

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2017/3847/P	Philippa Nelson	31 Princess Road London NW1 8JR	13/08/2017 22:15:55	OBJ	<p>Planning application Morrisons Superstore &amp; Camden Goods Yard Chalk Farm</p> <p>I am writing to object to the application for the Morrison Site redevelopment in its current form.</p> <p>The number of parking spaces (300) to be provided for shoppers at the Morrisons superstore is not in line with Camden and Transport for London policy to reduce the use of private motor vehicles because of the damage they cause to the environment, the health of citizens and the freedom of movement and safety of people not using cars, and to those walking or cycling. The location of the site means that the pollution produced by cars driven to the superstore is very likely to damage the health of the large numbers of visitors to Camden Market and reduce their enjoyment by restricting their movement around the area, as well as to the residents of the proposed accommodation on the site.</p> <p>Although there is no provision for resident parking it is nevertheless likely that inhabitants of the proposed development will also own cars; this will put pressure on surrounding parking elsewhere in the local area, further increase congestion and adversely affect the smooth running of local transport links and safety of cyclists, again negatively impacting on the successful implementation of Camden and Transport for London travel policy.</p> <p>The limited access to the site will further increase congestion in the local area, and does not provide for safe cycling or walking pathways to access the site.</p> <p>I make this point despite the current existence on the site of a large superstore with somewhat more parking provision (425 spaces). Since planning permission was given for the current superstore ?Camden Market has expanded very substantially, resulting in a correspondingly huge increase in the number of pedestrian visitors. ?Our understanding and knowledge of the health and environmental impact of motor vehicles has greatly increased and has been transformed since then and Camden policy on highway planning</p>

---

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2017/3847/P	Dominic Leggett	32 Belsize Park NW3 4DX	13/08/2017 14:45:29	COMMNT	<p>I support Camden Cycle Campaign"s position on this development, outlined below.</p> <p>There is an opportunity here for Camden to think carefully about how to work with developers to provide a mixed development that offers the fullest possible opportunity for active transport, particularly the use of electric bikes and cargo bikes for local shopping trips. These comments are from Camden Cycling Campaign, the local borough group of London Cycling Campaign (LCC). We represent the interests of cyclists living or working in the borough of Camden. We have discussed the consultation with our members and others on CycleScape.</p> <p>Our main position We believe that the application should be rejected. The number of parking spaces (300) to be provided for shoppers at the Morrisons superstore is inconsistent with Camden and Transport for London policy to reduce the use of private motor vehicles because of the damage they cause to the environment, the health of citizens and the freedom of movement and safety of people not using cars. The location of the site means that the pollution produced by cars driven to the superstore is very likely to damage the health of the large numbers of visitors to Camden Market and reduce their enjoyment by restricting their movement around the area. This makes the site unsuitable for this type of development. We take this position notwithstanding the current existence on the site of a large superstore with somewhat more parking provision (425 spaces) because since planning permission was given for the current superstore: Camden Market has expanded very substantially, resulting in a correspondingly huge increase in the number of pedestrian visitors. Our understanding of the health and environmental impact of motor vehicles has been transformed since then and Camden policy on highway planning and car use has changed as a result.</p> <p>Other comments We support the intention to maintain and improve the cycle route linking Gilbey's Yard to Chalk Farm Road, but aspects of the road designs are a cause for serious concern. The drawings do not appear to reflect the claim in the ENVIRONMENTAL STATEMENT NON-TECHNICAL SUMMARY, para 4.23: Cyclists would access the proposed development on the MS parcel using a segregated cycle path from Chalk Farm Road, following the same route as vehicles along Stephenson Street In that only a very short section of separate cycle track is shown at the junction with Chalk Farm Road and the layout shows that even that section of track involves a major risk of left-hook collisions for cyclists with left-turning vehicles exiting the site. It is essential that the design of the Chalk Farm Road/Stephenson Street/Ferdinand Street junction is fully reviewed and approved for cycling safety by Camden highway planners in consultation with Camden Cycling Campaign. The pedestrian entry from Chalk Farm Road north of the service station should be a</p>

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
					<p>shared-use path, enabling people on bikes to access Stephenson Street, the superstore and Gilbey's Yard from the north without passing through the potentially busy signalised junction. This statement also in para 4.23:</p> <p>As the centre of the proposed development would be pedestrian only, cyclists would be required to dismount before continuing on the proposed development.</p> <p>Is very unsatisfactory. It would severely deter the use of bicycles for transport by residents, their visitors and others. It isn't clear to us where the cycle parking for supermarket customers is located but it is essential that access to it should be safe and unencumbered. Note that special cycles and human-powered vehicles are commonly used by people with physical disabilities, parents transporting young children and for delivery purposes. All of the cycling provision should be designed with them in mind.</p> <p>Access to Gilbeys Yard and Oval Road: there is currently a cycle track from the Morrisons car park to Gilbeys Yard and through it to Oval Road. The track is unsatisfactory in several ways and this has a deterrent effect on its use:</p> <p>The access from the Morrisons car park is severely obstructed by bollards designed to prevent the theft of trolleys. It is completely impassable to non-standard cycles and it causes major inconvenience even to those on conventional bicycles.</p> <p>The cycle access from Oval Road through Gilbey's Yard is difficult because there are no parking restrictions in place to prevent obstruction of the existing cycle track, which is a frequent occurrence, and because the uneven track is narrow and often completely obstructed by pools of water. We suggest that the applicant be required to upgrade this track under a Section 106 agreement.</p> <p>A11 - Construction Management Plan: CMP states that working hours to be 8-6 M-F and 8-1 Sat with up to 60 vehicles per day, all to come and go via Chalk Farm Road (huge impact on residents). Deliveries to be "encouraged" to use 10-4. Could this be strengthened to say deliveries 10-4 unless pre-advertised and unavoidable?</p> <p>CMP states lorries to meet FORS and CLOCS. The FORS level is not specified, it should be Silver or Gold.</p>

---

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2017/3847/P	Guy Morley	Flat 9 30 Oval Road London NW1 7DE	13/08/2017 19:34:41	OBJ	<p>My interest in the application is by virtue of owning an apartment in the Henson building which is adjacent to the proposed development on the south side near the Interchange Building.</p> <p>There are a number of concerns with the proposals:</p> <p><b>Building Height</b> The heights of the proposed buildings are not contiguous with the local context and character of the area. The Henson is 6 stories high, which is typical of the maximum height of buildings in the area. The proposals are for a number of buildings which significantly exceed this: A (14 floors), C (10 floors), E1 (11 floors), F (9 floors).</p> <p>We are in agreement with the Design Review Panel of 02/12/2016, as shown on Page 40 of the Camden Goods Yard Planning Statement submitted with the planning application: "Panel suggest a shoulder height of 5 to 7 storeys, rising to 9 stories in one of two key locations would be more appropriate in this location."</p> <p>Applying this to the proposed development, we submit that the heights of the buildings should be amended as follows: E1: 11 to 6 floors. This building is in close proximity to the Henson which is 6 floors, and also the Interchange building. C: 10 to 6/7 floors. 10 floors towers above the Interchange building. F: 9 to 8 floors. As this is more central in the new village and is set back, a higher building may be possible without detriment to the surrounding area. A: 14 to 9 floors. As this is the most set back building, this could accommodate the highest building as recommended by the Design Review Panel of 9 floors. This is also the maximum height of building in the new Hawley Wharf development.</p> <p><b>Impact of Building Works</b> As this is a major project, the building works will take an extended number of years which will adversely affect the local community. Hence the utmost effort should be made to reduce the impact on local residents in terms of noise, pollution, and traffic. For example: - staging the building works: the plan envisions the petrol station being converted in the first stage to a temporary supermarket. Hence it makes sense to stage the works so that building commences in the north side of the development, and gradually works its way down so that the time during which major works are conducted adjacent to the buildings on the south side are limited; - erection of large hoardings to limit the impact of noise and pollution. There are many people who work from home, and also disabled people in the building, so solely limiting building works to the working day will not suffice in this instance, and hence extra measures are needed; - guarantee that Oval Road/Gilbey"s Yard will not be used for site access during development.</p>

Post development traffic

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2017/3847/P	Sarah Rosearne	41 Yerbury Rd	13/08/2017 20:59:55	COMMNT	<p>The traffic impact on Oval Road/Gilbey"s Yard is a concern. Since the site is essentially a car free zone, the impacts of concern are from taxi"s, and van and motorbike deliveries.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Taxis: even though the plan contains taxi pick up points on Stephenson Street on the north side of the development, in practice residents and office workers in the southern buildings will prefer to be picked up from the Gilbey"s Yard access point as it is a shorter walk for them. This will cause congestion in this small area. Measures to stop this being the case should be stipulated in the plan. Reducing the building height of E1 to 6 floors as described in the building heights section, which is nearest Gilbey"s Yard entrance, will help in this regard.</li> <li>- Van deliveries: since the concierge desk is located near the Gilbey"s Yard entrance, drivers may be tempted to temporary park there, and walk the short distance to the concierge deal in building E1, rather than drive all the way round and enter via Stephenson Street. Moving the concierge from E1 to, for example, building A, seems sensible and will reduce this considerably.</li> <li>- Motorbike deliveries: motorbikes will no doubt try to enter through the Gilbey"s Yard entrance, especially as the concierge is located in building E1 which is near the Gilbey"s Yard entrance. Again, moving the concierge to building A, will reduce this considerably. Further measures to dissuade motorbikes from entering through this pedestrian/cycle zone should be stipulated, which could turn into an accident hotspot.</li> </ul>
					<p>I consider that the proposed development will be of little value to Camden Residents or to visitors and other users of the area.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. No guarantee that Social Housing will actually be supplied as promised. This at a premium in Camden.</li> <li>2. Little evidence that congestion will not be made worse by extra traffic during the works. A similar development of a Morrisons site in London took 10 years to complete.</li> <li>3. Access is hazardous now, but will be made worse by construction traffic. There appears to be little consideration of the effect on pedestrian &amp; cycle use around Camden Market, Stables Market &amp; The Roundhouse. This has markedly increased since the original Safeway site was built.</li> <li>4. Air Quality will be further compromised as the existing cycle route will be disrupted &amp; walking made more difficult. Access through the site will not be possible, so users will be unable to use it as a quietway or short cut to avoid traffic fumes. No mention is made of the use of alternative types of vehicles for construction &amp; deliveries.</li> <li>5. Once completed, the provision of residential parking and spaces for shoppers will encourage the use of private cars in an area with excellent public transport. I believe this goes against Camden Council's attempts to restrict inclusion of space for cars in new developments.</li> <li>6. In general, I am convinced that the main stimulus for the planned development is profit and that it will have an adverse effect on local infrastructure, health &amp; social well-being.</li> </ol>

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2017/3847/P	Michael Goldman	43 The Henson Building 30 Oval Road London NW1 7DE	11/08/2017 10:37:03	COMMNT	<p>My interest in the application is by virtue of owning an apartment in the Henson building which is adjacent to the proposed development on the south side near the Interchange Building.</p> <p>There are a number of concerns with the proposals:</p> <p><b>Building Height</b></p> <p>The heights of the proposed buildings are not contiguous with the local context and character of the area. The Henson is 6 stories high, which is typical of the maximum height of buildings in the area. The proposals are for a number of buildings which significantly exceed this: A (14 floors), C (10 floors), E1 (11 floors), F (9 floors).</p> <p>We are in agreement with the Design Review Panel of 02/12/2016, as shown on Page 40 of the Camden Goods Yard Planning Statement submitted with the planning application: "Panel suggest a shoulder height of 5 to 7 storeys, rising to 9 stories in one of two key locations would be more appropriate in this location."</p> <p>Applying this to the proposed development, we submit that the heights of the buildings should be amended as follows:</p> <p>E1: 11 to 6 floors. This building is in close proximity to the Henson which is 6 floors, and also the Interchange building.</p> <p>C: 10 to 6/7 floors. 10 floors towers above the Interchange building.</p> <p>F: 9 to 8 floors. As this is more central in the new village and is set back, a higher building may be possible without detriment to the surrounding area.</p> <p>A: 14 to 9 floors. As this is the most set back building, this could accommodate the highest building as recommended by the Design Review Panel of 9 floors. This is also the maximum height of building in the new Hawley Wharf development.</p> <p><b>Impact of Building Works</b></p> <p>As this is a major project, the building works will take an extended number of years which will adversely affect the local community. Hence the utmost effort should be made to reduce the impact on local residents in terms of noise, pollution, and traffic. For example:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- staging the building works: the plan envisions the petrol station being converted in the first stage to a temporary supermarket. Hence it makes sense to stage the works so that building commences in the north side of the development, and gradually works its way down so that the time during which major works are conducted adjacent to the buildings on the south side are limited;</li> <li>- erection of large hoardings to limit the impact of noise and pollution. There are many people who work from home, and also disabled people in the building, so solely limiting building works to the working day will not suffice in this instance, and hence extra measures are needed;</li> <li>- guarantee that Oval Road/Gilbey's Yard will not be used for site access during development.</li> </ul> <p>Post development traffic</p>

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
					<p>The traffic impact on Oval Road/Gilbey's Yard is a concern. Since the site is essentially a car free zone, the impacts of concern are from taxi's, and van and motorbike deliveries.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>- Taxis: even though the plan contains taxi pick up points on Stephenson Street on the north side of the development, in practice residents and office workers in the southern buildings will prefer to be picked up from the Gilbey's Yard access point as it is a shorter walk for them. This will cause congestion in this small area. Measures to stop this being the case should be stipulated in the plan. Reducing the building height of E1 to 6 floors as described in the building heights section, which is nearest Gilbey's Yard entrance, will help in this regard.</li><li>- Van deliveries: since the concierge desk is located near the Gilbey's Yard entrance, drivers may be tempted to temporary park there, and walk the short distance to the concierge deal in building E1, rather than drive all the way round and enter via Stephenson Street. Moving the concierge from E1 to, for example, building A, seems sensible and will reduce this considerably.</li><li>- Motorbike deliveries: motorbikes will no doubt try to enter through the Gilbey's Yard entrance, especially as the concierge is located in building E1 which is near the Gilbey's Yard entrance. Again, moving the concierge to building A, will reduce this considerably. Further measures to dissuade motorbikes from entering through this pedestrian/cycle zone should be stipulated, which could turn into an accident hotspot.</li></ul>

