

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2020/3116/P	Mark Baker	18/08/2020 15:34:40	OBJ	<p>Dear Camden</p> <p>I am in favour of redeveloping this site, but absolutely NOT in this way. This plan will blight the area with an East Croydon facsimile, even as that architectural hell hole has begun to recover from the worst of its 1970s to 1980s development crimes.</p> <p>This proposal is WAY too big, WAY too dense, with huge towers that will loom over the area. Unbelievably, despite our neighbourhood's objections to the original plans, the new ones make the towers even bigger, remove green space, reduce light and air between the buildings making the whole thing feel oppressive, monolithic, and utterly out of keeping wit the area.</p> <p>PLEASE force them to reconsider and reduce the density of the land use and the size of the buildings.</p> <p>PLEASE don't blight our area with this white elephant that we will be stuck with for a generation until someone wiser comes along and has it all torn down.</p> <p>Three years ago the neighbourhood turned out to object to the original version of this scheme, attending meetings and the Planning Committee meeting. The Committee approved the scheme in spite of our objections but the developer abandoned it. The new scheme is a great deal worse, being denser and higher.</p> <p>Safety is an issue as there are no secondary staircases, in spite of the Grenfell tragedy</p> <p>The original plans bore no relation to Camden's own Development Plans for the area, and these depart even further from them.</p> <p>The nearby flats in Hawley Wharf have been used as holiday accommodation, and not sold as planned. The social housing in Hawley Wharf, run by Origin Housing, is not occupied although it was handed over to Origin twelve months ago. All this suggests Camden has not identified a need for more housing in this area.</p> <p>Please reject.</p> <p>Mark Baker</p>

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2020/3116/P	Dr Beth Watkins	23/08/2020 21:44:47	OBJ	Re: Camden Goods Yard – Application 2020/3116/P

I would like to lodge my strong objection to the above planning application. Please find below the reasons for this objection.

The original application in July 2017 (2017/3847/P) was given planning approval despite significant opposition from the local community. The consented scheme represented both large scale overdevelopment and poor architectural treatment whilst ignoring Camden Council's own development plan for the area.

The consented scheme failed to reach many of the standards concerning light and distance between dwellings, in many cases by a considerable margin. The proposed revised scheme abuses these standards even more; yet by stating that these are marginal or minimal changes to the approved scheme, this hides just how far this new proposal is from the actual benchmarks themselves.

With reference to light, on page 124 of the Internal Daylight Sunlight (IDS) report it suggests that the BRE recommendation is met (62% of open space area seeing 2+ hours of sunlight on 21st March). However, this figure is greatly distorted by the inclusion of the main road route through the site (the whole of Stephenson Street from Chalk Farm Road to the roundabout by Block A and the initial part of Engine House Way) and the pocket park area behind the petrol filling station, which is not part of the residential part of the development. When these roads and irrelevant areas are removed it is clear to see that the figure of 62% would drop well below 50%. This graphic also shows how many of the proposed public realm areas lack acceptable levels of sunlight. Camden Yard, Railway Park and Makers Yard are all largely dark areas, in spite of the misleading CGI representations showing the areas a light and bright.

The reduction in the internal courtyard spaces on Blocks B and F obviously has an effect on the light within these spaces making them even darker than the approved scheme. Page 127 of the IDS clearly shows this in relation to Block F, where the aforementioned BRE recommendation falls significantly short at 12.5%.

Furthermore, this page shows there is an area on Block C that has 0% sunlight; this area is referred to (on page 59 of the Design and Access Statement (DAS)) as a lightwell, which is clearly an oxymoron.

Furthermore, Pages 130-132 of the IDS show very worrying figures concerning the Vertical Sky Component for the whole of Blocks D, E1 & E2, and it is inevitable that, by reducing the floor height in Blocks A1, A2, B, C (both parts), E1 and F, this can only worsen the interior light within those premises.

All of the above represents a reduction in light in a scheme that was already badly short of light and arguably failed to meet the various required standards when approved in 2017. To accept that the situation can be worsened even further is untenable.

