

Planning Application Details

<i>Title</i>	Mr.
<i>Your First Name</i>	Alastair
<i>Initial</i>	R
<i>Last Name</i>	Loraine
<i>Organisation</i>	Resident
<i>Comment Type</i>	Object
<i>Postcode</i>	NW18HB
<i>Address line 1</i>	76 Gilbeys Yard, Oval Road,
<i>Address line 2</i>	Camden Town,
<i>Address line 3</i>	London
<i>Postcode</i>	NW18HB

Your comments on the planning application Please see the attached document.

If you wish to upload a file containing your comments then use the link below

[Objections to Morrisons Site](#)

<i>Received on</i>	09/09/2017
<i>Form reference</i>	21049376
<i>Status</i>	Submitted on 09/09/2017 23:45
<i>Contact method</i>	Self service
<i>Type</i>	Comments on a current Planning Application

OBJECTIONS FROM A GILBEYS YARD RESIDENT

GILBEY'S YARD

1. The privacy to habitable rooms at the rear of Gilbeys Yard, which are mainly bedrooms, to the proposed development is less than the 18m guideline in several places:

Block E1 Levels 1-4 living room windows and corner terraces range within 10-14m with Level 5 upwards bedroom windows being within 11m. Block E2 rear living rooms are within 15m. Block E2 rear landing windows are within 15m and are not shown as frosted.

2. The general height of the development is too tall, dominating all that surrounds it. Of particular concern is the very tall Block E1 at 11 storeys high. It is very close to and overlooks a great deal of Gilbeys Yard.

3. The single storey building at the south-west end of Block D should not be a retail unit as it will cause great disturbance especially for those whose properties directly neighbour the alleyway through to Oval Road. These properties have north facing bedrooms that would directly face and/or overlook this large retail unit.

4. The communal bin stores for Blocks D and E1 have been placed at the point where they are as close to Gilbeys Yard as is possible. This is unfair and disrespectful to the residents of Gilbeys Yard.

5. The number accessing the site via the Gilbeys Yard alleyway will be far greater than the developer suggests. Leaving the 'car-free' site by this route offers many advantages over leaving via the Chalk Farm Road route by the petrol filling station:

5a. It is the quickest route to Camden Town station. Camden Town offer more options than Chalk Farm station and is more accessible escalator based rather than elevator based.

5b. The choice of bus routes from Camden Town is far greater than those available from Chalk Farm Road and Chalk Farm station. Virtually all Camden bus routes stop at Camden Tube.

5c. Cycles will logically favour this entrance over the dangerous junction at Chalk Farm Road – it will take them on to the relative safety of Oval Road and beyond into the popular cycle routes around and through Regents Park.

5d. This entrance will also be a far more popular walking route than the developer suggests. This is the natural route down to Euston, Kings Cross, Oxford Street and so on.

OBJECTIONS FROM A GILBEYS YARD RESIDENT

6. Gilbeys Yard will be used by many taxis, delivery vehicles and fast food motorcycles to enter the development. Taxi users will greatly cut their fare and journey time by using Gilbeys Yard as a taxi rank and then enter or leave the site via the alleyway. Delivery drivers will logically park in Gilbeys Yard and try to deliver on foot where possible – it will be much quicker. Please note that the concierge for the entire development is in Block E, right by the alleyway, where deliveries will be received. Similarly, fast food motorcycles will use this alleyway in exactly the same way when suitable.

7. The suggested access route at the most easterly point of the main site by the Interchange building is simply illogical. Those that take this route will have to turn right into Gilbeys Yard in order to reach Oval Road, effectively meeting up with the alleyway where it enters Gilbeys Yard. For most it is simply a long route with no advantage.

THE PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT FROM WITHIN.

8. Within the new development itself the majority of habitable rooms are well within the 18m guidelines, some as close as 12m. Balconies worsen this lack of privacy. Furthermore, there are many examples of very high height to width ratios creating a 'canyon' effect throughout the development (for instance Roundhouse Way: 32.6m high by 15m wide).

8a. From the diagrams supplied approximately a third of dwellings within the development do not reach the BRE requirement for 5% Annual Probable Sunlight Hours. Also, approximately 180 out of over 1550 fail to meet the BRE standard for daylight. Of these, two thirds are living rooms or kitchens.

8c. The layout is disjointed and confusing, with no clear views or routes through. The great variety of building materials from block to block creates a lack of unifying coherence.

HERITAGE

9. There is considerable harm to heritage of the area, particularly the listed buildings including the Roundhouse (Grade II*), the Horse Hospital (Grade II*) and the Interchange (Grade II). There also considerable harm caused to the views from the surrounding conservation areas such as Primrose Hill.

9a. The views provided in the 'Townscape and Visual Impact Assessment' are misleading. Important views are completely missing (Juniper Crescent) or taken from a position to minimise the impact (view 37 on Oval Road should be taken from the opposite pavement to give a clearer indication). There should also be a view far nearer to the site from within Gilbeys Yard. Furthermore, View 21 is taken from the exact spot on Haverstock Hill when Block A is almost totally obscured by the Roundhouse. Moving just a few metres up or down the road would clearly show a far greater level of harm.

OBJECTIONS FROM A GILBEYS YARD RESIDENT

CHALK FARM JUNCTION

10. Changing this junction to a single crossroads will cause huge congestion on Chalk Farm Road, Ferdinand Street and the access road to the development (for instance, an increased queueing time on Chalk Farm Road itself in excess of 37 seconds).

10a. It is anticipated that when the site is fully developed there will be thousands on foot (residents leaving, workers arriving) trying to use a single 1.8m pavement during the morning and evening rush hours. This is unrealistic.

10c. There is almost no provision for cycles barring a short and meaningless cycle path. Cyclists will be left to compete with cars, buses and lorries. The Traffic Assessment document openly shows the dangerous conflict between cycles and lorries turning left on to Chalk Farm Road. This is clearly unsafe.

10d. By removing the road from behind the Petrol Filling Station the developer has also lost the option to ease the traffic situation of buses which could operate from this point. Instead, six bus stops and stands will be placed on the access road, two of which will be directly beneath the bedroom windows of Juniper Crescent.

10e. The developer admits that key traffic routes will be saturated by their own development leaving no capacity for any future development to the other sites within the framework.

11. The design of the petrol filling station with its huge glass façade has no place on Chalk Farm Road. It causes serious harm to the Grade II* listed Horse Hospital and is nothing but a covert signpost for the Morrisons supermarket. It would also cause serious issues with the consented development of 100 Chalk Farm Road and their future residents.

SOCIAL INFRASTRUCTURE

12. The drain on local resources appears to be greatly underestimated. For example the development will create a demand of only 0.7 of a GP. Knowing how difficult it is to get a GP appointment makes this estimate seem far too low.
MORRISONS STORE AND OTHER RETAIL UNITS

13. It should be a condition of any consent that the food store and petrol filling station cannot stay open for 24 hours as it is seeking to do. It should close at 11pm. There should also be very tight controls on the type and opening hours of all other retail units within the development.

SPD FRAMEWORK

14. Even though as residents our homes are threatened by being within the SPD Framework we have actively engaged with Camden Council to help shape the final version. It is clear that this planning application does not appear to respect the framework in far too many ways.