---

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2017/3847/P	Henry De'Ath	7 Fairfield Road Winchester SO22 6SF	13/08/2017 13:57:07	OBJ	<p>My interest in the application is by virtue of owning an apartment in the Henson building which is adjacent to the proposed development on the south side near the Interchange Building.</p> <p>There are a number of concerns with the proposals:</p> <p><b>Building Height</b></p> <p>The heights of the proposed buildings are not contiguous with the local context and character of the area. The Henson is 6 stories high, which is typical of the maximum height of buildings in the area. The proposals are for a number of buildings which significantly exceed this: A (14 floors), C (10 floors), E1 (11 floors), F (9 floors).</p> <p>We are in agreement with the Design Review Panel of 02/12/2016, as shown on Page 40 of the Camden Goods Yard Planning Statement submitted with the planning application: "Panel suggest a shoulder height of 5 to 7 storeys, rising to 9 stories in one of two key locations would be more appropriate in this location."</p> <p>Applying this to the proposed development, we submit that the heights of the buildings should be amended as follows:</p> <p>E1: 11 to 6 floors. This building is in close proximity to the Henson which is 6 floors, and also the Interchange building.</p> <p>C: 10 to 6/7 floors. 10 floors towers above the Interchange building.</p> <p>F: 9 to 8 floors. As this is more central in the new village and is set back, a higher building may be possible without detriment to the surrounding area.</p> <p>A: 14 to 9 floors. As this is the most set back building, this could accommodate the highest building as recommended by the Design Review Panel of 9 floors. This is also the maximum height of building in the new Hawley Wharf development.</p> <p><b>Impact of Building Works</b></p> <p>As this is a major project, the building works will take an extended number of years which will adversely affect the local community. Hence the utmost effort should be made to reduce the impact on local residents in terms of noise, pollution, and traffic. For example:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- staging the building works: the plan envisions the petrol station being converted in the first stage to a temporary supermarket. Hence it makes sense to stage the works so that building commences in the north side of the development, and gradually works its way down so that the time during which major works are conducted adjacent to the buildings on the south side are limited;</li> <li>- erection of large hoardings to limit the impact of noise and pollution. There are many people who work from home, and also disabled people in the building, so solely limiting building works to the working day will not suffice in this instance, and hence extra measures are needed;</li> <li>- guarantee that Oval Road/Gilbey"s Yard will not be used for site access during development.</li> </ul> <p><b>Post development traffic</b></p>



Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
					<p>The traffic impact on Oval Road/Gilbey"s Yard is a concern. Since the site is essentially a car free zone, the impacts of concern are from taxi"s, and van and motorbike deliveries.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>- Taxis: even though the plan contains taxi pick up points on Stephenson Street on the north side of the development, in practice residents and office workers in the southern buildings will prefer to be picked up from the Gilbey"s Yard access point as it is a shorter walk for them. This will cause congestion in this small area. Measures to stop this being the case should be stipulated in the plan. Reducing the building height of E1 to 6 floors as described in the building heights section, which is nearest Gilbey"s Yard entrance, will help in this regard.</li><li>- Van deliveries: since the concierge desk is located near the Gilbey"s Yard entrance, drivers may be tempted to temporary park there, and walk the short distance to the concierge deal in building E1, rather than drive all the way round and enter via Stephenson Street. Moving the concierge from E1 to, for example, building A, seems sensible and will reduce this considerably.</li><li>- Motorbike deliveries: motorbikes will no doubt try to enter through the Gilbey"s Yard entrance, especially as the concierge is located in building E1 which is near the Gilbey"s Yard entrance. Again, moving the concierge to building A, will reduce this considerably. Further measures to dissuade motorbikes from entering through this pedestrian/cycle zone should be stipulated, which could turn into an accident hotspot.</li></ul>

---

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2017/3847/P	Boris Ivesha	Flat 46 The Henson 30 Oval Rd London NW17DE	11/08/2017 12:25:57	OBJ	<p>My interest in the application is by virtue of owning an apartment in the Henson building which is adjacent to the proposed development on the south side near the Interchange Building.</p> <p>There are a number of concerns with the proposals:</p> <p><b>Building Height</b> The heights of the proposed buildings are not contiguous with the local context and character of the area. The Henson is 6 stories high, which is typical of the maximum height of buildings in the area. The proposals are for a number of buildings which significantly exceed this: A (14 floors), C (10 floors), E1 (11 floors), F (9 floors).</p> <p>We are in agreement with the Design Review Panel of 02/12/2016, as shown on Page 40 of the Camden Goods Yard Planning Statement submitted with the planning application: "Panel suggest a shoulder height of 5 to 7 storeys, rising to 9 stories in one of two key locations would be more appropriate in this location."</p> <p>Applying this to the proposed development, we submit that the heights of the buildings should be amended as follows: E1: 11 to 6 floors. This building is in close proximity to the Henson which is 6 floors, and also the Interchange building. C: 10 to 6/7 floors. 10 floors towers above the Interchange building. F: 9 to 8 floors. As this is more central in the new village and is set back, a higher building may be possible without detriment to the surrounding area. A: 14 to 9 floors. As this is the most set back building, this could accommodate the highest building as recommended by the Design Review Panel of 9 floors. This is also the maximum height of building in the new Hawley Wharf development.</p> <p><b>Impact of Building Works</b> As this is a major project, the building works will take an extended number of years which will adversely affect the local community. Hence the utmost effort should be made to reduce the impact on local residents in terms of noise, pollution, and traffic. For example: - staging the building works: the plan envisions the petrol station being converted in the first stage to a temporary supermarket. Hence it makes sense to stage the works so that building commences in the north side of the development, and gradually works its way down so that the time during which major works are conducted adjacent to the buildings on the south side are limited; - erection of large hoardings to limit the impact of noise and pollution. There are many people who work from home, and also disabled people in the building, so solely limiting building works to the working day will not suffice in this instance, and hence extra measures are needed; - guarantee that Oval Road/Gilbey's Yard will not be used for site access during development.</p> <p>Post development traffic</p>

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
					<p>The traffic impact on Oval Road/Gilbey's Yard is a concern. Since the site is essentially a car free zone, the impacts of concern are from taxi's, and van and motorbike deliveries.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Taxis: even though the plan contains taxi pick up points on Stephenson Street on the north side of the development, in practice residents and office workers in the southern buildings will prefer to be picked up from the Gilbey's Yard access point as it is a shorter walk for them. This will cause congestion in this small area. Measures to stop this being the case should be stipulated in the plan. Reducing the building height of E1 to 6 floors as described in the building heights section, which is nearest Gilbey's Yard entrance, will help in this regard.</li> <li>- Van deliveries: since the concierge desk is located near the Gilbey's Yard entrance, drivers may be tempted to temporary park there, and walk the short distance to the concierge deal in building E1, rather than drive all the way round and enter via Stephenson Street. Moving the concierge from E1 to, for example, building A, seems sensible and will reduce this considerably.</li> <li>- Motorbike deliveries: motorbikes will no doubt try to enter through the Gilbey's Yard entrance, especially as the concierge is located in building E1 which is near the Gilbey's Yard entrance. Again, moving the concierge to building A, will reduce this considerably. Further measures to dissuade motorbikes from entering through this pedestrian/cycle zone should be stipulated, which could turn into an accident hotspot.</li> </ul>

We believe the proposed development is just too high for the area, there does not exist any building of this height therefore it is NOT keeping with the area and should not be allowed.

2017/3847/P	Gopa Roy & Charles Robertson	3 Rothwell Street NW1 8YH	11/08/2017 21:59:46	OBJ	<p>It's good to see a substantial housing development in Camden and the site was clearly suitable for re-development.</p> <p>It's crucial that whatever happens, there's a substantial element of affordable housing this must under no circumstances be diminished.</p> <p>We have serious concerns about the high-rise nature of the development. This is not in keeping with the surroundings and will have a serious visual impact seen from anywhere. In particular it willy destroy the profile view of The Roundhouse, a monument of world significance.</p> <p>In terms of housing, there is a strong case for low or mid-rise density housing, other than tower blocks.</p>
2017/3847/P	John Ackers	40 Highbury Grove N5 2AG	12/08/2017 18:23:10	OBJEMAIL	<p>I just want to query the size of the store car park. 300 spaces seems a lot for an inner London store and will encourage journeys by car. I appreciate that Camden's hands are partially tied by government but there should be a separate parking charge which ALL drivers (except disabled) have to pay, regardless of what they have bought in the store, to discourage driving to the store. If the parking reaches 90% full, introduce some kind of surcharge added.. OK this is a dramatic option but size of the car parking needs to be reduced some creative thinking is needed.</p>

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2017/3847/P	Richenda Walford	1 Crestfield Street WC1H 8AT WC1H 8AT	12/08/2017 11:22:06	OBJ	This area is inappropriate for a development with 300 parking spaces. Public transport options are excellent so there is no need at all for any parking other than for the disabled. We now know that traffic causes dangerous pollution as well as congestion and danger for anyone else trying to use the public space. Camden Market attracts large numbers of pedestrians and their well-being should take precedence.
2017/3847/P	Ianthe McWilliams	Chairman of Friends of Regents Park & Primrose Hill 18 Kent Terrace London nw1 4rp	16/08/2017 19:35:21	OBJ	<p>The Friends of Regents Park &amp; Primrose Hill have strong objections to the proposed development to the extent that the two proposed towers would interrupt views outwards from the Regents Park and Primrose Hill ( as illustrated by the applicants's view 10. the Park is a listed grade 1 landscape, which was developed by Nash. It is an integral part of its heritage value that views from the park to the north should provide uninterrupted views to the green spaces of Highgate and Hampstead.</p> <p>Any encroachment of high buildings to the North of the Park will spoil the heritage views, which are part of the tranquil value of the Park to current park users.</p> <p>The Regents Park Conservation Area Advisory Committee has commented in detail with historical references, and this objection should be taken to endorse and include those details.</p>

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2017/3847/P	Philippa Nelson	31 Princess Road London NW1 8JR	13/08/2017 22:17:24	OBJ	<p>Planning application Morrisons Superstore &amp; Camden Goods Yard Chalk Farm</p> <p>I am writing to object to the application for the Morrison Site redevelopment in its current form.</p> <p>The number of parking spaces (300) to be provided for shoppers at the Morrisons superstore is not in line with Camden and Transport for London policy to reduce the use of private motor vehicles because of the damage they cause to the environment, the health of citizens and the freedom of movement and safety of people not using cars, and to those walking or cycling. The location of the site means that the pollution produced by cars driven to the superstore is very likely to damage the health of the large numbers of visitors to Camden Market and reduce their enjoyment by restricting their movement around the area, as well as to the residents of the proposed accommodation on the site.</p> <p>Although there is no provision for resident parking it is nevertheless likely that inhabitants of the proposed development will also own cars; this will put pressure on surrounding parking elsewhere in the local area, further increase congestion and adversely affect the smooth running of local transport links and safety of cyclists, again negatively impacting on the successful implementation of Camden and Transport for London travel policy.</p> <p>The limited access to the site will further increase congestion in the local area, and does not provide for safe cycling or walking pathways to access the site.</p> <p>I make this point despite the current existence on the site of a large superstore with somewhat more parking provision (425 spaces). Since planning permission was given for the current superstore ?Camden Market has expanded very substantially, resulting in a correspondingly huge increase in the number of pedestrian visitors. ?Our understanding and knowledge of the health and environmental impact of motor vehicles has greatly increased and has been transformed since then and Camden policy on highway planning</p>

---

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2017/3847/P	Philippa Nelson	31 Princess Road London NW1 8JR	13/08/2017 22:35:18	OBJ	<p>Planning application Morrisons Superstore &amp; Camden Goods Yard Chalk Farm</p> <p>I am writing to object to the application for the Morrison Site redevelopment in its current form.</p> <p>The number of parking spaces (300) to be provided for shoppers at the Morrisons superstore is not in line with Camden and Transport for London policy to reduce the use of private motor vehicles because of the damage they cause to the environment, the health of citizens and the freedom of movement and safety of people not using cars. The location of the site means that the pollution produced by cars driven to the superstore is very likely to damage the health of the large numbers of visitors to Camden Market and reduce their enjoyment by restricting their movement around the area, as well as to the residents of the proposed accommodation on the site.</p> <p>Although there is no provision for resident parking it is nevertheless likely that inhabitants of the proposed development will also own cars; this will put pressure on surrounding parking elsewhere in the local area, further increase congestion and adversely affect the smooth running of local transport links and safety of cyclists, again negatively impacting on the successful implementation of Camden and Transport for London travel policy.</p> <p>The limited access to the site will further increase congestion in the local area, and does not provide a safe cycling pathway to access the site.</p> <p>I make this point despite the current existence on the site of a large superstore with somewhat more parking provision (425 spaces). Since planning permission was given for the current superstore ?Camden Market has expanded very substantially, resulting in a correspondingly huge increase in the number of pedestrian visitors. ?Our understanding of the health and environmental impact of motor vehicles has been transformed since then and Camden policy on highway planning and car use has changed as a result.</p> <p>Additionally, plans for a 14-story redevelopmen</p>

