

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2017/1230/P	Bogdan Ionita	48 Reachview Close Nw1 0ty	05/04/2017 16:12:38	OBJ	I do not agree to these lans of construction due to the shadowing that will happen because of the 6 story building. Also the access to the canal will be poorly done.
2017/1230/P	Josh Atefi	22 Reachview Close London	05/04/2017 19:08:07	OBJ	I live at Reachview Close opposite and the huge block of flats will severely impair my view, and block out light for much of the day, as we only have windows canal facing. The build will also reduce light to the canal and wildlife.
2017/1230/P	Silvia Gallotti	16 Lewis Street nw1 8qt nw1 8qt	05/04/2017 13:56:01	OBJ	I object to the devolpment as a frequent user of the canal I think the creation of a continuous wall of shadow over the canal at many times during the day, will seriously reduce its character as a light and airy leisure feature and is certainly a reduction in the quality of the local canal environment

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2017/1230/P	Emma Smith	325 Ice Wharf 17 New Wharf Road London N1 9RW	03/04/2017 21:15:32	OBJ	<p>Dear Sir/Madam</p> <p>Ref: 2017/1230/P Bangor Wharf</p> <p>As a resident in a Regent's Canal-side location I wish to object to the proposed development at Bangor Wharf on the following grounds:</p> <p>The proposed development is far too large for the Bangor Wharf site and its location right on the canal. It will have a detrimental effect on the neighbouring residential dwellings particularly in Royal College Street and Reachview Close in terms of outlook, overlooking, privacy, and access to daylight and sunlight.</p> <p>In addition, the canal, the wildlife and the towpath will also suffer a detrimental effect as a result of the size of the proposed development reducing access to light and creating overshadowing. The towpath which is well used by walkers and cyclists at all times of the day, throughout the year, will experience a loss of daylight and sunlight which will have a harmful effect on the wildlife, vegetation and people's enjoyment of this valuable green space. I have seen turtles and many waterbirds adjacent to Bangor Wharf on numerous occasions which would be adversely affected by an over-large building on this site.</p> <p>As you know this site is located within the Regents Canal Conservation Area. From Camden Council Conservation Area Statement Regent's Canal The Council's own Guidelines state, in part, the following:</p> <p>From page 28 New development should be seen as an opportunity to enhance the Conservation Area and should respect the built form, scale and historic context of the particular section of canal in which they are located. and The Conservation Area is varied in scale and new design should respect the scale of their particular location. Appropriate design for the Conservation Area should complement the appearance, character and setting of the existing buildings, the canal, and the environment as a whole.</p> <p>The proposed development does not respect the form or scale of the canal, nor does it respect the scale of the surrounding buildings. It is far larger than the surrounding buildings and more importantly is too large for the space it proposes to occupy.</p> <p>From page 34 The Council will seek to ensure that all new buildings maintain the established scale of the particular section of the canal. The height of buildings should reflect that of existing canalside buildings or as a general rule the height of buildings which frame the canal should not exceed four domestic storeys on either side of the canal as taken from towpath level. and The Council will resist any development that has an adverse impact on the existing skyline</p>

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

Given the above guidelines, I do not see how the proposed development meets the guidelines. In addition, I can see a number of elements which contravene the guidelines. The proposed building extends to 5 and 6 stories, each storey likely taller than the 'domestic storeys' referenced when the guidelines were written.

And the skyline will also be significantly changed. The current buildings of only two storeys enable views of the canal to and from all surrounding buildings, which would be obliterated by the proposed building. The Council should follow its own guidelines and 'resist' this development. In addition, other councils have indicated the importance of protecting views of the canal from the bridges within this Conservation Area. This approach should be encouraged throughout the Conservation Area for consistency. The proposed development would almost destroy the view from Gray's Inn Bridge. The development should be much lower overall and especially at the corner of the site adjacent to the bridge, in order to protect this outlook.

