

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2017/1230/P	Fiona	26 Reachview Close London NW1 0TY	11/04/2017 17:44:38	OBJNOT	<p>Planning application 2017/1117/P, Bangor Wharf, Georgiana Street, London NW1 0QS</p> <p>I strongly object to the above proposal for the following reasons:</p> <p><b>HEIGHT AND SIZE</b></p> <p>According to the Camden Site Allocations: Local Development Document (Sept 2013), the development should, '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 surrounding listed buildings.'</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The development comprises a 6- and a 5-storey block, both with offices on the ground floor. With higher ceilings, the offices will add height to the buildings overall. The locally listed houses on Royal College Street are only 3 storeys, while the Constitution pub and the historic warehouse on Eagle Wharf, both of which are positive characteristics of the conservation area, are also 3 storeys. The proposed buildings are twice as high.</li> <li>2. The size and scale of the development is insensitive compared to new developments in the locality. The Design and Access Statement compares to heights of buildings in the local urban context on the canal, yet it fails to mention the following: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) Lawfords Wharf staggers down to one storey so as not to hide the listed buildings used as offices and the backs of the terraced houses on Lyme Street.</li> <li>b) The more recent development, Regent Canalside on Camden Road, which also straddles the canal, lowers to 3 storeys to match the height of the houses behind on Bonny Street, which is part of a conservation area.</li> <li>c) Star Wharf is only 3 storeys at Gray's Inn Bridge, Georgiana Street.</li> </ol> </li> <li>3. Sites along the canal should be considered individually, not as a whole, and the proposal fails to do so. DP24.10: 'In the borough, a site may be suitable for a tall building while adjacent sites are not, due to impact on either views, conservation areas or listed buildings. Indeed, in some cases, suitability for a tall building differs across a single site.'</li> <li>4. According to the Regent's Canal Conservation Area appraisal, 'It is the Council's intention to conserve and enhance the existing character of the canal', yet the height of the buildings will create an oppressive sense of enclosure on what is an open section of the canal, a site historically occupied by low buildings. The effect will 'close' the canal and harm its setting as a designated heritage asset. The Local Development document says, 'The character of this section of Regent's Canal is fairly open so any development should avoid excessive bulk and massing along the canal...'</li> </ol> <p><b>OVERSHADOWING</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The Transient Overshadowing Study in the Daylight and Sunlight Report, shows the negative effect of shadowing as it stretches across the water, the towpath and up the bank, covering the Baynes Street Canalside Garden nature reserve, which is run by London Wildlife Trust and Camden Council, and the gardens of Reachview Close. On 21 March, 50% of the canal and towpath will have sunlight for only two hours; currently, there would not be any significant shadowing of the canal or towpath until 1700hrs on 21 March. How is this considered to be acceptable?</li> <li>2. The loss of sunlight to existing homes and the towpath will affect the wellbeing of visitors and residents. In the winter the sun will not rise above the northern six-storey building. DP26: The Council will protect the quality of life of... neighbours by only granting permission for development that does not cause harm to amenity.</li> </ol>

Application No:    Consultees Name:    Consultees Addr:    Received:

Comment:    Response:

3. According to the Daylight and Sunlight Report, windows in the surrounding area fall BRE Report recommendations: 18 windows at Reachview Close; at 128, 132, 134, and 136 Royal College Street, 'transgressions of the guidelines do exist'; at 146 Eagle Wharf, 50% (17 of 34 tested windows) are not compliant.

#### VISUAL AMENITY

1. The applicant's previous Heritage and Townscape Appraisal said the development will 'enhance the setting of the adjacent locally listed buildings on Royal College Street', yet the reality is that the terrace's rooflines and historic pattern of window openings – a non-designated heritage asset, as positively referred to in the Regent's Canal Conservation Area appraisal – will be hidden when viewed from the towpath. Cantilevered balconies overhanging the courtyard area will also harm the setting of the Royal College Street terrace, and the gap in between the proposed buildings will appear 'closed' unless viewed straight on.
2. The historic warehouse at Eagle Wharf is a positive characteristic of the Regent's Canal Conservation Area, but its eastern façade will be obscured by the development, creating a loss of visual amenity from the towpath. (In a similar situation, the Victorian warehouse at Kingsland Wharves in Islington is dominated by, and obscured from the towpath, by flats of the same height as the proposal at Bangor Wharf.)

#### PUBLIC OPEN SPACE

According to the Local Development Document, the proposal should, 'Provide active frontage to the canal... in order to improve the relationship between the site and the public realm.'

