
From: Phebe Robinow [REDACTED]
Sent: 22 January 2020 09:34
To: Planning
Subject: Fwd: Planning application 2019/6302/HS2

Richard and I (28 Park Village East) agree with and endorse everything Roger Low writes below. As we could not put it better ourselves, I am re-sending Roger's e-mail to you which I would like you to accept as two objections.

Thank you.

Phebe Robinow

Sent from my iPad

Begin forwarded message:

From: Roger Low [REDACTED]
Date: 15 January 2020 at 04:36:08 GMT+7
To: Planning <planning@camden.gov.uk>
Cc: Sofie.Fieldsend@camden.gov.uk
Subject: Planning application 2019/6302/HS2

I strongly object to the subject planning application.

In my comments, below, I refer to HS2'S "Schedule 17 Plans and Specifications Written Statement for Information LBC.S112.PS.06"

2.3.2 If the Mornington Street Bridge is 350 m from the site, then Grade II* buildings are nearer than 350 m, as four such Nash houses are located south of the said Bridge. (Not 450 m from the site, as wrongly asserted)

4.1.3 - 4.1.5 The "honest but visually controlled" proposal is, totally, out of context for the site.

4.1.7 - 4.1.8 The "customised form" featuring "the same unique HS2 profile" cannot, by definition, fit in with "local heritage assets and conservations areas" and "recognise[s] the context of the local character." The material has no precedent or relationship to local materials. The design is an alien form. The colour is highly unsympathetic to its surroundings.

4.3.1 Less attention should be paid to "the honest expression of the engineering" and more attention should be paid to the context of this construction facing, not one, but two Conservation areas and a large number of existing Grade II and Grade II* buildings.

4.3.5 From the drawings, it is clear that the design of the wall is inappropriate for the location and the idea of a quick fix by covering the wall with "art" is, clearly, grasping at straws. This is Camden, after all--how many hours will it take for such a wall to be covered in graffiti?

6.1.1 The proposal DOES NOT "preserve the local environment or local amenity," Rather, it imposes a one-size-fits-all, route-wide, boring, civil engineering solution--NOT a "local solution."

The proposal DOES NOT "preserve a site of archaeological or historic interest." Rather, it runs rough-shod over the local Conservation Areas, the Nash houses, and other historical buildings.

Comments in the Written Statement suggest alternatives, so the proposal is "reasonably capable of being modified" to "preserve the local environment or local amenity" and "preserve a site of archaeological or historic interest."

6.2 Is a statement of assertions, which one would expect from an applicant for planning permission, seeking the cheapest, easiest solution. The statements are not evidence, nor proof. The applicant wishes to impose route-wide "Common Design Elements" on several of Camden's historic neighbourhoods. Once those neighbourhoods are destroyed by such alien design, they cannot be resurrected.

The Application should be denied.

Roger L. Low