Yours sincerely

Emma Smith

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2017/1230/P	Simon Kemper	32 Reachview Close Baynes Street NW1 0TY NW1 0TY	04/04/2017 21:02:59	OBJ	<p>I wish to object to this planning application and request that it is rejected.</p> <p>Many of the reasons for rejection are similar or the same as those for objecting to the rejected application 2016/1117/P last year, as the new proposal fails to remedy most of the problems that lay behind the objections then, also the reasons that caused the council to refuse that application. I agree with the points made by most or all of the other objectors, which are cogent and important and show that they are concerned with preserving the character of this light and airy canal section, also with protecting the amenity of existing residents, the very many leisure and barge canal users and the general public.</p> <p>This section of the canal is very popular for recreation and should not be lightly sacrificed.</p> <p>The site is certainly suitable for development for new housing and light industrial space, but this should be done in a sensitive way that is in accord with this canal section, does not hugely dominate and it and turn it into a gloomy, dark wind-tunnel, bordered by a cliff-like array of tall buildings. These will dominate the area and overshadow and violate the privacy of existing housing, especially in Royal College Street.</p> <p>The buildings should be no taller than 4 stories, particularly the Northern one, with less monolithic construction to humanise their appearance from all sides.</p> <p>Specific reasons for my objection are :</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Excessive and domineering massing of the proposed buildings • False claim that the new courtyard will be a valuable public open space • The shadowing and walling in of the canal and housing opposite • Failure to constructively use the canal or to enhance the canal environment • There was in reality NO community consultation on this application <p>Excessive Massing</p> <p>This was one of the main reasons for objections to the previous application and is little improved or even made worse by the current one. The developers claim that they have reduced this by removing one storey from the Georgiana Street building, but they have INCREASED the massing of canalside, Northern building, so at very best the massing has remained the same. In fact, the Northern building is significantly more important for overshadowing the canal, also for invading the privacy of housing in Royal College Street.</p> <p>The developers say "The massing creates two distinct buildings which front the canal"</p> <p>It is clear from their own visuals that from the vast majority of viewpoints on the canal towpath, this is false. The 2 buildings will visually merge to create a cliff-like front, walling in and shadowing the canal, as is confirmed by their hourly shadow diagrams.</p>

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

Comment: **Response:**

The developers claim that the gap between the 2 buildings will reduce its visual impact and reduction of light and make frequent comparisons with a similar arrangement in Lawfords" Wharf next along the canal. But the lowest building they propose is significantly higher than the highest building in Lawfords" Wharf, while their proposal will involve much more monolithic, massive buildings than the sensitive, rounded ones there. Also Lawford"s Wharf is surrounded by low rise buildings so the courtyard there has few visual blocks and is itself light and airy. It is also striking that the highest Lawford"s Wharf building is at most 3m higher than its nearest neighbour in Royal College Street, the Northern building proposed will be at least 10m higher than the existing culturally valuable commercial warehouse building, twice as high, which it will completely dominate, as it will loom over the entire neighbourhood.

The sight line through the new courtyard from the canal will be blocked by the Geogiana Street building, which is monolithic and cliff like. The idea that the courtyard will provide a canal view from Georgiana Street is clearly shown by the elevations and plans to be fanciful. So views either way over the courtyard will be blocked by the buildings.

False claim that the new courtyard will be a valuable public open space

The space between the 2 buildings is claimed to be a valuable addition to public space, which visitors can relax and enjoy as a new leisure facility, and will allow public access to the West side of the canal for the first time. This is so implausible it is hard to see this claim as anything but deliberately misleading.

The courtyard can only be accessed by a deep, gated tunnel in the Georgiana street wall. This has a grim and forbidding appearance, it is highly unlikely that the public will even know of the existence of the courtyard, let alone use it to eat sandwiches or have children play in. The gate will be locked in the evening anyway, so whoever is there would presumably have to be turfed out.

The (late supplied), shadow diagrams show that for the vast majority of the time, for most of the year, the courtyard will be in deep shadow and loomed over by the cliff edge of the 2 new tall buildings. This effect is made worse by the additional story added to the Northern building. This courtyard will be of little use as amenity to the residents of the new block, still less to the wider public.

The shadowing and walling in of the canal and housing opposite

The shadow diagrams show a much worse sunlight situation for the canal and existing housing if this scheme goes ahead. The courtyard will be in near continuous shade, even at high Summer, while for much of the year a solid block of shadow will be projected across the currently sunny canal from the late morning on. This will seriously reduce the current pleasant atmosphere of this section, there will also be serious loss of natural light in the Reachview Flats, claims to the contrary notwithstanding.

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

Comment: **Response:**

Failure to constructively use the canal or to enhance the canal environment

The developers claim that they will enhance canal use. Yet they only propose to "consider" the "possible" provision of a tap (but not waste disposal facilities) and "investigate" providing a mooring. These are minimal token gestures toward active canal use, and are so provisional that they are not any sort of solid commitment. There is every likelihood that these aspirations would not in fact be met, were the application to be approved.

The problem of minimal canal use remains, while the amenity for the very many recreational canal towpath users will be seriously diminished as the canal becomes walled-in and gloomy.

The development certainly fails to "enhance the canal", in fact its dark, walling-in quality does the reverse.

Community Consultation

The statement on community consultation is deeply misleading. It refers to a series of processes, themselves heavily loaded in favour of the developer, that all relate to the FIRST application, not the current one. The only "consultation" on this application was a glossy brochure distributed, in a fairly uneven fashion, to some residents 2 days before the formal application was made.

For all real purposes, there was NO community consultation on this application.

For these reasons, I urge rejection of this application. A further application to use this site should be more sensitive and less domineering to the existing situation.