Prior to the application of the 2017 scheme, the various stakeholders (of which my husband was one) drew up a document call the Camden Goods Yard Planning Framework (CGYPF) in conjunction with Camden Council. This document is still valid and applies to this application (available on the Camden Council website). This stakeholder group was called the Camden Goods Yard Working Group (CGYWG).

A key function of the framework document was to ensure that 'future development of neighbouring areas will not be prejudiced' (page 62 of the CGYPF). However, it was established during the application of the original scheme that parts of proposed junction from the site onto Chalk Farm Road will be at 'saturation' and have no further capacity. Obviously, this prejudiced the neighbouring areas, especially Juniper Crescent. At the time this was fully acknowledged and yet inexplicably, planning was approved.

It is impossible to understand how a further 71 properties can do anything but worsen this already problematic situation. Changing the road layout (to accommodate rebuilding the Morrisons store on the petrol station site) to a single crossroads at this junction has already caused significant traffic issues to both Chalk Farm Road and Ferdinand Street. It is acknowledged that the already-consented 573 new homes will cause significant traffic issues - adding more homes can only make matters worse. To be clear, there is simply no further

Application No: Consultees Name: Received:

Comment: Response:

capacity at this junction to support 71 additional homes.

It is also important to note that the proposed layout for this junction has widely been cited as being dangerous for cyclists and pedestrians. Logically, more homes on the site can only increase the risk to individuals.

I strongly disagree with the statement made on pages 80-81 of the DAS concerning the visual impact of the revised scheme. With some blocks increasing in height by nearly 6 metres it is wrong to consider these changes as minimal. Had these revised heights been proposed in the original application, the likelihood is they would have been sent back to be lowered prior to submission. Prior to the submission of the original scheme there was a great deal of discussion between the applicant, CGYWG and Camden Council concerning building heights. During these discussions the various building heights were reduced, some by many floors, prior to submission. It simply cannot be right that this new application simply reverses this change, re-instating previously rejected building heights under the guise of 'minor amendments'. What was unacceptable then remains so now. A full investigation concerning external and internal views etc. is required.

In many instances, the DAS document is patronising. For example, on page 122, the applicant states that some pedestrian access routes will be as narrow as 1.5 metres but wheelchair passing points will be provided. In these days of equality, it is impossible to believe that a site as large as this would need such features to make it easily navigable by those who are disabled. This is shameful and a clear illustration of just how cramped the overall scheme is.

The language used throughout the DAS document is misleading. The increase in height of up to 6 metres is not minimal. Cramping in an additional 71 homes is not marginal. The further reduction of already dark courtyards has far more than a limited effect. Forcing even more traffic, cycles and pedestrians through an already saturated and dangerous road junction is not a minor amendment.

Another point of concern is the addition of exposed rainwater downpipes to Block B (page 43 of the DAS). To propose such a design feature on an eight storey building is ridiculous and surely has no place in modern building design. It is also disappointing that this revised scheme advocates the removal of a further 15 trees. Whilst I accept that this is a planning application I cannot help but stress how poor this scheme is in light of the awful Grenfell Tower tragedy of 2017 where 72 people lost their lives. As I am sure you are aware the RIBA made the following recommendation in October 2017 in light of that dreadful event:

'In all new 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'

This criteria of 11 metres above ground applies to all of this development yet the applicant has chosen not to add a secondary staircase to any of the blocks.

My husband is a proud employee of the London Fire Brigade, and he applauded Camden Council's swift action concerning cladding on their (high rise) residential properties. I urge Camden Council to show the same courage and decisiveness when considering this application.

In summary, it is clear that the proposed changes make the already poor consented scheme far worse. The proposed scheme is more cramped and denser with even less light whilst being considerably higher in many parts. It further worsens the transport and safety situation at the entry junction and beyond. In addition, it shows no signs of even recognising the issues that the Grenfell Tower fire tragically highlighted.

The local residents were badly let down in 2017; we supported the vision of a high quality and well considered development. The approved scheme was anything but that. I urge Camden Council to refuse this application. Furthermore and if at all possible, I also urge Camden Council to ask the developer to re-engage with the local community in a meaningful and open-hearted way so the consented scheme can be re-appraised and the site's true potential be met.

