

Simon Kantor  
55 Hartland Road  
NW1 8DB

Tuesday, 18th August 2020

Ms Kristina Smith  
London Borough of Camden  
Development Management  
London  
WC1H 8ND

Dear Ms. Smith,

I would like to express a clear and unequivocal objection to Planning Application 2020/3116/P.

There was significant opposition to the original development; this amendment is a substantial change from the originally granted permissions.

My objection covers a number of issues:

**Lack of Consultation:** The developers appear to have focused their consultation on local businesses (e.g. LabTech and Camden Unlimited) and unaffected residents (Primrose Hill). Even their submission notes that the residents of Primrose Hill noted that the development would not affect them. Genuine local residents, organisations like TRACT and areas such as Harmood Street, Hartland Road and the surrounding roads were not consulted.

**Traffic generation:** Chalk Farm Road is already beset by significant traffic. Camden Council has just approved a narrowing of the road to enable cycle routes. Introducing an additional 70+ residential units will increase the pre-existing issues. Whether residents use their own vehicles or depend on private-hire vehicles, the flow of traffic will be further worsened by the additional residents.

**Noise and disturbance resulting from use:** Introducing 70+ additional residential units will bring new residents. Ideally these will be long term residents but, as we have seen with the Hawley Wharf development, developers are not shy about converting units for use as short-term lets. Thus we local residents can expect additional noise and disturbance in the local area from a range of short-term visitors who will be more likely to contribute to the night-time economy than the local community.

**Adverse effect on the residential amenity of neighbours:** If the new residential units are indeed intended to bring long-term residents to the area, there needs to be some consideration to the already-constrained local amenities. Parking has already been hugely restricted (with

residents' spaces in the process of being privatised by the Council). Schools are operating at full capacity in the area. GP surgeries are running at full capacity. I doubt that growth of Police and Fire services will be commensurate with the number of new residential units being built. Our residential amenities will be fundamentally affected by the approval of this plan.

**Layout and density of building:** Increasing the height of each building by as much as two stories will deepen the issues identified in the initial planning process. More residential units on the same site will result in increased density of population.

Further, under this proposal, many of the buildings will clear 11 meters above ground level. In the wake of the Grenfell disaster, RIBA's contribution to the *Independent Review of Building Regulations and Fire Safety* proposed the following:

*"In all new multiple occupancy residential buildings, a requirement for at least 2 staircases offering alternative means of escape, where the top floor is more than 11 metres above ground level"*

This plan calls for a single staircase for a number of buildings that surpass 11 meters. It seems baffling that a proposal that does not take account of this report would be considered for approval. I would be appalled if Camden Council signalled a willingness to put their citizens at risk,

**Design, appearance and materials:** This amendment to the original plan calls for external rainwater pipes. Given that these tend to form a welcome home to Camden's burgeoning pigeon population, I would ask that this "improvement" to the plans be reconsidered.

Pigeons will also be delighted to discover that blocks A1 and A2 will have inclined columns, perfect for their nests. Again, it is unclear how this will benefit anyone beyond the developer.

**Landscaping:** 15 additional trees are due to be destroyed under this plan. I fail to see how the community will benefit from further destruction of greenery.

**Proposals in the Camden Development Plan:** In Camden's own Development Plan, it is stated that:

*"there are sufficient identified sites in place to provide just over 17,100 additional homes from 2016/17 to 2030/31 and exceed our housing targets throughout the Plan period"*

Given that this document was approved in advance of planning permission on the Morrisons site, it is safe to assume that neither the original (approved) plan nor this expanded plan are key to the provision of sufficient housing in Camden.

In the Development Plan, it is stated that:

*"In October 2013, almost 1,300 homes in Camden had been vacant for 6-months or more, approximately 1.3% of the borough's housing stock, compared with 0.6% across London."*

Given the newly built, sparsely occupied Hawley Wharf development, one would assume that this number has risen over the last seven years. Thus, Camden Council should take note of its own Development Plan and demonstrate that *"returning vacant homes to use is a high priority"*.

At multiple places in the Development Plan, it is made clear that the focus of development should be "vacant or underused sites". This is clearly not the case for a major local amenity (Morrisons). It is even less true when one considers that a significant development has already been approved for the site, which now cannot possibly be considered "underused"

Please consider this my objection to application 2020/3116/P.

Yours Sincerely

Simon Kantor