won't have anymore sun wake me up in the morning through my window and enjoy the canal view with ducks and swans. It will be very sad. And also we were not aware about the new plas as we were last year., as we should be.</p>

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2017/1230/P	Nic Shore	Flat 59 Lulworth Wrotham Road London NW1 9ST	27/03/2017 08:46:02	OBJ	<p>The height, scale and sheer mass will be detrimental to the character and general appearance of the canal side, plus lack of reflected light from the water and the increased wind tunnel effect by the aforementioned will give a distinctly gloomy and possibly unfriendly aspect to the towpath. Obviously the biodiversity of the will be affected by the overshadowing created.</p> <p>The proposed development fails to preserve or enhance the character/appearance of the Regents Canal Conservation Area.</p> <p>The design, layout and addition of gates also detrimental to the conservation area.</p> <p>No priority, or even a thought, has been given to the water space and to promote its use for sustainable transport during construction or looking to the future. Developers state they 'will consider ' providing a tap. No bins.</p> <p>Also, they, 'will investigate the possibility' of providing moorings, failing to note locked courtyard gates( no public access) would make this completely unrealistic.</p>
2017/1230/P	Reagan Kynaston	142a Royal College Street London NW1 0TA NW1 0TA	28/03/2017 10:10:13	OBJEMPER	<p>I am objecting to this development on the ground of rights of light. Our terrace is already overlooked by Rainbow Wave and half shadowed by the neighbours' extension. Any more will detract from our quality and enjoyment of our terrace. I also object for the neighbours this will directly affect as right of light and privacy is invaluable.</p>