

**Hazelton, Laura**

---

**From:** Peter Darley - [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** 03 July 2020 14:22  
**To:** Hazelton, Laura  
**Cc:** Vicky Richardson; William Brimmer; David Waller  
**Subject:** Planning application 2020/2887/L, Chalk Farm Gate, The Stables Market

**[EXTERNAL EMAIL]** Beware – This email originated outside Camden Council and may be malicious Please take extra care with any links, attachments, requests to take action or for you to verify your password etc. Please note there have been reports of emails purporting to be about Covid 19 being used as cover for scams so extra vigilance is required.

Dear Laura

I am rather disappointed that you did not send this listed building application to Camden Railway Heritage Trust (CRHT). We were responsible, after all, for the application to upgrade the Horse Hospital, and for the report on the stables complex that led to the re-designation.

The DAS goes into some historical detail which curiously entirely fails to justify changing the name from Stables Market to Camden Market. There appears to be no attempt to justify this change anywhere. If we were looking at a stronger link to the heritage, we would call the site “Stables Yard” – we would certainly ignore the brief “Stanley Sidings” interlude. Perhaps “Stables Yard Market” is too lengthy a name for the sign, and so we find ourselves back with “Stables Market”, already a compromise in heritage terms.

At least “Stables Market” captures the stables element of the heritage, which I consider vital. How can the entrance sign completely ignore the Grade II\* listing that it is constantly referring to in the DAS? The answer appears to be that it emphasises the listing of the wall, while effectively ignoring the listing of the stable that is the most significant element in Stables Yard – the Horse Hospital – the reason for the listing of the wall and ramps.

Just as vital for the future is to retain “Camden Lock Market” (also a compromise in heritage terms) and “Hawley Wharf Market” rather than subsuming all this into a banal “Camden Market”, which removes all historic association.

As for the quality of the signage itself, I believe that this fails to capture any element of the heritage which it is supposed to herald, and to which it is the entrance portal.

CRHT strongly opposes the planning application, while applauding the intention of exposing the side pillars. The applicant should be sent back to the drawing board.

Sincerely

Peter Darley

Director, Camden Railway Heritage Trust