1. Active frontage to the canal will be limited. Approximately two-thirds of the canal edge will have offices facing onto it, with only a narrow section in front for public use, with balconies overhead, which will feel unwelcoming.
2. The Transient Overshadowing Study in the Daylight and Sunlight Report shows the canal frontage at Bangor Wharf and the proposed public courtyard will be shaded year-round, with total overshadowing in both March and June. The Report also says that only 2 of the 4 amenity spaces in the development are BRE Report compliant, and the main amenity space falls short of the guidelines.
3. The courtyard space will become a hangout for office smokers, and given its proximity to water it is not suitable as a children's play area. (Urbanest King's Cross, which has courtyards off the towpath, is a prime example of unwelcoming public space overshadowed by tall buildings. Its gates are usually locked and, despite the high volume of footfall passing by, nobody visits the space.)
3. The tunnel-like entrance has massing above and a thickness created by the width of the southern blocks. This, and the addition of a gate that will be locked in the evening and morning for security, does not provide a welcoming and inviting access point for the public. (The applicant mentions the provision of a residential mooring, yet with a locked gate this would not work.) The overall impression would be of a private estate, and people walking along Georgiana Street (which has little footfall compared with the towpath) would not notice the 'glimpse' of the canal through the entrance.

#### CONSERVATION AREA STATUS

1. The planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990, says decision makers with respect to any buildings or other land in a conservation area should pay 'special attention... to the

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

**Comment:**    **Response:**

desirability of preserving or enhancing the character or appearance of that area'. Preserving the conservation area should mean that the characteristics in this section of the canal (the two bridges, the Constitution pub, Eagle Wharf, the willow tree, the rooflines, and open planting on the opposite bank) provide a sense of place.

2. Contradicting the above, the developer's Heritage and Townscape Appraisal for the first application said the new development will provide the 'sense of place' and 'create new views' and a signage for people to navigate the area, in a development that is 'deliberately dense', with a scale that is 'deliberately more than that which exists at the moment in order to achieve important urban design objectives'. This suggests the dominance of the scheme, despite its conservation area setting.

#### BIODIVERSITY

According to the Local Development Document, the proposal should, '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.'

1. This part of the canal will lose its characteristically green nature, as the trees along the canal edge will be chopped down, with one 'feature tree' replacing the willow. There is no guarantee that landscaping on the development will be carried out or maintained.
2. The biodiversity of the Baynes Street Canalside Garden nature reserve will be affected by the overshadowing of the buildings, as well as the waterway itself.
3. Bats inhabit this section of the canal. They are mentioned in the Ecological Appraisal as having potential habitat here, but they are easy to see with the naked eye flying backwards and forwards at dusk. Lighting pollution from inside the proposed flats on the canal edge, as well as the light reflected on the canal water, could have a detrimental effect on the bat population.
4. The floating bird platforms in front of Bangor Wharf were removed ahead of submitting planning proposals in mid-February 2016. Previously, this was a prolific site for waterfowl and the developer has, by its own admission in the Statement of Community Involvement, cleansed the site of these birds and their breeding ground. The developer has deprived the local community, children and canal visitors of wildlife along this stretch of the canal. The platforms were removed illegally, as both London Wildlife Trust and the Canal and River Trust were unaware of their removal.

#### DESIGN

1. I would expect and hope the brick stock and design is of a high quality deserving of a conservation area, but there is no guarantee. DP24.12: 'Designs for new buildings... should respect the character and appearance of... neighbouring buildings. Within areas of distinctive character, development should reinforce those elements which create the character.'
2. The gap between the buildings proposes to allow good levels of sunlight and daylight to the water. It is clear from Transient Overshadowing Study in the Daylight and Sunlight Report that this is not the case.
3. The increase in height of the northern block will have a drastic effect regarding overshadowing as the site lies on the southern side of the canal. And it will dominate the adjacent historic warehouse at Eagle Wharf, at twice its height, while harming views of the building from the towpath, heading west.
4. The vertical cliff-like façades of the buildings on the canal edge will have a canyon-like effect. Tall

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

**Comment:**    **Response:**

buildings create wind tunnels and trap pollution. The latter is something good architecture and planning should be addressing at a time when we are facing a public health emergency through pollution.

#### BLUE RIBBON NETWORK POLICY

According to the Local Development Document, the proposal should, 'Take opportunities to utilise the canal for the transportation of goods and materials, both during construction and in the operations of the development.'