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2017/1230/P	Richard Horne	2 High Street Eccleshall Stafford ST21 6BZ	04/04/2017 10:56:18	OBJ	<p>The Commercial Boat Operators Association (CBOA) represents water freight carriage by barge on the UK's inland and estuarial waterways and is accepted by the Government as the representative industry body.</p> <p>The CBOA has an interest in promoting use of the River Thames and London's canals and basins for carriage of freight by barge, to relieve road congestion and reduce exhaust emissions. This is particularly relevant where movement of materials is proposed for developments that are adjacent or near to waterways. This is in line with Government proposals for assisting reduction of road congestion in London. (See GPG 2122 - Planning for Freight on Inland Waterways www.aina.org.uk/docs/Planning4freight(1).pdf, and also the London Plan http://www.london.gov.uk/priorities/planning/london-plan; the latter as a good example of use of the "Blue Ribbon Network" of navigable waterways for freight). Leeds, Tower Hamlets and Greenwich in London are examples whose local authorities are keen on freight use of waterways in this way.</p> <p>The site at Bangor wharf is a good example of where at least part of the wharf should be kept for future canal transport use for the loading and unloading of barges, for distribution to the vicinity, or collection from the vicinity. Some space on site for the turning of vehicles would also be required. With the increasing population in London, more use should be made of canals and rivers to alleviate use of the road network for goods transport. Good examples of goods (but not limited to these) that can be carried are those for construction purposes, or carrying away excavated material during site preparation. An increase in population means an increasing need for goods distribution.</p> <p>As an illustration, the benefits of barge transport can be:-</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Significant reduction of road congestion - Lower risk of road accidents/fatalities - Lower noise on highways - Reduced highway wear and tear from lorries, meaning lower long term highway maintenance costs - Lower fuel consumption meaning reduction of the carbon footprint - Lower exhaust emissions, meaning less air pollution in the district - Each barge can carry 2 or more lorry loads. <p>Secondly, any construction carried out on this site should obviously make full use of the canal for both carrying away excavated material and for bringing in new construction materials. Shortage of storage space on site during construction can be alleviated by using the barges for storage. This needs to be stipulated within the planning consent; contractors are often unwilling to consider canal transport and so the need for the specification of it. The same advantages are applicable with the use of barges as above.</p> <p>If you need any further information I would be pleased to assist.</p>

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2017/1230/P	Fabian Cordes	12 Reachview Close	05/04/2017 13:13:30	OBJ	Sir/Madam,

I hereby object to the planning consent and intention to redevelop and build the new buildings at Bangor Wharf.

I am not against new buildings at that site per se and indeed Camden needs more houses and it makes absolutely sense to redevelop brownfield sites. And yet I find myself wondering whether the proposed redevelopment would cause more harm than good to Camden residents, the Camden environment and the Camden economy. My three main concerns and reasons to object are:

(i) OneHousing states on their homepage <http://www.onehousingbangorwharf.co.uk/about/> that they want to “fund affordable housing” and that OneHousing “responds to and exceeds the need of local community engagement”. And yet only 6 of 40 flat units would be considered being “affordable”. More affordable houses and flats is what Camden needs and what the residents need and OneHousing refuses to provide these affordability. In my view, that is neither “responding to and exceeding the need of local community engagement” nor funding “affordable housing”. In fact, what I read here between all this documents is just another company pretending to care, but secretly trying to maximise profits – even if they act as non-profit. Camden needs more affordable houses. “London is in the midst of a housing crisis” is what our mayor Sadiq Khan said and according to the Mayor of London homepage (November 2016), he wants to see developments with at least 50% affordable flats, not 15% as currently proposed by OneHousing.

(ii) What makes Camden so beautiful and the people so happy to live there is Camden’s unique atmosphere which builds upon the nature combined with the lovely and diverse people living in Camden. One of this ingredients for our unique atmosphere is threatened by this redevelopment project: The nature in form of the canal. Increased shadowing will affect the biodiversity of the canal and the sunny nature of the canal towpath. OneHousing could take this into account by reducing the floors of their development to a level which not only matches the adjacent houses, but also does not affect the canal atmosphere.

(iii) The redevelopment actually destroys more value than it creates. From an economical point of view, in my opinion, the redevelopment lowers the economic value of adjacent houses. Current houses with a canal view, for instance from their balcony, will look at a house front or perhaps inside another flat. That will fundamentally lower the value of these houses. In turn, OneHousing provides new flats with a canal view and they don’t care what their development does to adjacent houses. Camden should not allow a new building which leads to more unhappy people than it creates happy ones. There are ways to maximise the value for everyone, including adjacent buildings, but that requires a redesign of the site and actually listening to the community’s needs. Something OneHousing has not been doing greatly after the first planning rejection. In fact, many adjacent residents did not even get information about the new proposal. It appears that since the official way did not work for OneHousing, they now changed strategy to push for another design without consulting with the public properly. In my view, that is not how one should do business.

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
-----------------	------------------	------------------	-----------	----------	-----------

We are here, let us talk together.

Kind regards,
Fabian Cordes
12 Reachview Close