Dr Beth Watkins

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2020/3116/P	Richard Simpson for Primrose Hill CAAC	23/08/2020 11:09:34	OBJ	<p>ADVICE from Primrose Hill Conservation Area Advisory Committee 12A Manley Street, London NW1 8LT</p> <p>5 August 2020</p> <p>Camden Goods Yard 2020/3116/P</p> <p>Strong objection.</p> <p>The Advisory Committee addresses the additional height now proposed to the already over-tall buildings permitted under 2017/3847/P. These extra storeys would add to the substantial harm to heritage assets which would be caused by this consent. We repeat our assessment, quoting from our advice dated 17 July 2017.</p> <p>6.0 Heritage issues</p> <p>6.1 We have argued consistently that the proposals would be substantially harmful to the heritage assets which surround the site. In March we wrote (our para 7) 'In our para 5 on 21 December we argued that the scale of the proposed high buildings would destroy one of the key characteristics of the area, which is that the historic industrial buildings are dominant. This is partly a matter of the scale of the historic industrial buildings, but also their forms and roof lines. Both the Interchange Building and the Roundhouse have instantly recognizable, iconic forms. They give real character and identity to the immediate area. This is key to the significance of the area and of its relationship to the surrounding areas and to the range of heritage assets they include. This significance would be harmed by the present (March) proposals. In our view the heritage assets should be celebrated as giving unique value to the area.'</p> <p>6.2 We sought a creative dialogue with the applicants: unfortunately the response was a rhetorical justification, which we found unconvincing.</p> <p>6.3 Since March, Camden has adopted the very welcome 'Camden Goods Yard Planning Framework'. We note a number of its objectives in respect of the present application.</p> <p>6.4 The Chalk Farm Road and 'Camden wall'. We that the 'Framework' states (p. 48) 'Particular consideration will need to be given to the level of enclosure created by any development, ensuring that it is sympathetic to the surrounding urban form and character and the listed wall.' The proposed new building on the Petrol Station site substantially fails this test. It dominates the Wall – which here should set the scale for the street – and even dominates the railway viaduct behind, which also sets the traditional scale of the area. In terms of the Listed Wall, the proposed Petrol Station building, by its sheer scale, trivialises the Wall. The proposals substantially harm the historic significance of the Wall as the surviving enclosure of this exceptional grouping – 'one of the most complete groups of C19 railway buildings and associated canal structures in England.'(see List entry to 1258100).</p> <p>6.5 Interchange Building. We have consistently argued that this major building, with it's iconic tower, should remain the dominant form at this end of the site. The 'Framework' states (at p. 52) in relation to the Interchange that proposals should 'Be informed by the historic significance of the area as a Goods Yard. New and adapted buildings should respect and enhance the setting of listed buildings and structures.' The</p>

Application No: **Consultees Name:** **Received:****Comment:** **Response:**

proposals offer some limited immediate tidying up of the area around the Interchange, but then overwhelm it with new buildings, again trivializing its scale and significance in the new hierarchy of building which the present application proposes. The proposals substantially harm the significance of the Interchange building.

6.6 Roundhouse. Again, we have argued, and the 'Framework' states (p. 47), that 'The Roundhouse is a major landmark and focal point in architectural, townscape and cultural terms ...'. The 'Framework' goes on to state that development should 'Take the opportunity to enhance the setting of the Roundhouse, the Stables market and the listed historic wall. ... Development should also be sensitive of important local views.' The application, by its sheer scale and bulk, diminishes rather than enhancing all the heritage assets noted here. It fails this test.

6.7 Primrose Hill conservation area. The 'Framework' restates the duty on the local planning authority to seek to preserve or enhance the character and appearance of the conservation area, noting (at p. 58) the setting and views from the Primrose Hill conservation area. It is clear that identified views, along Edis Street, Princess Road, and across the Canal bridge on Gloucester Avenue, will be neither preserved nor enhanced, but interrupted and dominated by the new development. The proposals undermine the careful work of Camden and the community in protecting the roofline in the conservation area since designation in 1972.

