Planning Department, London Borough of Camden

2nd Floor, 5 Pancras Square c/o Town Hall, Judd Street London WC1H 9JE

Attn Gavin Sexton via email: gavin.sexton@camden.gov.uk

08 September 2017

RE: Objection to proposal 2017/3847/P Morrison's Camden Goods Yard

Background

The principle I welcome the redevelopment of the existing Morrison's site within Good's Yard in Camden Town. However, I object to the proposed scheme submitted by Barrett's as it does not address the requirements of the Approved Camden Goods Yard Planning Framework, is a gross over development of the site, will adversely impact the many surrounding heritage assets and fails to address issues of linkages and transportation to, from and through the site.

Camden Goods Yard Planning Framework

"It aims to shape development, to enhance the area for existing communities and to guide the provision of new homes, affordable homes, jobs, open space and facilities to create an integrated and attractive place to live, work and visit."

Site Layout and Linkages

The proposed primary route through the site appears to be made up of the left over space between the buildings, has significant level changes and lacks coherence. It fails to provide a primary route that would ultimately link Oval Road with the Roundhouse.

The proposals do not give due consideration to areas of future development outside its site boundary e.g. the Camden Highline or the impact of these routes on existing residential areas or possible redevelopment of the One Housing Group sites. Issues of a significantly increased population arriving and leaving the site have not been properly addressed.

The level change in the site fails to improve connects with Chalk Farm Road. Increased access at the level of Chalk Farm Road would allow a connection with the Stables Market and to Camden Lock Place inline with the Planning Framework. A problem with the scheme's intended connection to Camden Lock Place at high level is it would promote the influx of the market and night-time economy visitors into Gilbey's Yard and the new residential areas to the detriment of their amenity.

Land Use

The strategic land use layout fails to protect the amenity of existing and new residential areas from the transient daily population influx arriving to work or use the adjacent market and existing night-time economies. Refer to the land use diagram in the adopted Framework P32.

There is insufficient affordable offices and workspace which LB Camden has identified as needed in their Employment Land Study 2014.

There should be an increase in non-Morrison's food store A1-4 to support the diversity and variety required by the Planning Framework.

Local Planning Policy: Townscape, Heritage Assets and Visual Impact

Policy CS14 requires that development is of the highest standard of design and that it respects local context and character. It also ensures that Camden's heritage assets and their settings, including conservation areas, listed buildings, archaeological remains, scheduled ancient monuments and historic parks and gardens are preserved and enhanced and promotes high quality landscaping and works to streets and public spaces.

The height and bulk and siting of the buildings fails to preserve or enhance the setting of the Primrose Hill CA, the Regent's Canal CA, the Grade II Interchange Building, The Grade II* Roundhouse and the Horse Hospital. The proposed development causes substantial harm to these heritage assets and is not outweighed by the economic benefit of much needed housing as claimed by the applicant, particularly as LB Camden has exceeded it housing supply target in the last year by circa 50%.

Public Realm

Spaces between buildings appear to be leftover rather than planned. The height to width ratio gives a feeing of being in a narrow canyon.

Many of the key public spaces within this scheme would have very low levels of sunlight and be overshadowed. This is not what I would expect from a high quality architectural scheme. As always the visuals provided are 'artists impressions' with unrealistically enhanced imagery.

Housing Quality

Too many units that face north are single aspect. It appears that a significant number of units would not receive adequate sunlight to the BRE standard. The GIA report documents what I consider to be an unacceptable number of living rooms or kitchens that fail the BRE standard for daylight. Most habitable rooms are below the 18m guideline for residential privacy (without the inclusion of balconies).

Impact on Neighbouring Amenity

There will be a negative impact on daylight/sunlight to a number of habitable rooms in Juniper Crescent.

Several of the windows in the proposed development are within the 18m privacy guideline.

There is a long-standing issue with buses parking and idling on Stephenson Way. The increased population will require an increase in buses that will exacerbate this issue. The closing of the road behind the existing petrol station removes one of the options that could resolve this issue.

The proposals locate a concierge position close to Gilbey's Yard that will only exacerbate the current noise/nuisance problems being experience by residents by the inclusion of delivery vehicles. This should be located adjacent to Chalk Farm Road.

Transport and Vehicles

The proposals only give consideration to the redevelopment of the Morrison's site and not to the wider Framework area. It fails to consider properly the needs of pedestrians and cyclist across the site.

Cars and buses are brought to the upper level of the site when they could be kept at the lower level.

Taxi pick-up and drop off have not been properly considered with regard to what will happen in practice and the effect it will have on residents.

The proposed transport strategy fails to deal with the possibility of the redevelopment of the rest of the Planning Framework area, the removal of the existing road junction will cause problems on Chalk Farm Road and there is insufficient thought or provision made for safe cyclist and pedestrian routes.

The number of parking spaces provided for Morrison's is 50 more than their calculated peak requirement. No provision seems to have been made for car clubs, taxi or local delivery vehicles.

Construction concerns

It is not clear how the proposals would be constructed without the use of Oval Road which is not acceptable. This may be reviewed in any CMP but as a matter of H&S should be a consideration.

Conclusion

I object to this development as currently proposed and urge you to refuse this application.

Yours sincerely,

Kathryn Gemmell