1. The Regent's Canal is part of the London Plan's Blue Ribbon Network policy. According to section 4C of the policy, '...policies should make the most of sustainable and efficient use of space in London, by protecting and enhancing the multi-functional nature of the Blue Ribbon Network so that it enables and supports those uses and activities that require a water or waterside location.' Canal-boat users have not been guaranteed a water tap and bin facilities. An original dock adjacent to Eagle Wharf could be restored for their use.

2. DP20.3 'The Regent's Canal provides the potential for more sustainable, lower impact waterborne movement of freight. It is the only navigable waterway in Camden...' With good road access, Bangor Wharf could be partly used for sustainable transport for goods, or kept for this use in the future. There should be a report as to the feasibility for delivering goods to shops, restaurants and bars along the canal, for example. Taking heavy goods vehicles off the roads and reducing pollution should be a priority, and the canal should be used during construction work. Royal College Street and Baynes Street are already suffering from increased levels of traffic congestion and pollution.

#### PUBLIC CONSULTATION

1. The developer provided no public consultation for this second proposal, even though it is classed as a major development, as they felt the changes 'did not represent a significant departure from the initial proposals'. However, an alternative design was provided, and the northern block increased in height by one floor. They posted feedback leaflets through some doors in the vicinity – although many flats on the Royal College Street did not receive them. I emailed my feedback to Curtin & Co and did not receive an acknowledgment.

2. The Statement of Community Involvement contains inaccuracies that are of significance. It says that height alteration 'means the tallest element of the proposal is located furthest away from Reachview Close'. However, the tallest element is now facing the middle of Reachview Close, creating an even worse situation regarding overshadowing of the canal water, towpath, nature reserve, and communal gardens.

#### Conclusion

The benefit of providing only 6 'affordable' homes does not outweigh the harm the development will do to this historic waterway and conservation area, nor does it do much for the 'much needed' housing issue. The nearby Barratt London development, Camden Courtyards, is currently advertising availability of two-bed flats from £755,000 to £947,500. This is an indication of local market rates and how unaffordable the flats will be at Bangor Wharf. I would like to see the homes go to junior doctors, teachers, nurses – those key workers who need to be near their place of work.

Rainbow Wave, which occupies the Victorian warehouse at 146 Royal College Street employs 50 people. It runs as a fashion showroom and studio, which requires natural light for its business. This is

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
					<p>the kind of creative business that the council should encourage to the area, as suggested in the Site Allocations document.</p> <p>The proposed development is too close to residential properties and its overdevelopment will have a devastating effect on the daylight and sunlight levels on the canal water and towpath. This will be an irreversible loss for future generations, for the Londoners and visitors who enjoy the canal and its towpath for leisure, and those who do not have balconies, terraces or communal roof gardens.</p> <p>The focus on taking height and massing away from Georgiana Street and St Pancras Way is detrimental to the canal, towpath and nature.</p> <p>Given the constraints of the site at Bangor Wharf, I would question whether this site is suitable for such intensive development. More thoughtful architecture could take away height, while still allowing public access to the canal edge, and in doing so put the courtyard space to better use.</p> <p>The proposed development only meets 50% of the Site Allocations guidelines, which were agreed through a public consultation process.</p> <p>The current developer has aggressive housing targets to meet, but Bangor Wharf, given its importance in the history of London canals and its conservation area status, needs a softer and more long-term approach to development.</p> <p>Despite it being rejected for 18 reasons, the developer has lodged an appeal against the rejection of their first proposal, which shows they are not serious about working with the council and local community to improve their plans.</p> <p>I would urge planners, councillors and those involved in the decision-making process to look at the negative effect this proposal will have on the canal, one of London's great assets and a place of public recreation, and to please consider my comments when you make your decision. At the very least, this development should match the height of adjacent buildings.</p> <p>Fiona Russell 26 Reachview Close London NW1 0TY</p>

---

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2017/1230/P	André Pinto	12a Reachview Close	10/04/2017 19:12:36	OBJ	<p>Greetings</p> <p>My name is Andre. I am a resident in Reachview Close.</p> <p>Upon viewing the plans for your project, I feel they are unacceptable. The size of the building will overwhelm the neighboring buildings and deprive them and the park of natural sunlight, as well as the natural obstruction to the views it will pose. It will carry significant costs on the park and wildlife adjacent to the canal.</p> <p>This not only affects the canalside's status but will also cause the existent buildings to lose value, thus greatly affecting the entire canalside desirabilty on the long term in favor of short term gains.</p> <p>I am strongly against this project going forward</p> <p>Regards</p> <p>André Pinto</p>