---

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2017/3847/P	Martin Nelson	Martin Nelson 31 Princess Road London NW1 8JR	13/08/2017 22:22:49	OBJ	<p>Planning application Morrisons Superstore &amp; Camden Goods Yard Chalk Farm</p> <p>I am writing to object to the application for the Morrison Site redevelopment in its current form.</p> <p>The number of parking spaces (300) to be provided for shoppers at the Morrisons superstore is not in line with Camden and Transport for London policy to reduce the use of private motor vehicles because of the damage they cause to the environment, the health of citizens and the freedom of movement and safety of people not using cars, and to those walking or cycling. The location of the site means that the pollution produced by cars driven to the superstore is very likely to damage the health of the large numbers of visitors to Camden Market and reduce their enjoyment by restricting their movement around the area, as well as to the residents of the proposed accommodation on the site.</p> <p>Although there is no provision for resident parking it is nevertheless likely that inhabitants of the proposed development will also own cars; this will put pressure on surrounding parking elsewhere in the local area, further increase congestion and adversely affect the smooth running of local transport links and safety of cyclists, again negatively impacting on the successful implementation of Camden and Transport for London travel policy.</p> <p>The limited access to the site will further increase congestion in the local area, and does not provide for safe cycling or walking pathways to access the site.</p> <p>I make this point despite the current existence on the site of a large superstore with somewhat more parking provision (425 spaces). Since planning permission was given for the current superstore ?Camden Market has expanded very substantially, resulting in a correspondingly huge increase in the number of pedestrian visitors. ?Our understanding and knowledge of the health and environmental impact of motor vehicles has greatly increased and has been transformed since then and Camden policy on highway planning</p>
2017/3847/P	Amanda Dickins	Flat 76 Primrose Hill Court King Henry's Road	13/08/2017 21:30:23	COMMNT	<p>Too many car parking spaces with not enough consideration of pressure on surrounding roads which are already too busy.</p> <p>Not impressed by poor cycle access - no good having all those cycle parking spaces if the access to them isn't safe, ideally segregated.</p> <p>I am a local resident and his is my nearest supermarket -- but I don't use it very often because the existing access to Morrisons is designed around cars but is very unsafe / intimidating as a cyclist or a pedestrian (I've tried both, many times).</p> <p>Fewer people are using cars to go to the supermarket for big shops these days -- people shop online and get it delivered. The Morrisons car park rarely had very many cars in it...</p>

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2017/3847/P	P J White	45 Princess Road NW1 8JS London	13/08/2017 11:51:16	OBJ	To: Gavin Sexton, Development Management, Camden Town Hall, Judd Street, WC1H 9JE.  Re application 2017/3847/P.

I wish to object to the above application for the following reasons:

1. Although Barratts do appear to have consulted the local community since summer 2016, I believe these consultations were a sham. The main concession, that of lowering the highest building from seventeen storeys to fourteen (with the three lost storeys being distributed to other buildings in the plan) may have been a negotiating ploy. The majority of the plan is much the same as first presented by Barratts and just as undesirable. They had a vision at the start which would not have been appropriate to the local environment or acceptable to the community and they have in the main persevered with it.

2. The scale, mass, and bulk of the proposals have a harmful impact on heritage, on the Listed Buildings, on the railway heritage, on the Chalk Farm Road and its character and in particular on the Interchange Building and Roundhouse. This is largely due to the height of buildings in the plan, to the narrow spaces between buildings ( these seem not to exceed 14m wide even in the main arteries, whereas the norm is 18m in width) and to the layout of the site in terms of the sense of place but also of the practical issues of living and working safely, securely and happily in the area.

3. The scale of the proposed high buildings would destroy one of the key characteristics of the area, which is that the historic industrial buildings are dominant. This is partly a matter of the scale of the historic industrial buildings, but also their forms and roof lines. Both the Interchange Building and the Roundhouse have instantly recognizable, iconic forms. They give real character and identity to the immediate area. This is key to the significance of the area and of its relationship to the surrounding areas and to the range of heritage assets they include. This significance would be harmed by the proposals.

4. The height of the buildings in the plan are also harmful in long views of heritage assets across the site and from within the site. Views from streets and vantage points in the Primrose Hill CA (Princess Road, Edis Street, Oval Road, St Mark's Square, King Henry's Road, the pedestrian bridge by the Pembroke pub, Regents Park Road, the top of Primrose Hill, etc) would also be radically altered, which is unacceptable. The Roundhouse in particular is one building of which the views must be preserved. The iconic view of it, from Haverstock Hill, at about the Eton Road junction, is one which would be blocked by the proposed new buildings. This blocking must be avoided. The images of these views in the application may well be deceptive so the Council should insist on independently produced views.

5. The three open spaces in the plans are also a problem. They are alien in appearance and open to abuse. In particular Market Square/Goods Yard Place is open to the Chalk Farm



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

Road and the applicants seem unable to accept that the night-time entertainment on the Chalk Farm Road is often characterised by immense crowds, drunkenness and other anti-social behaviour, as was the neighbouring area of Hawley Wharf (before it became a building site). This can easily be witnessed by a night-time visit on a Thursday, Friday or at the weekend. The open access to this area in front of the new supermarket will become a haven for anyone on the Chalk Farm Road wanting a dark corner, a hidden drug space or a urinal. This may force Morrisons to gate the open space in the future which is not desirable. The Design & Access Statement (DAS) also now describes this as a civic space, something it is patently not and is not capable of becoming, given the above. It seems the applicants want us to think they are giving us more public space but these spaces are not really desirable open public space but merely space full of potential problems.

4. The DAS also states that the setting of the listed Interchange building will be improved by the space in front of it adjacent to this new development. This is patently absurd as the space will be hedged in with high buildings and, as stated above, will be harmed by this plan.

5. The proposed new Chalk Farm Road building/petrol station is too high for this street which is modest in character. It is misconceived in scale and form, and very harmful to the heritage assets on which it would impinge. The architect for this building said at the presentation that traditional late-nineteenth-century corner buildings offered models for this location. By showing rounded turreted buildings such as the Boston Arms and the Assembly Rooms, he stated that this building would echo that corner treatment. Not only is it impossible to see any such similarities here but the high corner buildings shown were characteristic of urban centres – town centres and High Streets – for example Britannia Junction on Camden High Street. What is critical about the Chalk Farm Road is that it was not a High Street but the road to Hampstead. It is characterised by retail buildings which were built on the front gardens of modest, two- or three-storey houses. It is this modest scale and character which, by contrast, helps give the comparatively massive railway buildings their significance. It is why contemporaries could see the railway buildings built in this area as comparable with the great buildings of antiquity. This proposal is seriously harmful to the nearby heritage assets.

7. The winter garden building on the front of the proposed new Chalk Farm Road building/petrol station is a specious example of the arguments expressed by the architect in 6 above. It is too high, much higher than the proposed new supermarket building/petrol station, which is in itself too high, for no apparent reason. The lettering of 'Juniper' on the front is a mystery. The transparency of it is pointless where it looks into the proposed new building's offices and where it towers above the building, it shows a good view of sky and clouds, again pointless. It is not a landmark, it has nothing to recommend it and does not form a good corner building on the streetscape. As an architectural fancy, it is extremely self-indulgent. It is particularly obtrusive and easily seen obscuring the skyline from points in the Primrose Hill CA and does harm to the CA. This building should be abandoned forthwith.

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
					<p>8. The pedestrian entry to the site off Oval Road, currently a bit over 4m wide, should be preserved. There is a dangerous view expressed in Appendix A of the DAS under the heading of 'future proofing' which suggests that this opening might be enlarged in future, with reference to future development of Gilbey's Yard by One Housing, presumably involving demolition of the existing housing. This should be resisted by all means possible in order to stop the site becoming a through way for vehicle traffic, which the applicants seem to want to endorse, and which would increase air pollution within the site. Future proofing should be used to preserve the car-free nature of the site.</p> <p>9. Much of the proposal seems detrimental to the principles and established existence of the Primrose Hill Conservation Area (PHCA) and the other two adjoining CAACs. Every effort should be taken to minimise this harm, even if it means reducing the height of many of the proposed buildings, losing the high density of the site, reducing the number of residential and office units. The plans show a proposal which is much too high in density for either living and working in new streets and alleyways which will rarely see any sunlight, which will be harmful to those who live, work and visit here and which should not even be considered. It would bring a services overload to the area. It seems that financial greed is propelling much of this plan and if Barratts are permitted to build what they propose, the whole area will be much the poorer for it. The high density of dark spaces is reminiscent of a Victorian slum though of a poorer design. The applicants need to reconfigure the heights to medium density to protect our heritage assets.</p> <p>10. The Construction Management Plan (CMP) proposed here is not fit for purpose. It offers a newsletter once a quarter and a monthly community meeting. A recent much smaller development, in Fitzroy Road in the PHCA, gave local residents daily newsletters by email and began with more frequent meetings. This CMP needs to be completely re-thought in order to give local people a daily group email update on what noisy, dusty, disturbing and intrusive work is being done.</p> <p>11. The Camden Goods Yard Planning Framework offers some useful guidelines for this development and the application should be re-submitted to take this into account.</p> <p>12. There are serious problems and omissions in the proposal with regard to accessibility especially for the old, the physically disabled and for families with small children. Additionally there are no details of any infrastructure such as medical services, educational provision, community indoor space.</p> <p>13. Traffic issues have hardly been touched upon in the proposal, nor have the plans considered air pollution levels.</p> <p>14. The design of the new buildings leaves a lot to be desired. Having heard the architects state that their reference point was the historic industrial buildings, it is hard to reconcile the design with the heritage of the surrounding buildings. The Victorians could do this monumental architecture. The present applicants, apparently, can not. The buildings are unattractive, block-like and slab-like, harsh and unyielding. They are alien to the urban</p>

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
					<p>pattern. This application is for a plan which seems to have been dropped in to this already highly stressed area, shoehorned in between Camden Lock, two major historic buildings, preserved Victorian terraces of residential housing, the railway, the canal and a major road. They seem not to have much architectural merit. If this plan is built, these buildings will not make the space a pleasant one to live or work in, or to visit. This plan seems to give no benefit to the community, especially as the flats appear to be ideally targeted at the short-let or airbnb market. If any development is to take place here, it is of the utmost importance that the architecture should be of high quality design and demonstrate more concern for heritage assets, This does neither.</p> <p>In summary I urge you to reject this application to which I object in the strongest possible way. I have lived in the Primrose Hill CA for over 34 years and this presents the greatest threat to our local heritage and will also make living nearby a much different and much impoverished prospect. There has not been such a change to the area in my time here and the changes proposed here to the six metre high goods yard site on which Morrisons currently sits are dangerous, and ones which it is the duty of Camden's planning officers and committee to refuse. This poorly conceived plan does not deserve to be built and destroy the views and setting of our preserved heritage.</p> <p>P J White Email pp.white@zen.co.uk</p>

---

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2017/3847/P	Philippa Nelson	31 Princess Road London NW18JR	13/08/2017 22:19:07	OBJ	<p>Planning application Morrisons Superstore &amp; Camden Goods Yard Chalk Farm</p> <p>I am writing to object to the application for the Morrison Site redevelopment in its current form.</p> <p>The number of parking spaces (300) to be provided for shoppers at the Morrisons superstore is not in line with Camden and Transport for London policy to reduce the use of private motor vehicles because of the damage they cause to the environment, the health of citizens and the freedom of movement and safety of people not using cars, and to those walking or cycling. The location of the site means that the pollution produced by cars driven to the superstore is very likely to damage the health of the large numbers of visitors to Camden Market and reduce their enjoyment by restricting their movement around the area, as well as to the residents of the proposed accommodation on the site.</p> <p>Although there is no provision for resident parking it is nevertheless likely that inhabitants of the proposed development will also own cars; this will put pressure on surrounding parking elsewhere in the local area, further increase congestion and adversely affect the smooth running of local transport links and safety of cyclists, again negatively impacting on the successful implementation of Camden and Transport for London travel policy.</p> <p>The limited access to the site will further increase congestion in the local area, and does not provide for safe cycling or walking pathways to access the site.</p> <p>I make this point despite the current existence on the site of a large superstore with somewhat more parking provision (425 spaces). Since planning permission was given for the current superstore ?Camden Market has expanded very substantially, resulting in a correspondingly huge increase in the number of pedestrian visitors. ?Our understanding and knowledge of the health and environmental impact of motor vehicles has greatly increased and has been transformed since then and Camden policy on highway planning</p>
2017/3847/P	Angela Hobsbaum	5 Chatto Mansions 1 Olmstead Close N10 3FB	13/08/2017 21:39:34	OBJ	<p>The number of parking spaces (300) to be provided for shoppers at the Morrison's superstore is inconsistent with the policies of Camden and Transport for London, to reduce the use of private motor vehicles because of the damage they cause to the environment, the health of citizens and the freedom of movement and safety of people not using cars.</p> <p>Plenty of people will want to walk or cycle to this store, but no safe and convenient access for cyclists and pedestrians has been included. The large number of cycle parking spaces is pointless if cyclists of all ages and confidence levels cannot safely access the site.</p>
2017/3847/P	Emma Dyer	298 Hither Green Lane SE13 6TS SE13 6TS	13/08/2017 22:03:39	INT	<p>This is an already very busy part of town, and right next to a lot of history with the stables. The traffic both automobile and pedestrian is already very busy, especially at weekends, and increasing the population by such a huge number is going to make this unworkable. Not to mention destroy the iconic look of this very popular area with both tourists and locals.</p>

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2017/3847/P	Janet Cowen	15 Eton Place	13/08/2017 17:25:01	COMMNT	(1) The scale of the proposed development seems questionable in relation to the space available. Has sufficient attention been given to the potential effects of increased pressure on local transport and other local resources? (2) It seems questionable whether the proposed green space areas will remain free from the damaging overspill of late-night activity from the Camden Lock area.
2017/3847/P	Jean Dollimore	23 Torriano Cottages NW5 2TA NW5 2TA	12/08/2017 15:52:35	OBJEMPER	<p>Referring to the Travel Plan document ,the development has been designed to cater for a largely car-free scheme: the residential and a large part of the commercial element will be car-free, apart from disabled parking provided that is to be provided in line with standards.</p> <p>These aims follow Camden's and Transport for London's policy to reduce the use of private motor vehicles because of the damage they do to the environment, the health and safety of people not sustainable modes of transport or buses. The Mayor's Transport Strategy is to create Healthy Streets.</p> <p>The provision of 300 parking spaces at the proposed new superstore is totally inconsistent with a Healthy Streets approach.</p> <p>I therefore urge Camden to reject this application.</p>
2017/3847/P	Joanna Frank	47 Eton Hall	11/08/2017 10:47:07	OBJ	I am objecting to the proposed redevelopment as it would completely change the area - there would be increased congestion and so pollution on the already highly polluted roads, it is a very densely populated area already, there will be increased noise from the extra traffic and people and it is already noisy enough, and the surrounding infrastructure is not there and not possible to be put in place to support the redevelopment proposed.

