

From Robert Harbison  
84 Harwood Street  
NW1 8DS

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](mailto:gavin.sexton@camden.gov.uk)**

12 September 2017

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

The redevelopment of the Camden Goods Yard site has tremendous potential for the future of the district. It is much bigger than Hawley Wharf and both more promising and more threatening for the community.

Taken together, the Planning Framework Draft produced by Camden and the response to it by Paul Whiteley and his group contain much good careful thought about what could happen on the site if there is the will to push for it. The main ideas as far as I understand them are to think of the entire site as one, not just the Morrison's part by itself. And to consider the relation of new buildings to the surroundings more than the present Morrison/Barratt proposal does, and, most important, to insist on more social benefit in the final result.

So **routes through the site** connecting it strongly to the wider district, **a smaller place for cars** (and especially the elimination of the present unfriendly way in, up a ramp enclosed by blank walls), **meaningful public spaces** and **a green route** along the top of the site, eventually stretching from Primrose Hill station to the canal around the Market would all make the site more accessible and friendly to inhabitants and pedestrians.

Then there is the huge matter of **the scale and bulk of the proposed structures**--much too large and densely packed at the moment--and **what kind of spaces they create for people on the ground**. And the possibility of **new arts venues**, in the

recently listed vaults ... and in the building on Chalk Farm Road where the petrol station now is.

I'm writing this in hope that it is not too late to persuade both the developers and Camden's planners to take more notice of the Planning Framework and the further ideas of the Working Group. In order for this to happen it seems that Camden must get more strongly behind the Framework, which represents a sizable commitment and now risks being ignored.

The application in its present form should be refused. In my opinion it would need substantial changes, increasing the social benefits of the scheme considerably, in order to become acceptable.

Robert Harbison  
Professor of Architectural History