6.8 The Advisory Committee would argue that, while in some instances, the harm to heritage assets is less than substantial, in major cases the harm is substantial, and further, that, viewed as a whole – from Regent's Park to Primrose Hill, to Haverstock Hill, and the Chalk Farm Road, the cumulative harm to heritage assets caused by the sheer scale and mass of the application is substantial.

6.9 We see no exceptional public benefit – beyond the requirements of planning policy – which would outweigh this substantial harm.

6.10 We also continue to argue that, given the scale of the Morrison's site, there are opportunities for high-density medium-rise development which would provide substantial development without causing harm to local heritage assets.

Richard Simpson FSA
Chair

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2020/3116/P	Steven Stokes	23/08/2020 13:56:59	OBJ	Re: Camden Goods Yard – Application 2020/3116/P

I am writing to state my strong objection to the above mentioned planning application.

The original application in July 2017 (2017/3847/P) was given planning approval despite significant opposition from the local community. The consented scheme represented both large scale overdevelopment and poor architectural treatment whilst ignoring Camden Council's own development plan for the area.

The consented scheme failed to reach many of the standards concerning light and distance between dwellings, in many cases by a considerable margin. The proposed revised scheme abuses these standards even more; yet by stating that these are marginal or minimal changes to the approved scheme, this hides just how far this new proposal is from the actual benchmarks themselves.

With reference to light, on page 124 of the Internal Daylight Sunlight (IDS) report it suggests that the BRE recommendation is met (62% of open space area seeing 2+ hours of sunlight on 21st March). However, this figure is greatly distorted by the inclusion of the main road route through the site (the whole of Stephenson Street from Chalk Farm Road to the roundabout by Block A and the initial part of Engine House Way) and the pocket park area behind the petrol filling station (its inclusion being simply insulting). When these roads and irrelevant areas are removed it is clear to see that the figure of 62% would dip well below 50%.

This graphic also shows how many of the proposed public realm areas lack acceptable levels of sunlight. Camden Yard, Railway Park and Makers Yard are all largely dark areas, despite what the misleading CGI representations suggest.

The reduction in the internal courtyard spaces on Blocks B and F obviously has an effect on the light within these spaces making them even darker than the approved scheme. Page 127 of the IDS clearly shows this in relation to Block F, where the aforementioned BRE recommendation falls hopelessly short at 12.5%.

Furthermore, this page shows there is an area on Block C that has 0% sunlight. Unbelievably, this area is referred to on page 59 of the Design and Access Statement (DAS) as a lightwell! I'm sorry to say that this well is bone dry.

Furthermore, Pages 130-132 of the IDS show very worrying figures concerning the Vertical Sky Component for the whole of Blocks D, E1 & E2.

It is also inevitable that, by reducing the floor height in Blocks A1, A2, B, C (both parts), E1 and F, this can only worsen the interior light within those premises.

All of the above represents a reduction in light in a scheme that was already badly short of light and arguably failed to meet the various required standards when approved in 2017. To accept that the situation can be worsened even further is ridiculous.

Prior to the application of the 2017 scheme, the various stakeholders (of which I was one) drew up a document call the Camden Goods Yard Planning Framework (CGYPF) in conjunction with Camden Council. This document is still valid and applies to this application (available on the Camden Council website). For reference, the stakeholder group I was part of was called the Camden Goods Yard Working Group (CGYWG).

Application No: Consultees Name: Received:

Comment: Response:

A key function of the framework document was to ensure that 'future development of neighbouring areas will not be prejudiced' (page 62 of the CGYPF). However, it was established during the application of the original scheme that parts of proposed junction from the site onto Chalk Farm Road will be at 'saturation' and have no further capacity. Obviously, this prejudiced the neighbouring areas, especially Juniper Crescent. At the time this was fully acknowledged and yet inexplicably, planning was approved.

How can a further 71 properties do anything but worsen this dreadful situation even further? In fact just the change to a single crossroads at this junction has already caused significant traffic issues to both Chalk Farm Road and Ferdinand Street. It is acknowledged that the already-consented 573 new homes will cause huge traffic issues - adding more homes can only make matters worse. To be clear, there is simply no further capacity at this junction to support 71 additional homes.