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2017/3847/P	Ms Laura Rivkin	43 Princess Road London NW1 8J	13/08/2017 01:28:07	OBJ	<p><b>Long-Term Community?</b></p> <p>There is nothing in the proposal that shows a commitment to creating a long-term neighbourhood for the future. The privately sold residential units are too small for families to establish themselves long-term. The site will mostly become a giant dormitory with transient residents. I envisage a large turnover of owner-occupiers, short-term renters, and Airbnb-type uses (whether banned or not). After Grenfell, people do not want to live in Blocks.</p> <p><b>Social Housing</b></p> <p>We would expect cast-iron assurances that, once planning is granted, that the 30% affordable/social housing will not be reduced no matter how hard Barratts lobby to change the percentage. (How about MORE social housing?)</p> <p><b>Supermarket</b></p> <p>I really object personally to lowering the street level of the supermarket. A lot of people who walk to Morrisons are elderly and enter from the Oval Road side. People who approach from the Chalk Farm Road side already have a Sainsbury and a Tesco they can use on Chalk Farm Road. There are no reasonably sized shopping stores on the Oval Road side. Those entering the site from this side will have to weave their way through the tower blocks and negotiate the tall staircase down to the new entrance. I personally know elderly people who will no longer be able to do their shopping independently, if the store level is lowered. They rely on the flat access from Oval Road.</p> <p><b>Harmful impact on local heritage.</b></p> <p>The soaring height of the blocks is out of proportion for north Camden and is particularly harmful to the immediate Camden vernacular. It will look like a mini-Manhattan visible for miles in every direction. The area is made up mostly of charming early Victorian terraces and simple, functional, medium to small railway-related industrial buildings. The tall blocks will obliterate views of this early Victorian architecture including the listed Interchange building, and the Grade I Listed Roundhouse.</p> <p>The high-rise blocks will be visible from Regent's Park which is a Grade I list park (i.e. ruin the views that Nash designed into the Park), harm views from Primrose Hill, Parliament Hill, and the excellent view of the Roundhouse coming down Haverstock Hill and from other local vantage points.</p> <p>The development will permanently detrimentally affect the character of the surrounding conservation areas (Primrose Hill, Harmond Street, West Kentish Town).</p> <p><b>Architecture and Site Layout</b></p> <p>The architecture of the buildings is without merit. No distinguished architectural design of any kind is evident in the drawings.</p> <p>Except for the use of London stock bricks, the drawings of the blocks show no reference to the local Victorian history in either architecture of the buildings or the layout of the site. (Block B looks like a Disney pastiche of a dock-side bonded warehouse. The blocks overall comprise a sort of faux Chicago-esque theme park.)</p>

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
					<p>The 'roads' between the buildings are too narrow. The big blocks, so closely packed, will create canyon-like, inhospitable walkways.</p> <p>Flats lower down the blocks will never receive direct sunlight. People will be staring straight into other flats in a direct line. Gilbeys Yard and Juniper Crescent residences will be deprived of daylight by the tall blocks and some properties will be thrown into permanent deep shadow.</p> <p>The public spaces will be pseudo-public, encouraging anti-social behaviour especially at night.</p> <p>Density</p> <p>Too high density. Circa 550 units on the site. That means a minimum of 1200 people living on the site and probably more like 1600.</p> <p>The sheer number of people cannot be sustained by the current level of services and infrastructure in the area: Schools? Transport? Doctors' surgeries/hospitals?</p> <p>But even with this too high density, an innovative design could have reduced the height of the buildings dramatically, and only reduced the numbers of units by a relatively small amount, ref. Auden Place in Primrose Hill which has a high density of residents and with low impact on the local area.</p> <p>Traffic movements on site</p> <p>How will deliveries be made to so many units within such a small area? With a population density this high, there will constant delivery vans coming and going. How will the site layout as it is currently proposed cope with the vehicle movements and idling time and pollution – Uber-type cars constantly coming and going; Removal Vans (probably will be high turnover of residents); Order deliveries, etc.</p> <p>Construction and Air Pollution</p> <p>How will they get utility services in? Will our local roads need to be dug up to get the cables/pipes/sewers in? What about water pressure locally? Nothing (of substance) in Environmental Report on any of this.</p> <p>There is a perfect storm of construction traffic and pollution coming to the wider area.</p> <p>HS2 traffic and road closures;</p> <p>Centric Close (Oval Road blocks of flats);</p> <p>Cycle Superhighway traffic displacement;</p> <p>100 Avenue Road tower block;</p> <p>new block at Chalk Farm Tube Station;</p> <p>Camden Town Underground Station;</p> <p>Etc.,</p> <p>Public Transport</p> <p>Tube – In light of the enormous increase in residents, where is the plan to talk to TfL about</p>

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
					<p>how to mitigate extra numbers at Chalk Farm Tube Station (already over-crowded at rush hour)?</p> <p>Buses – I see no plans for improving local bus services.</p> <p>Canal access – I see no plans to improve the decrepit staircase at the Oval Road canal entrance. Barratts should be compelled to rebuild this staircase, as part of any planning consent deal. The vastly increased numbers of local residents resulting from this development will inevitably increase the numbers using the canal.</p> <p>The petrol station building which will sit on Chalk Farm Road is ugly and should at the least be the same height as 100 Chalk Farm Road (the One Housing building). The glass ‘winter garden’ is shockingly awful, too large, and completely out of keeping with every architectural structure in north Camden.</p> <p>Historic England wants a full and independent archaeological survey done before Consent is granted. So far, that hasn’t happened. The important industrial archaeology of the site should be preserved. Enough of Camden is disappearing to the developers.</p>
2017/3847/P	Ellen Gates	11 Grove Terrace London NW5 1PH	12/08/2017 18:02:48	OBJ	<p>The application should be rejected because of the large number of car parking spaces for the supermarket (300). This will encourage people to visit by private car, contrary to Camden’s stated policies to discourage private car use. The detrimental effect of encouraging cars would be exacerbated by the narrow entrance to the site from Chalk Farm Road, with resultant continued danger and negative impact on pedestrians and cyclists, as well as the well understood issues of pollution.</p> <p>In addition, access to the site for cyclists is totally inadequate. The published plans show no dedicated cycle facilities such as segregated tracks and include a poorly designed unprotected signalised junction with Chalk Farm Road.</p> <p>Without safe and convenient access for cyclists and pedestrians Camden’s policy of encouraging cycling and walking cannot be met.</p>
2017/3847/P	George Coulouris	23 Torriano Cottages Torriano Avenue NW5 2TA	12/08/2017 17:50:28	OBJ	<p>I have already sent a the fairly lengthy objection by email on behalf of the Camden Cycling Campaign.</p> <p>This submission is to ensure that you will contact me with the details of the Committee meeting, to which we intend to send a delegation on behalf of Camden Cycling Campaign.</p>



Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2017/3847/P	Aleksandr Alekshev	Flat 8 30 Oval Road	11/08/2017 19:47:21	COMMNT	My interest in the application is by virtue of owning an apartment in the Henson building which is adjacent to the proposed development on the south side near the Interchange Building.

There are a number of concerns with the proposals:

#### Building Height

The heights of the proposed buildings are not contiguous with the local context and character of the area. The Henson is 6 stories high, which is typical of the maximum height of buildings in the area. The proposals are for a number of buildings which significantly exceed this: A (14 floors), C (10 floors), E1 (11 floors), F (9 floors).

We are in agreement with the Design Review Panel of 02/12/2016, as shown on Page 40 of the Camden Goods Yard Planning Statement submitted with the planning application:

“Panel suggest a shoulder height of 5 to 7 storeys, rising to 9 stories in one of two key locations would be more appropriate in this location.”

Applying this to the proposed development, we submit that the heights of the buildings should be amended as follows:

E1: 11 to 6 floors. This building is in close proximity to the Henson which is 6 floors, and also the Interchange building.

C: 10 to 6/7 floors. 10 floors towers above the Interchange building.

F: 9 to 8 floors. As this is more central in the new village and is set back, a higher building may be possible without detriment to the surrounding area.

A: 14 to 9 floors. As this is the most set back building, this could accommodate the highest building as recommended by the Design Review Panel of 9 floors. This is also the maximum height of building in the new Hawley Wharf development.

Impact of Building Works

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

As this is a major project, the building works will take an extended number of years which will adversely affect the local community. Hence the utmost effort should be made to reduce the impact on local residents in terms of noise, pollution, and traffic. For example:

- staging the building works: the plan envisions the petrol station being converted in the first stage to a temporary supermarket. Hence it makes sense to stage the works so that building commences in the north side of the development, and gradually works its way down so that the time during which major works are conducted adjacent to the buildings on the south side are limited;

- erection of large hoardings to limit the impact of noise and pollution. There are many people who work from home, and also disabled people in the building, so solely limiting building works to the working day will not suffice in this instance, and hence extra measures are needed;

- guarantee that Oval Road/Gilbey's Yard will not be used for site access during development.

#### Post development traffic

The traffic impact on Oval Road/Gilbey's Yard is a concern. Since the site is essentially a car free zone, the impacts of concern are from taxi's, and van and motorbike deliveries.

- Taxis: even though the plan contains taxi pick up points on Stephenson Street on the north side of the development, in practice residents and office workers in the southern buildings will prefer to be picked up from the Gilbey's Yard access point as it is a shorter walk for them. This will cause congestion in this small area. Measures to stop this being the case should be stipulated in the plan. Reducing the building height of E1 to 6 floors as described in the building heights section, which is nearest Gilbey's Yard entrance, will help in this regard.

- Van deliveries: since the concierge desk is located near the Gilbey's Yard entrance, drivers may be tempted to temporary park there, and walk the short distance to the concierge deal in building E1, rather than drive all the way round and enter via Stephenson Street. Moving the concierge from E1 to, for example, building A, seems sensible and will reduce this considerably.

- Motorbike deliveries: motorbikes will no doubt try to enter through the Gilbey's Yard entrance, especially as the concierge is located in building E1 which is near the Gilbey's Yard entrance. Again, moving the concierge to building A, will reduce this considerably. Further measures to dissuade motorbikes from entering through this pedestrian/cycle zone should be stipulated, which could turn into an accident hotspot.

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2017/3847/P	Samuel Markham	Flat 3 56a chalk farm rd nw1 8an	12/08/2017 15:12:55	OBJLETTE R	<p>I live in a flat opposite Morrisons petrol station and chose to buy here because of the open aspect, the all year round sunshine and the heritage of this corner of Camden.</p> <p>I see that Morrisons now plan to build across the road an office block even higher than the one next door to the Roundhouse. This will remove my open aspect and for the major part of the year will block out the sun. I understand the need for more housing in London and that where there is a choice to be made between blocking sunlight from existing residences and building more flats a sacrifice may have to be made. However, I don't accept that there is such a desperate need for another modern office block on Chalk Farm Road that you should allow such an overbearing construction.</p> <p>Morrisons need a two story building in place of the petrol station so that they can continue to trade for the six years or so that the whole development will take so I suggest that you limit this part of the development to two stories.</p> <p>It also appears from the applicant's sketches that the ground level of the proposed office block is to be a parade of shops. I understand from people who have lived and worked on Chalk Farm Road since before the petrol station was built that the listed wall that ran the length of the South side of the road was only allowed to be broken up on condition that it was reproduced behind the petrol station and as part of the petrol station building. To hide this replica wall behind an office block and a parade of shops must surely be a breach of a legally binding agreement and I request that the Planning Officer make public the details of this agreement and of any variation that has since been agreed by Camden. To Morrisons this is just another wall, but to many residents of Chalk Farm it is part of a heritage that would be ruined by importing a Kings Cross style office development and setting the precedent for others to continue to turn it into yet another high rise canyoned London Street.</p>