---

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2017/1230/P	Lester May	24 Reachview Close Camden Town London NW1 0TY	10/04/2017 16:51:39	OBJ	<p>A year has passed since the Camden New Journal reported on the planning application for housing at Bangor Wharf, by the Regent's Canal in Camden Town. A deeply flawed scheme, the paper also published letters from concerned locals. The application was rejected with fully eighteen points for developer One Housing to note.</p> <p>Residents adjacent to the site have recently received a glossy leaflet from One Housing, complementing its revised planning application 2017/1230/P.</p> <p>Serendipitously, I was reading the leaflet on the tube when a fellow passenger enquired about it and revealed he was a resident of a property in One Housing's portfolio. His reaction was interesting. He was clearly unimpressed by One Housing's failure to respond adequately to maintenance of their present housing stock. Poor landlords, regrettably, aren't news. We parted agreeing that it would be so much better were One Housing first to manage properly their current portfolio rather than extend themselves further with new properties, letting down potentially more people with their good words but inadequate deeds.</p> <p>The new plans, not very different from last year's, are extraordinary. Submitted originally to Camden Town Hall incomplete, it just confirms the incompetence of One Housing.</p> <p>The scale of the buildings proposed is quite out of keeping with the immediate area. Two stories higher than any nearby buildings, yet hardly set back from the canal, the planned edifices are of little architectural merit and will contribute to a corridor of shadow along the Regent's Canal, deleterious to flora and fauna. Indeed, the short stretch of the canal between two road bridges currently is open and sunny, popular with towpath users, but this development casts a shadow for users in future decades.</p> <p>Pity the residents of the Georgian terrace housing at 118-134 Royal College Street. Their back windows will be so close to the planned development that it'll be akin to a wartime blackout, permanently.</p> <p>One Housing ignores Camden Council's wish to "conserve and enhance the existing character of the canal" and its intention that "designs for new buildings ... should respect the character and appearance of the local area and neighbourhood ...". It's extraordinary that the company dares put forward this planning application.</p> <p>One Housing also makes much of creating a publically accessible space in and around the development. There is absolutely no such need. The towpath and the Regent's Canal itself are the principal amenity, the adjacent Gray's Inn Bridge carrying St Pancras Way has a large expanse of pavement that's perfect for enjoying the view from above and, of course, the beautifully tended St Martin's Gardens are two minutes' walk away.</p> <p>I don't deny the need for housing or, indeed, for commercial space affording employment. I do say that six stories are far too high whereas four stories would be compatible with the immediate area and reduce the impact of shadow.</p>

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
					<p>Only a developer could claim that the proposals are an improvement on the first application and that they will visually improve the area and enhance the canal!</p> <p>It's a pity, though, that further industrial use is not being considered for this particular site, its being so used for a century and more. London's population increases apace, the one-lane Royal College Street (the A5202) is often one long traffic jam, and yet we all expect more and timely home deliveries of online purchases. Thought must be given to future commercial use of the canals and space reserved for canalside warehousing.</p> <p>This revised planning application from One Housing must be rejected.</p>
2017/1230/P	Edward Lee	24 Bergholt Mews NW1 0BQ NW1 0BQ	10/04/2017 15:02:57	COMMNT	<p>We wish to raise our concerns about the proposed development of Bangor Wharf.</p> <p>We are not against a development in principle, as the site is clearly being inefficiently used at present, and there are many potential needs. However, we would oppose the application without satisfactory answers to the following points:</p> <p>(1) The height to the building - there needs to be a balance between development and the deprivation of light to the residents of Reachview Court, the many people who now use the canal as a route for commuting or leisure, and the Constitution pub and beer garden which is both a local amenity and a more widely known attraction.</p> <p>(2) Wildlife – the simple haven used by wildlife has been removed even before permission has been given to go ahead. This does not say much for the integrity of the developers. It would be a simple and cheap matter – and indeed an attraction for users of the new building if a simple wildlife haven on the lines of that next to the Camley Street Park were restored. Since it would be actually on the canal there would be no loss of ground for the development.</p> <p>(3) The greatest need locally is for housing to house young working people who have grown up here, but are being driven away by housing costs. This could still be profitable – many are young professionals – all that is needed is that the excess above costs and a reasonable profit – which will in fact be income for decades – be removed.</p> <p>(4) What provision is being made for the extra services which will be needed – for example, even buyers of new homes become sick at times.</p> <p>(5) The site is at a very awkward point on a busy road. We wish to be informed how the traffic which is needed during construction will be managed. At present the outlook seems to be months of disruption, which in the complex traffic system of Camden has in the past had huge knock-on effects back towards King's Cross, Camden Town and Kentish Town.</p>



Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2017/1230/P	Jeffrey Glass	60 Reachview Close Camden Town. London NW1 0TY	11/04/2017 16:18:41	OBJLETTE R	<p>Application Number2017/1230/P Tuesday, 11 April 2017 Dear Sir or Madam Re: Planning objection in respect to Application Number2017/1230/P Addresses: Bangor Wharf, Georgiana Street, London, NW1 0QS</p> <p>I wish to object strongly to the development the above planning application in Bangor Wharf The proposed development will result in a monolithic building which looks ugly, over-bearing, out-of-scale, and far out of character in respect to appearance compared with the character buildings in Georgiana Street and it neighbours. The building would have an adverse impact on the character of the neighbourhood</p> <p>Georgiana Street is a very small road built with an outstanding character. The through road cannot take any more traffic. it would be another accident waiting to happen because of the narrowness and the large development on the corner of such a small narrow street. Parking in Royal College Street and Georgiana Street is already a problem. There would be Insufficient parking space which will adversely affect the service of surrounding properties. Roadside parking on this narrow lane/busy junction would be a problem A residential feature, the loss of existing views from Reachview Close and neighbouring properties would be adversely affected. Not only will there be a loss of views, there would be a loss or privacy. Our flat and neighbouring properties will be overlooked by bedroom windows from the proposed building. To development does little to help meet the housing, and social requirements of the community. Affordable housing has been given little consideration in this development despite government guidelines/regulations. The splendour of Camden is being able to enjoy walks down the canal and enjoy the wildlife and open views. The blockage of light into the canal which will inevitably result should this monolithic development be allowed to proceed will harmfully affect wildlife habitats. The development does not in any way enhance the local environment Planning permission should be refused for reasons of poor design that fail to improve the character and quality of the neighbourhood and the way it functions. Therefore, I strongly oppose this planning application due to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Insufficient parking space will adversely affect the amenity of surrounding properties through roadside parking on this narrow lane/busy junction</li> <li>• The proposal could lead to vehicles overhanging the adopted highway verge/road to the detriment of other road users</li> <li>• Adverse effect on the residential amenity of neighbours, by reason of (among other factors) noise, disturbance, overlooking, loss of privacy, overshadowing etc., noise and disturbance arising from the actual execution of the works.</li> <li>• Highway safety. The development would adversely affect highway safety and the convenience of road users</li> <li>• Unacceptably high density/overdevelopment of the site</li> <li>• Objection to new dwellings when there is NO existing development.</li> <li>• Effect of the development on the character of the neighbourhood.</li> <li>• Design. The proposed development is over-bearing, out of scale, out of character in terms of its</li> </ul>

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
					<p>appearance compared with existing development in the locality.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Loss of existing views from the neighbouring properties would adversely affect the residential features of the owner/occupiers.</li> <li>• The proposed development would result in an unacceptable loss of privacy, adversely affecting the amenities enjoyed by the occupier of the adjacent dwelling house</li> <li>• The mass, bulk and proximity of the side elevation would present an overbearing and intrusive element to those neighbours opposite the property.</li> <li>• The proposed development would result in an unacceptable loss of light, adversely affecting the amenities enjoyed by residents of Camden and it visitors to the canal, and in addition the loss of light will adversely affect wildlife</li> <li>• The proposed development would result in an unacceptable loss of privacy, adversely affecting the amenities enjoyed by the occupier of neighbouring dwellings</li> <li>• The proposed development by reason of its size, depth, width, height and massing would have an unacceptably adverse impact on the amenities of the properties immediately adjacent to the site and the surrounding area by reason of overlooking, loss of privacy and visually overbearing impact</li> </ul> <p>I sincerely hope, this time, you take my comments into consideration and hopefully we will have a satisfactory outcome resulting in the planning application being opposed.</p> <p>Sincerely,</p> <p>Jeff Glass</p>

---

2017/1230/P	Paul Shearsmith	54 Falkland Road Kentish Town London	11/04/2017 15:34:48	OBJ	<p>I fail to see how anybody can describe this revised plan as an improvement on the last one, Once again the developers are trying to shoehorn an oversized ugly block into a purpose-built access point that could - and should - be used for road-to-water transfers. I hope the council rejects this swiftly before we all incur pointless costs. If the developers are not interested in helping to revive the canal then I think they should exercise their vandalism elsewhere.</p>
-------------	-----------------	--	---------------------	-----	--

---