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2017/3847/P	Jamie Johnston	Flat 5 56a Chalk Farm Road NW1 8AN	13/08/2017 23:59:23	WREP	<p>I am a local resident, living on the Chalk Farm Road almost directly opposite the Morrisons petrol station. In general I welcome the proposal to build more housing, especially more social and affordable housing, in the neighbourhood. Camden of course badly needs more housing, and the Morrisons site seems like a good place for some of it. There are some aspects of the proposed development that I have some worries about, and some aspects that I don't feel able to express a view on but would simply ask the Council to consider especially carefully.</p> <p>I attended the second 'development forum' meeting hosted by the developers and the Council, and also a community meeting held by the Primrose Hill Conservation Area Advisory Committee, so I have a sense of some of the concerns other commenters may raise. I know there's considerable worry about the height of some of the proposed blocks and the impact on the skyline. To some extent I share those worries but not entirely. I suspect the Council may hear from commenters who object to the idea of being able to see the new buildings at all. I don't share that concern. There's nothing inherently wrong with a building being visible, if the building is pleasant to look at (more on that later) and it isn't blocking the view of something better.</p> <p>Like some at the Advisory Committee's meeting, I do suspect that the adapted photographs showing the development's appearance on the skyline may have been chosen rather tactically to make the impact seem lesser than it would from slightly different vantage-points. Not least (though understandably) the photographs are all from street level, and so they give no sense of the development's effects on the views enjoyed by local residents of above-ground flats and houses. As far as I can tell, the view from my own flat will change quite dramatically. The flat currently looks out over the top of the petrol station and across the railway, giving a good sense of open space into the distance southwards. Much of that open space will be lost, in particular by the building on the petrol station site. That will be a pity, but one that I can live with in the interests of alleviating the local housing problem. (Having said that, I will have something to say about the height of the petrol station building a bit later.) I think others who live and work in the area should tolerate some impact on the skyline.</p> <p>But since the buildings are going to become part of the local landscape, it's important for them to be both attractive in themselves and a good fit with the character of the neighbourhood. I'm not convinced that they will be either. I appreciate that at least one of the blocks has been designed to echo some visual elements of the industrial brick architecture of Chalk Farm, but those elements seem to be visible mainly from inside the development. The parts that are visible from a little further away, and so the parts that most people will see most of the time, seem to be very boring and generic tower-blocks that will add nothing to the neighbourhood and have little to do with the existing architectural heritage. That's disappointing. One thing I find particularly objectionable is that, unlike any of the historic industrial brick buildings that the proposers claim to have been inspired by, the external faces of the proposed buildings are almost completely flat and featureless: no</p>

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
					<p>window-sills, window surrounds, ridges, grooves, alcoves, or other detailing. The effect is very ugly in my opinion, and completely fails to gel with the local heritage. I hope the Council will press the developers to come back with some architecture that Camden be proud of, and that the new residents can be proud to live in.</p> <p>The proposed building on the site of the petrol station is particularly uninspiring in my opinion. It looks very shiny and fashionable but totally out of character for the neighbourhood, more like something from Oxford Street or thereabouts. The style of the retail units fronting onto the Chalk Farm Road is like nothing in the local area at all. They look like the shops inside St Pancras station, not like the Victorian / twentieth century shop fronts of Chalk Farm and Camden Town. I'm also concerned about the height of the building. It's true that it's a similar height to the neighbouring buildings on either side, but that's the problem. The skyline of Haverstock Hill, Chalk Farm Road, and Camden High Street is mostly fairly low with occasional higher buildings, and it is varied. The current gap between the market buildings on one side and the One Housing building on the other helps to keep the skyline on that part of the road varied. Inserting another building almost exactly the same height as both will make the whole stretch of the road seem monolithic and much less characterful.</p> <p>I'm also concerned about the public spaces and access routes in and through the development. I very much welcome the fact that the proposed development is to be largely pedestrianized and that the residents are not to have cars. The idea of providing public spaces and green spaces is also excellent in principle. But I'm concerned that those spaces are going to be so hemmed in by tall buildings that they won't feel like open spaces at all, but more like canyons, or at best thoroughfares. In a way, public spaces need to be designed even more carefully than homes, in that if they aren't well designed they simply won't be used at all, or will be used in an anti-social way. A home will at least be used as a home because the residents will make the best of the space they've got. But if a public space is inhospitable it will just become a deserted hole in the neighbourhood, or a rubbish dump, or a place where people vent their boredom and frustration on the built environment. As nice as the sketches and computer simulations look, it's apparent from many of them that the spaces will be surrounded on all sides by looming towers. They may well be in shadow most of the day.</p> <p>Another concern about the public spaces and pedestrian routes among the buildings is physical accessibility. The movements of people with physical disabilities and mobility problems have clearly not been more than an afterthought to the designers. It will be impossible to traverse the site without climbing stairs or using one of a small number of lifts that seem to be located very much out of the way. One of the drawings shows a group of friends happily making their way through the development, one of them using a wheelchair. But it's fairly clear that at a certain point in their journey, the wheelchair user will have to make a substantial detour to get up to a higher level, while their friends will be able to just walk up a few steps in the direction they were already going. That isn't accessible space, that's inaccessible space with barely minimal accommodations added after the main design</p>

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
					<p>thinking has already been done. I urge the Council to insist that the public spaces be redesigned with accessibility as a central feature.</p> <p>I support the inclusion of community facilities including the rooftop 'urban farm' but it's especially important for these to be not only accessible but convenient. The community is not going to use community facilities that aren't easy to get to. I understand the indoor community spaces are going to be mostly on upper floors above the supermarket. Why not at ground level? And the descriptions of the urban farm as a place of leisure and relaxation are attractive but don't really seem plausible in light of the considerable distance people will have to travel from ground level to the roof to get there. The best community spaces are ones that are so easily visited that they're actually hard to avoid. The rooftop of a tower-block in the middle of a private development is far from that.</p> <p>On the subject of community facilities, the Council will be aware that the current Morrisons cafe has become an important affordable community space for local people, especially elderly people, people with disabilities, and people on low incomes. It's affordable, unpretentious, relaxed, and accessible. It will be important to keep, or ideally increase, this sort of facility on the new development. It must not be allowed to be gentrified so as to exclude the people who use what exists there now.</p> <p>Gentrification is a concern more widely in Camden and I'd ask the Council to be alert to that risk with this development. A greater proportion of social and affordable housing would be desirable, and also measures to encourage the retail and business spaces to be used by independent businesses in preference to chains of the kind that are rapidly conquering Camden High Street and will probably soon begin to creep up the Chalk Farm Road.</p>

---

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2017/3847/P	Beverly Bonner	33 The Henson NW1 7DE	11/08/2017 23:03:33	APP	<p><b>Building Height</b></p> <p>The heights of the proposed buildings are not contiguous with the local context and character of the area. The Henson is 6 stories high, which is typical of the maximum height of buildings in the area. The proposals are for a number of buildings which significantly exceed this: A (14 floors), C (10 floors), E1 (11 floors), F (9 floors).</p> <p>We are in agreement with the Design Review Panel of 02/12/2016, as shown on Page 40 of the Camden Goods Yard Planning Statement submitted with the planning application: "Panel suggest a shoulder height of 5 to 7 storeys, rising to 9 stories in one of two key locations would be more appropriate in this location."</p> <p>Applying this to the proposed development, we submit that the heights of the buildings should be amended as follows:</p> <p>E1: 11 to 6 floors. This building is in close proximity to the Henson which is 6 floors, and also the Interchange building.</p> <p>C: 10 to 6/7 floors. 10 floors towers above the Interchange building.</p> <p>F: 9 to 8 floors. As this is more central in the new village and is set back, a higher building may be possible without detriment to the surrounding area.</p> <p>A: 14 to 9 floors. As this is the most set back building, this could accommodate the highest building as recommended by the Design Review Panel of 9 floors. This is also the maximum height of building in the new Hawley Wharf development.</p> <p><b>Impact of Building Works</b></p> <p>As this is a major project, the building works will take an extended number of years which will adversely affect the local community. Hence the utmost effort should be made to reduce the impact on local residents in terms of noise, pollution, and traffic. For example:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- staging the building works: the plan envisions the petrol station being converted in the first stage to a temporary supermarket. Hence it makes sense to stage the works so that building commences in the north side of the development, and gradually works its way down so that the time during which major works are conducted adjacent to the buildings on the south side are limited;</li> <li>- erection of large hoardings to limit the impact of noise and pollution. There are many people who work from home, and also disabled people in the building, so solely limiting building works to the working day will not suffice in this instance, and hence extra measures are needed;</li> <li>- guarantee that Oval Road/Gilbey's Yard will not be used for site access during development.</li> </ul> <p><b>Post development traffic</b></p> <p>The traffic impact on Oval Road/Gilbey's Yard is a concern. Since the site is essentially a car free zone, the impacts of concern are from taxi's, and van and motorbike deliveries.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Taxis: even though the plan contains taxi pick up points on Stephenson Street on the north side of the development, in practice residents and office workers in the southern buildings will</li> </ul>

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
					<p>prefer to be picked up from the Gilbey's Yard access point as it is a shorter walk for them. This will cause congestion in this small area. Measures to stop this being the case should be stipulated in the plan. Reducing the building height of E1 to 6 floors as described in the building heights section, which is nearest Gilbey's Yard entrance, will help in this regard.</p> <p>- Van deliveries: since the concierge desk is located near the Gilbey's Yard entrance, drivers may be tempted to temporary park there, and walk the short distance to the concierge deal in building E1, rather than drive all the way round and enter via Stephenson Street. Moving the concierge from E1 to, for example, building A, seems sensible and will reduce this considerably.</p> <p>- Motorbike deliveries: motorbikes will no doubt try to enter through the Gilbey's Yard entrance, especially as the concierge is located in building E1 which is near the Gilbey's Yard entrance. Again, moving the concierge to building A, will reduce this considerably. Further measures to dissuade motorbikes from entering through this pedestrian/cycle zone should be stipulated, which could turn into an accident hotspot.</p>
2017/3847/P	Mustafa Arif	Flat 151 Park West London W2 2QP	12/08/2017 14:26:05	OBJEMPER	<p>The application should be rejected.</p> <p>The number of parking spaces (300) to be provided for shoppers at the Morrisons superstore is inconsistent with Camden and TfL policy to reduce the use of private motor vehicles because of the damage they cause to the environment, the health of citizens and the freedom of movement and safety of people not using cars. The location of the site means that the pollution produced by cars driven to the superstore is very likely to damage the health of the large numbers of visitors to Camden Market and reduce their enjoyment by restricting their movement around the area. This makes the site unsuitable for this type of development. This is notwithstanding the current existence on the site of a large superstore with somewhat more parking provision (425 spaces) because since planning permission was given for the current superstore:</p> <p>Camden Market has expanded very substantially, resulting in a correspondingly huge increase in the number of pedestrian visitors.</p> <p>Our understanding of the health and environmental impact of motor vehicles has been transformed since then and Camden policy on highway planning and car use has changed as a result.</p>
2017/3847/P	LT	Treaty Street Islington London N1 0TE	12/08/2017 22:38:53	COMMNT	<p>Carpark of this size not needed, Camden should enable/encourage walkers and cyclists not polluting car driving. Complete waste of land and useless in long term.</p>



Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2017/3847/P	Michael Kenney	Reject Pot Shop 56 Chalk Farm Road NW1 8AN	13/08/2017 17:16:25	OBJEMAIL	<p>Virtually the whole South side of Chalk Farm Road was Grade 2 Listed when Safeway was allowed to build a supermarket and petrol station in exchange for providing 192 social housing units on what is now known as Juniper Crescent. A condition was that the brick part of the petrol station and the wall behind it would be a faithful reproduction of the listed wall that it replaced.</p> <p>Morrisons now owns Safeway and wants to be allowed to build on top of the petrol station and create a six-storey office block with shops below in exchange for, not more social housing, but a flagship store surrounded by some 500 'market price' flats that the average London worker could not hope to afford.</p> <p>Any replacement for the original listed wall should be in the style of that wall and should be no more than two stories high. A six story modern office block would be out of place on such a heritage site and would probably be the start of Chalk Farm Road turning into just another sunless city canyon.</p> <p>For the major part of the year, with the sun behind the office block, there would be a giant shadow over the North side of the road and residential properties would be denied both sunshine and the open aspect which they currently enjoy.</p> <p>Furthermore, no thought seems to have been given to what will happen when cars and taxis stop to drop off shoppers on the single lane carriageway that runs West along this section of Chalk Farm Road. Traffic chaos would result, and more than likely, accidents.</p> <p>I am also of the opinion that a single notice posted on a lamp post in Juniper Crescent during school holidays hardly represents a legitimate 'consultation' and that a further period of consultation should be set for September.</p>
2017/3847/P	Ianthe McWilliams	Chairman of Friends of Regents Park & Primrose Hill 18 Kent Terrace London nw1 4rp	16/08/2017 19:35:35	OBJ	<p>The Friends of Regents Park &amp; Primrose Hill have strong objections to the proposed development to the extent that the two proposed towers would interrupt views outwards from the Regents Park and Primrose Hill ( as illustrated by the applicants's view 10. the Park is a listed grade 1 landscape, which was developed by Nash. It is an integral part of its heritage value that views from the park to the north should provide uninterrupted views to the green spaces of Highgate and Hampstead.</p> <p>Any encroachment of high buildings to the North of the Park will spoil the heritage views, which are part of the tranquil value of the Park to current park users.</p> <p>The Regents Park Conservation Area Advisory Committee has commented in detail with historical references, and this objection should be taken to endorse and include those details.</p>

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2017/3847/P	Charles Habanananda	Flat 4 Henson Building 30 Oval Road NW1 7DE	13/08/2017 12:17:57	COMMNT	<p>My interest in the application is by virtue of owning an apartment in the Henson building which is adjacent to the proposed development on the south side near the Interchange Building.</p> <p>There are a number of concerns with the proposals:</p> <p><b>Building Height</b> The heights of the proposed buildings are not contiguous with the local context and character of the area. The Henson is 6 stories high, which is typical of the maximum height of buildings in the area. The proposals are for a number of buildings which significantly exceed this: A (14 floors), C (10 floors), E1 (11 floors), F (9 floors).</p> <p>We are in agreement with the Design Review Panel of 02/12/2016, as shown on Page 40 of the Camden Goods Yard Planning Statement submitted with the planning application: "Panel suggest a shoulder height of 5 to 7 storeys, rising to 9 stories in one of two key locations would be more appropriate in this location."</p> <p>Applying this to the proposed development, we submit that the heights of the buildings should be amended as follows: E1: 11 to 6 floors. This building is in close proximity to the Henson which is 6 floors, and also the Interchange building. C: 10 to 6/7 floors. 10 floors towers above the Interchange building. F: 9 to 8 floors. As this is more central in the new village and is set back, a higher building may be possible without detriment to the surrounding area. A: 14 to 9 floors. As this is the most set back building, this could accommodate the highest building as recommended by the Design Review Panel of 9 floors. This is also the maximum height of building in the new Hawley Wharf development.</p> <p><b>Impact of Building Works</b> As this is a major project, the building works will take an extended number of years which will adversely affect the local community. Hence the utmost effort should be made to reduce the impact on local residents in terms of noise, pollution, and traffic. For example: - staging the building works: the plan envisions the petrol station being converted in the first stage to a temporary supermarket. Hence it makes sense to stage the works so that building commences in the north side of the development, and gradually works its way down so that the time during which major works are conducted adjacent to the buildings on the south side are limited; - erection of large hoardings to limit the impact of noise and pollution. There are many people who work from home, and also disabled people in the building, so solely limiting building works to the working day will not suffice in this instance, and hence extra measures are needed; - guarantee that Oval Road/Gilbey's Yard will not be used for site access during development.</p> <p><b>Post development traffic</b></p>

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
					<p>The traffic impact on Oval Road/Gilbey's Yard is a concern. Since the site is essentially a car free zone, the impacts of concern are from taxi's, and van and motorbike deliveries.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>- Taxis: even though the plan contains taxi pick up points on Stephenson Street on the north side of the development, in practice residents and office workers in the southern buildings will prefer to be picked up from the Gilbey's Yard access point as it is a shorter walk for them. This will cause congestion in this small area. Measures to stop this being the case should be stipulated in the plan. Reducing the building height of E1 to 6 floors as described in the building heights section, which is nearest Gilbey's Yard entrance, will help in this regard.</li><li>- Van deliveries: since the concierge desk is located near the Gilbey's Yard entrance, drivers may be tempted to temporary park there, and walk the short distance to the concierge deal in building E1, rather than drive all the way round and enter via Stephenson Street. Moving the concierge from E1 to, for example, building A, seems sensible and will reduce this considerably.</li><li>- Motorbike deliveries: motorbikes will no doubt try to enter through the Gilbey's Yard entrance, especially as the concierge is located in building E1 which is near the Gilbey's Yard entrance. Again, moving the concierge to building A, will reduce this considerably. Further measures to dissuade motorbikes from entering through this pedestrian/cycle zone should be stipulated, which could turn into an accident hotspot.</li></ul>

---

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2017/3847/P	Ms A Gilliam	30 Oval Road Flat 30 The Henson nw1 7de	13/08/2017 10:25:25	COMMNT	<p>My interest in the application is by virtue of owning an apartment in the Henson building which is adjacent to the proposed development on the south side near the Interchange Building.</p> <p>There are a number of concerns with the proposals:</p> <p><b>Building Height</b></p> <p>The heights of the proposed buildings are not contiguous with the local context and character of the area. The Henson is 6 stories high, which is typical of the maximum height of buildings in the area. The proposals are for a number of buildings which significantly exceed this: A (14 floors), C (10 floors), E1 (11 floors), F (9 floors).</p> <p>We are in agreement with the Design Review Panel of 02/12/2016, as shown on Page 40 of the Camden Goods Yard Planning Statement submitted with the planning application: "Panel suggest a shoulder height of 5 to 7 storeys, rising to 9 stories in one of two key locations would be more appropriate in this location."</p> <p>Applying this to the proposed development, we submit that the heights of the buildings should be amended as follows:</p> <p>E1: 11 to 6 floors. This building is in close proximity to the Henson which is 6 floors, and also the Interchange building.</p> <p>C: 10 to 6/7 floors. 10 floors towers above the Interchange building.</p> <p>F: 9 to 8 floors. As this is more central in the new village and is set back, a higher building may be possible without detriment to the surrounding area.</p> <p>A: 14 to 9 floors. As this is the most set back building, this could accommodate the highest building as recommended by the Design Review Panel of 9 floors. This is also the maximum height of building in the new Hawley Wharf development.</p> <p><b>Impact of Building Works</b></p> <p>As this is a major project, the building works will take an extended number of years which will adversely affect the local community. Hence the utmost effort should be made to reduce the impact on local residents in terms of noise, pollution, and traffic. For example:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- staging the building works: the plan envisions the petrol station being converted in the first stage to a temporary supermarket. Hence it makes sense to stage the works so that building commences in the north side of the development, and gradually works its way down so that the time during which major works are conducted adjacent to the buildings on the south side are limited;</li> <li>- erection of large hoardings to limit the impact of noise and pollution. There are many people who work from home, and also disabled people in the building, so solely limiting building works to the working day will not suffice in this instance, and hence extra measures are needed;</li> <li>- guarantee that Oval Road/Gilbey's Yard will not be used for site access during development.</li> </ul> <p><b>Post development traffic</b></p> <p>The traffic impact on Oval Road/Gilbey's Yard is a concern. Since the site is essentially a car free zone, the impacts of concern are from taxi's, and van and motorbike deliveries.</p>

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
					<p>- Taxis: even though the plan contains taxi pick up points on Stephenson Street on the north side of the development, in practice residents and office workers in the southern buildings will prefer to be picked up from the Gilbey's Yard access point as it is a shorter walk for them. This will cause congestion in this small area. Measures to stop this being the case should be stipulated in the plan. Reducing the building height of E1 to 6 floors as described in the building heights section, which is nearest Gilbey's Yard entrance, will help in this regard.</p> <p>- Van deliveries: since the concierge desk is located near the Gilbey's Yard entrance, drivers may be tempted to temporary park there, and walk the short distance to the concierge deal in building E1, rather than drive all the way round and enter via Stephenson Street. Moving the concierge from E1 to, for example, building A, seems sensible and will reduce this considerably.</p> <p>- Motorbike deliveries: motorbikes will no doubt try to enter through the Gilbey's Yard entrance, especially as the concierge is located in building E1 which is near the Gilbey's Yard entrance. Again, moving the concierge to building A, will reduce this considerably. Further measures to dissuade motorbikes from entering through this pedestrian/cycle zone should be stipulated, which could turn into an accident hotspot.</p>
2017/3847/P	Stefano Bertolotto	39a Priory Terrace	13/08/2017 19:46:28	OBJ	I object as a Parking of 300 cars is inconsistent with camden plans to reduce car usage. The car park will continue to make this area dominated by cars which will cause pollution and accidents.
2017/3847/P	John Chamberlain	11 Grove Terrace London NW5 1PH	12/08/2017 16:18:25	OBJ	<p>The application should be rejected because of the large number of car parking spaces for the supermarket (300). This will encourage people to visit by private car, contrary to Camden's stated policies to discourage private car use. The detrimental effect of encouraging cars would be exacerbated by the narrow entrance to the site from Chalk Farm Road, with resultant continued danger and negative impact on pedestrians and cyclists, as well as the well understood issues of pollution.</p> <p>Further, the application proposes parking and storage for over 1000 cycles but access to the site for cyclists is totally inadequate, being either through a narrow privately owned alley from Oval Road or from a narrow road ('Stephenson Street') linking to Chalk Farm Road. This road will carry buses (two routes) and delivery traffic for the site and the petrol station as well as private cars. The published plans show no dedicated cycle facilities such as segregated tracks and include a poorly designed unprotected signalised junction with Chalk Farm Road.</p> <p>Without safe and convenient access for cyclists and pedestrians Camden's policy of encouraging cycling and walking cannot be met and the large number of cycle spaces is pointless if cyclists of all ages and confidence levels cannot safely access the site.</p>

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2017/3847/P	Saira Jaffer	Flat 31 30 Oval Road, NW1 7DE NW1 7DE	11/08/2017 23:35:16	PETITNSU PP	<p>My interest in the application is by virtue of owning an apartment in the Henson building which is adjacent to the proposed development on the south side near the Interchange Building.</p> <p>There are a number of concerns with the proposals:</p> <p><b>Building Height</b></p> <p>The heights of the proposed buildings are not contiguous with the local context and character of the area. The Henson is 6 stories high, which is typical of the maximum height of buildings in the area. The proposals are for a number of buildings which significantly exceed this: A (14 floors), C (10 floors), E1 (11 floors), F (9 floors).</p> <p>We are in agreement with the Design Review Panel of 02/12/2016, as shown on Page 40 of the Camden Goods Yard Planning Statement submitted with the planning application: "Panel suggest a shoulder height of 5 to 7 storeys, rising to 9 stories in one of two key locations would be more appropriate in this location."</p> <p>Applying this to the proposed development, we submit that the heights of the buildings should be amended as follows:</p> <p>E1: 11 to 6 floors. This building is in close proximity to the Henson which is 6 floors, and also the Interchange building.</p> <p>C: 10 to 6/7 floors. 10 floors towers above the Interchange building.</p> <p>F: 9 to 8 floors. As this is more central in the new village and is set back, a higher building may be possible without detriment to the surrounding area.</p> <p>A: 14 to 9 floors. As this is the most set back building, this could accommodate the highest building as recommended by the Design Review Panel of 9 floors. This is also the maximum height of building in the new Hawley Wharf development.</p> <p><b>Impact of Building Works</b></p> <p>As this is a major project, the building works will take an extended number of years which will adversely affect the local community. Hence the utmost effort should be made to reduce the impact on local residents in terms of noise, pollution, and traffic. For example:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- staging the building works: the plan envisions the petrol station being converted in the first stage to a temporary supermarket. Hence it makes sense to stage the works so that building commences in the north side of the development, and gradually works its way down so that the time during which major works are conducted adjacent to the buildings on the south side are limited;</li> <li>- erection of large hoardings to limit the impact of noise and pollution. There are many people who work from home, and also disabled people in the building, so solely limiting building works to the working day will not suffice in this instance, and hence extra measures are needed;</li> <li>- guarantee that Oval Road/Gilbey's Yard will not be used for site access during development.</li> </ul>

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
					<p>Post development traffic</p> <p>The traffic impact on Oval Road/Gilbey's Yard is a concern. Since the site is essentially a car free zone, the impacts of concern are from taxi's, and van and motorbike deliveries.</p> <p>- Taxis: even though the plan contains taxi pick up points on Stephenson Street on the north side of the development, in practice residents and office workers in the southern buildings will prefer to be picked up from the Gilbey's Yard access point as it is a shorter walk for them. This will cause congestion in this small area. Measures to stop this being the case should be stipulated in the plan. Reducing the building height of E1 to 6 floors as described in the building heights section, which is nearest Gilbey's Yard entrance, will help in this regard.</p> <p>- Van deliveries: since the concierge desk is located near the Gilbey's Yard entrance, drivers may be tempted to temporary park there, and walk the short distance to the concierge deal in building E1, rather than drive all the way round and enter via Stephenson Street. Moving the concierge from E1 to, for example, building A, seems sensible and will reduce this considerably.</p> <p>- Motorbike deliveries: motorbikes will no doubt try to enter through the Gilbey's Yard entrance, especially as the concierge is located in building E1 which is near the Gilbey's Yard entrance. Again, moving the concierge to building A, will reduce this considerably. Further measures to dissuade motorbikes from entering through this pedestrian/cycle zone should be stipulated, which could turn into an accident hotspot.</p>

---

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2017/3847/P	Holly David	Flat 24 30 Oval Road NW1 7DE NW1 7DE NW1 7DE	14/08/2017 02:28:20	OBJ	<p>My interest in the application is by virtue of owning an apartment in the Henson building which is adjacent to the proposed development on the south side near the Interchange Building.</p> <p>There are a number of concerns with the proposals:</p> <p><b>Building Height</b></p> <p>The heights of the proposed buildings are not contiguous with the local context and character of the area. The Henson is 6 stories high, which is typical of the maximum height of buildings in the area. The proposals are for a number of buildings which significantly exceed this: A (14 floors), C (10 floors), E1 (11 floors), F (9 floors).</p> <p>We are in agreement with the Design Review Panel of 02/12/2016, as shown on Page 40 of the Camden Goods Yard Planning Statement submitted with the planning application: "Panel suggest a shoulder height of 5 to 7 storeys, rising to 9 stories in one of two key locations would be more appropriate in this location."</p> <p>Applying this to the proposed development, we submit that the heights of the buildings should be amended as follows:</p> <p>E1: 11 to 6 floors. This building is in close proximity to the Henson which is 6 floors, and also the Interchange building.</p> <p>C: 10 to 6/7 floors. 10 floors towers above the Interchange building.</p> <p>F: 9 to 8 floors. As this is more central in the new village and is set back, a higher building may be possible without detriment to the surrounding area.</p> <p>A: 14 to 9 floors. As this is the most set back building, this could accommodate the highest building as recommended by the Design Review Panel of 9 floors. This is also the maximum height of building in the new Hawley Wharf development.</p> <p><b>Impact of Building Works</b></p> <p>As this is a major project, the building works will take an extended number of years which will adversely affect the local community. Hence the utmost effort should be made to reduce the impact on local residents in terms of noise, pollution, and traffic. For example:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- staging the building works: the plan envisions the petrol station being converted in the first stage to a temporary supermarket. Hence it makes sense to stage the works so that building commences in the north side of the development, and gradually works its way down so that the time during which major works are conducted adjacent to the buildings on the south side are limited;</li> <li>- erection of large hoardings to limit the impact of noise and pollution. There are many people who work from home, and also disabled people in the building, so solely limiting building works to the working day will not suffice in this instance, and hence extra measures are needed;</li> <li>- guarantee that Oval Road/Gilbey's Yard will not be used for site access during development.</li> </ul>



Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
					<p>Post development traffic</p> <p>The traffic impact on Oval Road/Gilbey's Yard is a concern. Since the site is essentially a car free zone, the impacts of concern are from taxi's, and van and motorbike deliveries.</p> <p>- Taxis: even though the plan contains taxi pick up points on Stephenson Street on the north side of the development, in practice residents and office workers in the southern buildings will prefer to be picked up from the Gilbey's Yard access point as it is a shorter walk for them. This will cause congestion in this small area. Measures to stop this being the case should be stipulated in the plan. Reducing the building height of E1 to 6 floors as described in the building heights section, which is nearest Gilbey's Yard entrance, will help in this regard.</p> <p>- Van deliveries: since the concierge desk is located near the Gilbey's Yard entrance, drivers may be tempted to temporary park there, and walk the short distance to the concierge deal in building E1, rather than drive all the way round and enter via Stephenson Street. Moving the concierge from E1 to, for example, building A, seems sensible and will reduce this considerably.</p> <p>- Motorbike deliveries: motorbikes will no doubt try to enter through the Gilbey's Yard entrance, especially as the concierge is located in building E1 which is near the Gilbey's Yard entrance. Again, moving the concierge to building A, will reduce this considerably. Further measures to dissuade motorbikes from entering through this pedestrian/cycle zone should be stipulated, which could turn into an accident hotspot.</p>
2017/3847/P	Sean Howes	246 BARKER DRIVE NW1 0JF	15/08/2017 18:36:03	COMMNT	The creation of a huge amount of parking is not consistent with Camden and Transport for London policy to reduce the use of private motor. This will allow the continued damage to the environment, the health of citizens and the freedom of movement and safety of people not using cars. This will also bring more traffic and congestion to Calk Farm Road, which is already dangerous for active travel.
2017/3847/P	Amanda C de C Williams	1Prince of Wales Rd Flat 49 London NW5 3LW	13/08/2017 19:14:31	OBJEMPER	The huge amount of car parking will only increase traffic and pollution in an already congested area. This is totally incompatible with Camden's Hesthy Streets initiative. Cycle provision is almost entirely lacking and presents obvious dangers to the cyclist using the area and the superstore, both by poor design of roads and by the increased car and lorry traffic. I object to the scheme on these grounds.

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2017/3847/P	Eavan buckley	Flat 7 30 oval road	14/08/2017 08:25:31	COMMNT	<p>My interest in the application is by virtue of owning an apartment in the Henson building which is adjacent to the proposed development on the south side near the Interchange Building.</p> <p>There are a number of concerns with the proposals:</p> <p><b>Building Height</b> The heights of the proposed buildings are not contiguous with the local context and character of the area. The Henson is 6 stories high, which is typical of the maximum height of buildings in the area. The proposals are for a number of buildings which significantly exceed this: A (14 floors), C (10 floors), E1 (11 floors), F (9 floors).</p> <p>We are in agreement with the Design Review Panel of 02/12/2016, as shown on Page 40 of the Camden Goods Yard Planning Statement submitted with the planning application: "Panel suggest a shoulder height of 5 to 7 storeys, rising to 9 stories in one of two key locations would be more appropriate in this location."</p> <p>Applying this to the proposed development, we submit that the heights of the buildings should be amended as follows: E1: 11 to 6 floors. This building is in close proximity to the Henson which is 6 floors, and also the Interchange building. C: 10 to 6/7 floors. 10 floors towers above the Interchange building. F: 9 to 8 floors. As this is more central in the new village and is set back, a higher building may be possible without detriment to the surrounding area. A: 14 to 9 floors. As this is the most set back building, this could accommodate the highest building as recommended by the Design Review Panel of 9 floors. This is also the maximum height of building in the new Hawley Wharf development.</p> <p><b>Impact of Building Works</b> As this is a major project, the building works will take an extended number of years which will adversely affect the local community. Hence the utmost effort should be made to reduce the impact on local residents in terms of noise, pollution, and traffic. For example: - staging the building works: the plan envisions the petrol station being converted in the first stage to a temporary supermarket. Hence it makes sense to stage the works so that building commences in the north side of the development, and gradually works its way down so that the time during which major works are conducted adjacent to the buildings on the south side are limited; - erection of large hoardings to limit the impact of noise and pollution. There are many people who work from home, and also disabled people in the building, so solely limiting building works to the working day will not suffice in this instance, and hence extra measures are needed; - guarantee that Oval Road/Gilbey's Yard will not be used for site access during development.</p>

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
					<p>Post development traffic</p> <p>The traffic impact on Oval Road/Gilbey's Yard is a concern. Since the site is essentially a car free zone, the impacts of concern are from taxi's, and van and motorbike deliveries.</p> <p>- Taxis: even though the plan contains taxi pick up points on Stephenson Street on the north side of the development, in practice residents and office workers in the southern buildings will prefer to be picked up from the Gilbey's Yard access point as it is a shorter walk for them. This will cause congestion in this small area. Measures to stop this being the case should be stipulated in the plan. Reducing the building height of E1 to 6 floors as described in the building heights section, which is nearest Gilbey's Yard entrance, will help in this regard.</p> <p>- Van deliveries: since the concierge desk is located near the Gilbey's Yard entrance, drivers may be tempted to temporary park there, and walk the short distance to the concierge deal in building E1, rather than drive all the way round and enter via Stephenson Street. Moving the concierge from E1 to, for example, building A, seems sensible and will reduce this considerably.</p> <p>- Motorbike deliveries: motorbikes will no doubt try to enter through the Gilbey's Yard entrance, especially as the concierge is located in building E1 which is near the Gilbey's Yard entrance. Again, moving the concierge to building A, will reduce this considerably. Further measures to dissuade motorbikes from entering through this pedestrian/cycle zone should be stipulated, which could turn into an accident hotspot.</p>

---

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2017/3847/P	Katie jackson	Flat 2 30 oval road	13/08/2017 22:52:26	OBJCOMP AP	<p>My interest in the application is by virtue of owning an apartment in the Henson building which is adjacent to the proposed development on the south side near the Interchange Building.</p> <p>There are a number of concerns with the proposals:</p> <p><b>Building Height</b> The heights of the proposed buildings are not contiguous with the local context and character of the area. The Henson is 6 stories high, which is typical of the maximum height of buildings in the area. The proposals are for a number of buildings which significantly exceed this: A (14 floors), C (10 floors), E1 (11 floors), F (9 floors).</p> <p>We are in agreement with the Design Review Panel of 02/12/2016, as shown on Page 40 of the Camden Goods Yard Planning Statement submitted with the planning application: "Panel suggest a shoulder height of 5 to 7 storeys, rising to 9 stories in one of two key locations would be more appropriate in this location."</p> <p>Applying this to the proposed development, we submit that the heights of the buildings should be amended as follows: E1: 11 to 6 floors. This building is in close proximity to the Henson which is 6 floors, and also the Interchange building. C: 10 to 6/7 floors. 10 floors towers above the Interchange building. F: 9 to 8 floors. As this is more central in the new village and is set back, a higher building may be possible without detriment to the surrounding area. A: 14 to 9 floors. As this is the most set back building, this could accommodate the highest building as recommended by the Design Review Panel of 9 floors. This is also the maximum height of building in the new Hawley Wharf development.</p> <p><b>Impact of Building Works</b> As this is a major project, the building works will take an extended number of years which will adversely affect the local community. Hence the utmost effort should be made to reduce the impact on local residents in terms of noise, pollution, and traffic. For example: - staging the building works: the plan envisions the petrol station being converted in the first stage to a temporary supermarket. Hence it makes sense to stage the works so that building commences in the north side of the development, and gradually works its way down so that the time during which major works are conducted adjacent to the buildings on the south side are limited; - erection of large hoardings to limit the impact of noise and pollution. There are many people who work from home, and also disabled people in the building, so solely limiting building works to the working day will not suffice in this instance, and hence extra measures are needed; - guarantee that Oval Road/Gilbey"s Yard will not be used for site access during development.</p>

Post development traffic

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
					<p>The traffic impact on Oval Road/Gilbey"s Yard is a concern. Since the site is essentially a car free zone, the impacts of concern are from taxi"s, and van and motorbike deliveries.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>- Taxis: even though the plan contains taxi pick up points on Stephenson Street on the north side of the development, in practice residents and office workers in the southern buildings will prefer to be picked up from the Gilbey"s Yard access point as it is a shorter walk for them. This will cause congestion in this small area. Measures to stop this being the case should be stipulated in the plan. Reducing the building height of E1 to 6 floors as described in the building heights section, which is nearest Gilbey"s Yard entrance, will help in this regard.</li><li>- Van deliveries: since the concierge desk is located near the Gilbey"s Yard entrance, drivers may be tempted to temporary park there, and walk the short distance to the concierge deal in building E1, rather than drive all the way round and enter via Stephenson Street. Moving the concierge from E1 to, for example, building A, seems sensible and will reduce this considerably.</li><li>- Motorbike deliveries: motorbikes will no doubt try to enter through the Gilbey"s Yard entrance, especially as the concierge is located in building E1 which is near the Gilbey"s Yard entrance. Again, moving the concierge to building A, will reduce this considerably. Further measures to dissuade motorbikes from entering through this pedestrian/cycle zone should be stipulated, which could turn into an accident hotspot.</li></ul>

---

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2017/3847/P	Philippa Nelson	31 Princess Road London NW1 8JR	13/08/2017 22:39:23	OBJ	<p>Re 2017/3847/P Morrisons Superstore and Petrol Filling Station, Chalk Farm Road, NW1 8EH</p> <p>I am writing to object to the application for the Morrison Site redevelopment in its current form.</p> <p>The number of parking spaces (300) to be provided for shoppers at the Morrisons superstore is not in line with Camden and Transport for London policy to reduce the use of private motor vehicles because of the damage they cause to the environment, the health of citizens and the freedom of movement and safety of people not using cars, and to those walking or cycling. The location of the site means that the pollution produced by cars driven to the superstore is very likely to damage the health of the large numbers of visitors to Camden Market and reduce their enjoyment by restricting their movement around the area, as well as to the residents of the proposed accommodation on the site.</p> <p>Although there is no provision for resident parking it is nevertheless likely that inhabitants of the proposed development will also own cars; this will put pressure on surrounding parking elsewhere in the local area, further increase congestion and adversely affect the smooth running of local transport links and safety of cyclists, again negatively impacting on the successful implementation of Camden and Transport for London travel policy.</p> <p>The limited access to the site will further increase congestion in the local area, and does not provide for safe cycling or walking pathways to access the site.</p> <p>I make this point despite the current existence on the site of a large superstore with somewhat more parking provision (425 spaces). Since planning permission was given for the current superstore Camden Market has expanded very substantially, resulting in a correspondingly huge increase in the number of pedestrian visitors. Our understanding and knowledge of the health and environmental impact of motor vehicles has greatly increased and has been transformed since then and Camden policy on highway planning and car use has also changed as a result.</p> <p>Additionally, plans for a 14-story redevelopment on an already raised site are inappropriate, as it will dominate the skyline unnecessarily and negatively impact on the views from streets in the Primrose Hill conservation area. It is a high-density development in an already over crowded area, a lower density and lower rise development would be more appropriate.</p> <p>The plans for an open space, whilst attractive on paper, are also a potential invitation to antisocial behaviour and public nuisance, given the current level of low level crime in the immediate vicinity of Camden Lock and the Regents Canal.</p> <p>The points above make the site unsuitable for this type of development. I urge you to reject the planning application in its current form.</p>

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

---

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2017/3847/P	Steven	14 Kingswear Road	12/08/2017 20:44:55	COMMEM PER	<p>Chalk Farm Morrisons Development Plan</p> <p>A deeply disappointing and distressing application - especially regarding Camden Council's apparently being a leading borough in regard to concerns about impacts on the environment from traffic (noise, pollution, emissions, impediments to sustainable/active travel etc).</p> <p>There is no question that this must NOT be approved</p> <p>How can provision of 300 parking spaces for Morrisons' shoppers do anything but encourage MORE private motor vehicles? How will this assist people to use the store safely and without experiencing the negative impacts? Are parents cycling with children or those arriving by public transport really going to benefit from the impact of a constant stream of motor vehicles? Nearby visitors to Camden Market would also be affected by this extraordinary lack of awareness or consideration. This site may as well be rejected out of hand for the proposed development since there is clearly no joined up thinking here: no alignment even with TfL's own policies.</p> <p>Camden Market has recently expanded somewhat, resulting in a huge increase in the number of pedestrian visitors. The 425 places existing are also unacceptable in this regard. To ignore the position of this store so close to the centre of Camden is negligent.</p> <p>Elsewhere, the intention to maintain and improve the cycle route from Gilbey's Yard to Chalk Farm Road is good but there are issues with the road designs.</p> <p>The drawings do not appear to reflect the claim in the ENVIRONMENTAL STATEMENT NON-TECHNICAL SUMMARY, para 4.23: Cyclists would access the proposed development on the MS parcel using a segregated cycle path from Chalk Farm Road, following the same route as vehicles along Stephenson Street. The brief section of separate cycle track shown (junction with Chalk Farm Rd) shows the danger to those cycling of from left-hooks as vehicles leave the site.</p> <p>The Chalk Farm Road/Stephenson Street/Ferdinand Street junction design must be fully reviewed and approved for cycling safety by Camden highway planners in consultation with Camden Cycling Campaign. This is imperative.</p> <p>From Chalk Farm Road (north of the service station) there must be a shared-use path at a minimum. People cycling have to be able to access Stephenson Street, the superstore and Gilbey's Yard from the north without passing through the potentially busy signalised junction.</p>



Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
					<p>Para 4.23: "As the centre of the proposed development would be pedestrian only, cyclists would be required to dismount before continuing on the proposed development." Unacceptable. A deterrent and impediment to cycling on top of those experienced on other roads around the borough. This is poor consideration of the needs for residents, their visitors and others to use bicycles as transport. Cycle parking at present for supermarket customers is clear at least but not for the intentions of this design. Access should be safe, unencumbered and clearly signed.</p> <p>Remember that cycling access should be provide for those using tricycles. hand cycles, or any sort where it aids mobility, in addition to cargo bikes and of course parents with children and young cyclists themselves.</p> <p>The current access to Gilbeys Yard and Oval Road is an unsatisfactory cycle track from the car park to Gilbeys Yard (and on to Oval Road). Bollards here cause a serious obstruction (place to stop trolley theft). This must be rectified. In addition there are problems for cyclists at this point due to motors parking on the existing cycle track (parking restrictions and enforcement are urgently needed here). The standard of the finish of this track is poor and should be improved under Section 106 ruling.</p> <p>A11 - Construction Management Plan: working hours are proposed as to be 8-6 M-F &amp; 8-1 Sat with up to 60 vehicles per day, all via Chalk Farm Road. This would have a massive impact on residents. Deliveries should be restricted to 10-4 (with occasional exceptions where unavoidable). Lorries will meet FORS and CLOCS levels but this should (FORS) be Silver or Gold.</p>

---

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2017/3847/P	Martin Nelson	31 Princess Road London NW1 8JR	13/08/2017 22:33:14	OBJ	<p>I am writing to object to the application for the Morrison Site redevelopment in its current form.</p> <p>The number of parking spaces (300) to be provided for shoppers at the Morrisons superstore is not in line with Camden and Transport for London policy to reduce the use of private motor vehicles because of the damage they cause to the environment, the health of citizens and the freedom of movement and safety of people not using cars, and to those walking or cycling. The location of the site means that the pollution produced by cars driven to the superstore is very likely to damage the health of the large numbers of visitors to Camden Market and reduce their enjoyment by restricting their movement around the area, as well as to the residents of the proposed accommodation on the site.</p> <p>Although there is no provision for resident parking it is nevertheless likely that inhabitants of the proposed development will also own cars; this will put pressure on surrounding parking elsewhere in the local area, further increase congestion and adversely affect the smooth running of local transport links and safety of cyclists, again negatively impacting on the successful implementation of Camden and Transport for London travel policy.</p> <p>The limited access to the site will further increase congestion in the local area, and does not provide for safe cycling or walking pathways to access the site.</p> <p>I make this point despite the current existence on the site of a large superstore with somewhat more parking provision (425 spaces). Since planning permission was given for the current superstore Camden Market has expanded very substantially, resulting in a correspondingly huge increase in the number of pedestrian visitors. Our understanding and knowledge of the health and environmental impact of motor vehicles has greatly increased and has been transformed since then and Camden policy on highway planning and car use has also changed as a result.</p> <p>Additionally, plans for a 14-story redevelopment on an already raised site are inappropriate, as it will dominate the skyline unnecessarily and negatively impact on the views from streets in the Primrose Hill conservation area. It is a high-density development in an already over crowded area, a lower density and lower rise development would be more appropriate.</p> <p>The points above make the site unsuitable for this type of development. I urge you to reject the planning application in its current form.</p>
2017/3847/P	LT	Treaty Street Islington London N1 0TE	12/08/2017 22:39:10	COMMNT	<p>Carpark of this size not needed, Camden should enable/encourage walkers and cyclists not polluting car driving. Complete waste of land and useless in long term.</p>

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2017/3847/P	Martin Nelson	31 Princess Road London NW1 8JR	13/08/2017 22:33:02	OBJ	<p>I am writing to object to the application for the Morrison Site redevelopment in its current form.</p> <p>The number of parking spaces (300) to be provided for shoppers at the Morrisons superstore is not in line with Camden and Transport for London policy to reduce the use of private motor vehicles because of the damage they cause to the environment, the health of citizens and the freedom of movement and safety of people not using cars, and to those walking or cycling. The location of the site means that the pollution produced by cars driven to the superstore is very likely to damage the health of the large numbers of visitors to Camden Market and reduce their enjoyment by restricting their movement around the area, as well as to the residents of the proposed accommodation on the site.</p> <p>Although there is no provision for resident parking it is nevertheless likely that inhabitants of the proposed development will also own cars; this will put pressure on surrounding parking elsewhere in the local area, further increase congestion and adversely affect the smooth running of local transport links and safety of cyclists, again negatively impacting on the successful implementation of Camden and Transport for London travel policy.</p> <p>The limited access to the site will further increase congestion in the local area, and does not provide for safe cycling or walking pathways to access the site.</p> <p>I make this point despite the current existence on the site of a large superstore with somewhat more parking provision (425 spaces). Since planning permission was given for the current superstore Camden Market has expanded very substantially, resulting in a correspondingly huge increase in the number of pedestrian visitors. Our understanding and knowledge of the health and environmental impact of motor vehicles has greatly increased and has been transformed since then and Camden policy on highway planning and car use has also changed as a result.</p> <p>Additionally, plans for a 14-story redevelopment on an already raised site are inappropriate, as it will dominate the skyline unnecessarily and negatively impact on the views from streets in the Primrose Hill conservation area. It is a high-density development in an already over crowded area, a lower density and lower rise development would be more appropriate.</p> <p>The points above make the site unsuitable for this type of development. I urge you to reject the planning application in its current form.</p>

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2017/3847/P	selwin hurwitz	apartment 20 the henson 30 oval road nw1 7de	12/08/2017 18:24:47	OBJ	<p>My interest in the application is by virtue of owning an apartment in the Henson building which is adjacent to the proposed development on the south side near the Interchange Building.</p> <p>There are a number of concerns with the proposals:</p> <p><b>Building Height</b></p> <p>The heights of the proposed buildings are not contiguous with the local context and character of the area. The Henson is 6 stories high, which is typical of the maximum height of buildings in the area. The proposals are for a number of buildings which significantly exceed this: A (14 floors), C (10 floors), E1 (11 floors), F (9 floors).</p> <p>We are in agreement with the Design Review Panel of 02/12/2016, as shown on Page 40 of the Camden Goods Yard Planning Statement submitted with the planning application: "Panel suggest a shoulder height of 5 to 7 storeys, rising to 9 stories in one of two key locations would be more appropriate in this location."</p> <p>Applying this to the proposed development, we submit that the heights of the buildings should be amended as follows:</p> <p>E1: 11 to 6 floors. This building is in close proximity to the Henson which is 6 floors, and also the Interchange building.</p> <p>C: 10 to 6/7 floors. 10 floors towers above the Interchange building.</p> <p>F: 9 to 8 floors. As this is more central in the new village and is set back, a higher building may be possible without detriment to the surrounding area.</p> <p>A: 14 to 9 floors. As this is the most set back building, this could accommodate the highest building as recommended by the Design Review Panel of 9 floors. This is also the maximum height of building in the new Hawley Wharf development.</p> <p><b>Impact of Building Works</b></p> <p>As this is a major project, the building works will take an extended number of years which will adversely affect the local community. Hence the utmost effort should be made to reduce the impact on local residents in terms of noise, pollution, and traffic. For example:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- staging the building works: the plan envisions the petrol station being converted in the first stage to a temporary supermarket. Hence it makes sense to stage the works so that building commences in the north side of the development, and gradually works its way down so that the time during which major works are conducted adjacent to the buildings on the south side are limited;</li> <li>- erection of large hoardings to limit the impact of noise and pollution. There are many people who work from home, and also disabled people in the building, so solely limiting building works to the working day will not suffice in this instance, and hence extra measures are needed;</li> <li>- guarantee that Oval Road/Gilbey's Yard will not be used for site access during development.</li> </ul> <p><b>Post development traffic</b></p>

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
					<p>The traffic impact on Oval Road/Gilbey's Yard is a concern. Since the site is essentially a car free zone, the impacts of concern are from taxi's, and van and motorbike deliveries.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Taxis: even though the plan contains taxi pick up points on Stephenson Street on the north side of the development, in practice residents and office workers in the southern buildings will prefer to be picked up from the Gilbey's Yard access point as it is a shorter walk for them. This will cause congestion in this small area. Measures to stop this being the case should be stipulated in the plan. Reducing the building height of E1 to 6 floors as described in the building heights section, which is nearest Gilbey's Yard entrance, will help in this regard.</li> <li>- Van deliveries: since the concierge desk is located near the Gilbey's Yard entrance, drivers may be tempted to temporary park there, and walk the short distance to the concierge deal in building E1, rather than drive all the way round and enter via Stephenson Street. Moving the concierge from E1 to, for example, building A, seems sensible and will reduce this considerably.</li> <li>- Motorbike deliveries: motorbikes will no doubt try to enter through the Gilbey's Yard entrance, especially as the concierge is located in building E1 which is near the Gilbey's Yard entrance. Again, moving the concierge to building A, will reduce this considerably. Further measures to dissuade motorbikes from entering through this pedestrian/cycle zone should be stipulated, which could turn into an accident hotspot.</li> </ul>
2017/3847/P	Angela Hobsbaum	5 Chatto Mansions 1 Olmstead Close N10 3FB	13/08/2017 21:39:51	OBJ	<p>The number of parking spaces (300) to be provided for shoppers at the Morrison's superstore is inconsistent with the policies of Camden and Transport for London, to reduce the use of private motor vehicles because of the damage they cause to the environment, the health of citizens and the freedom of movement and safety of people not using cars.</p> <p>Plenty of people will want to walk or cycle to this store, but no safe and convenient access for cyclists and pedestrians has been included. The large number of cycle parking spaces is pointless if cyclists of all ages and confidence levels cannot safely access the site.</p>

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2017/3847/P	Alastair Loraine	76 Gilbeys Yard Camden Town London NW1 8HB	11/08/2017 20:21:47	AMEND	<p>I would like to ask for three amendments to be made to the application. First I'd like to object to the height of Block A, C and most of all E1. The scale of all three is high for this part of Camden/Chalk Farm but it is the scale and position of block E1 that appears from the plans to loom over the local community. It's position at the top of Oval Road will dominate the skyline as you look up Oval Rd. It all so dominates the surrounding housing with nearly all of Gilbeys Yard losing their privacy, with the occupants of the block spying into everyones gardens.</p> <p>Secondly, the path from Gilbeys Yard through to the Morrisons site presently goes in a straight line to a destination, the proposed new path zigs and zags around building, surely this would be better designed to go directly to a destination.</p> <p>And thirdly, there are a row of mature London Plain trees at the back of the flats in Gilbeys Yard, that shield the flats from the car park and the supermarket. It would be a tragedy for these mature trees to be felled, surely they can be kept as part of the redevelopment. Local residents are found of this screen and if we are going to have years of redevelopment and construction then I hope the council will insist that these trees are incorporated into the scheme.</p> <p>I'm pro the construction of more housing in London but I believe schemes have to fit in and not dominate local communities, as well as making some minor concessions to get approval for their plans.</p>

---

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2017/3847/P	G Wheeler	2 Oval Road London	13/08/2017 20:48:51	AMEND	<p>Whilst I am not against the redevelopment of this site (indeed, I consider that it is a valuable opportunity to make significant improvements to the current environment) I object to these current proposals on the following grounds:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Increased traffic flow and congestion with the resulting increase in pollution (air and noise) around Oval Road, where I live. Oval Road includes listed properties and in part lies within a conservation area. Oval Road and Jamestown Road already suffer from traffic issues as follows (1) traffic build ups in busy periods, (2) goods vehicles passing over the speed bumps causing vibration to listed properties, and (3) cars and motorbikes often speeding down Oval Road causing safety issues for other road users including pedestrians. The current proposals would increase these issues. Taxi, van and motorbike traffic along Oval Road would increase by virtue of (1) the large number of dwellings proposed and (2) the fact that the concierge office is proposed to be located near the pedestrian entrance to the site near Oval Road. Proposals should ensure that ALL traffic access to this site REMAINS onto Chalk Farm Road. This will include moving the concierge office to that side of the site. It will also be important that any planning permission granted at this stage includes a condition that any future planning applications to allow vehicle access to this site from Oval Road will be denied. Failure to do this will increase traffic, air and noise pollution in a conservation and residential area. Oval Road will already have increased traffic as a result of the redevelopment of Centric Close. Further congestion through this development is therefore a significant concern.</li> <li>2. The height of the buildings proposed are out of character with the historic low rise environment of Camden. Whilst redevelopment of this site is welcome, designs should be more in keeping with the traditional Camden feel - the buildings proposed in this application will destroy the very character of this part of Camden that is attractive to current residents and the high level of visitors upon which many local businesses depend. Heights of the buildings should be reduced to a maximum of 5 levels, with more space between the buildings.</li> <li>3. Local medical, educational and public transport infrastructure in Camden is already stretched. Amending the scale and height of the buildings should deal with this concern in part however consideration should also be given to requiring the developers as a condition to any permission granted to build in the site, and provide ongoing funding for, a medical surgery and a childrens play and pensioners day care centre.</li> </ol>
2017/3847/P	Les Hearn	Flat 49 1 Prince of Wales Road London NW5 3LW	13/08/2017 20:44:57	OBJ	<p>The enormous increase in car parking will only increase traffic and pollution in an already congested area. This is incompatible with Camden's Healthy Streets initiative.</p> <p>Increased cycle provision is welcome but access to the site for bikes is difficult and potentially dangerous (steep road passing Morrison's garage with no cycle lane and lots more cars, vans and lorries, if planned car parking increase occurs; alternative route involves inconvenient and time consuming detour through congested Camden Lock area).</p> <p>I object to the scheme on these grounds.</p>