It is also important to note that the proposed layout for this junction has widely been cited as being dangerous for cyclists and pedestrians. Logically, more homes on the site can only increase the risk to individuals.

I strongly disagree with the statement made on pages 80-81 of the DAS concerning the visual impact of the revised scheme. Having been in many meetings that the CGYWG had with Camden Council concerning the 2017 scheme I consider those original judgements to have been marginal. With some blocks increasing in height by nearly 6 metres it is wrong to consider these changes as minimal. I am absolutely certain that had these revised heights been proposed in the original application they would have been sent back to the applicant to be lowered prior to submission. To my mind it is clear that a full investigation concerning external and internal views etc. is required.

Furthermore, I can also advise that prior to the submission of the original scheme there was a great deal of discussion between the applicant, CGYWG and Camden Council concerning building heights in general. During these discussions the various building heights were reduced, some by many floors, prior to submission. It simply cannot be right that this new application simply reverses this change, re-instating previously rejected building heights under the guise of 'minor amendments'. What was unacceptable then remains so now.

The glib nature of the DAS document is patronising. On page 122, the applicant states that some pedestrian access routes will be as narrow as 1.5 metres but wheelchair passing points will be provided! How can a site so big need such features to make it easily navigable? This is a clear illustration of just how cramped the overall scheme is.

In fact, the language repeatedly used throughout the DAS document is misleading. The increase in height of up to 6 metres is not minimal. Cramming in an additional 71 homes is not marginal. The further reduction of already dark courtyards has far more than a limited effect. Forcing even more traffic, cycles and pedestrians through an already saturated and dangerous road junction is not a minor amendment.

Another point of concern is the addition of exposed rainwater downpipes to Block B (page 43 of the DAS). To propose such a design feature on an eight storey building is ridiculous and surely has no place in modern building design.

Application No: **Consultees Name:** **Received:****Comment:** **Response:**

It is also disappointing that this revised scheme advocates the removal of a further 15 trees.

Whilst I accept that this is a planning application I cannot help but stress how poor this scheme is in light of the awful Grenfell Tower tragedy of 2017 where 72 people lost their lives. As I am sure you are aware the RIBA made the following recommendation in October 2017 in light of that dreadful event:

'In all new 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'

This criteria of 11 metres above ground applies to all of this development yet the applicant has chosen not to add a secondary staircase to any of the blocks.

I am a proud employee of the London Fire Brigade, and I applauded Camden Council's swift action concerning cladding on their (high rise) residential properties. I urge Camden Council to show the same courage and decisiveness when considering this application.

It is clear that the proposed changes make the already poor consented scheme far worse. The proposed scheme is more cramped and denser with even less light whilst being considerably higher in many parts. It further worsens the transport and safety situation at the entry junction and beyond. In addition, it shows no signs of even recognising the issues that the Grenfell Tower fire tragically highlighted.

The local residents were badly let down in 2017; we supported the vision of a high quality and well considered development. The approved scheme was anything but that. I urge Camden Council to refuse this application. Furthermore and if at all possible, I also urge Camden Council to ask the developer to re-engage with the local community in a meaningful and open-hearted way so the consented scheme can be re-appraised and the site's true potential be met.

Steven Stokes.

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2020/3116/P	Peter Clapp	17/08/2020 09:11:27	OBJ	<p>The original scheme, (2017/3847/P) brought enormous opposition from local residents and we were appalled when it was given planning approval in July 2017. It represented both monstrous overdevelopment, very poor architectural treatment and completely ignored Camden's own Development Plan for the area.</p> <p>It seems hardly credible that the developer is now seeking to increase the number of units on the site, which requires raising the height of the majority of the buildings previously approved, reducing the size of the internal courtyards of the residential blocks and removing an additional 15 trees.</p> <p>The 162 page Design and Access Statement attempts to justify the "Improved Scheme". It saddens me that members of my own profession can possibly put their names to such utter garbage as contained in this document.</p> <p>Block A1, increased from 14 to 15 storeys and one metre higher Block A2, increased from 11 to 12 storeys and 1.6 metres higher The extraordinary inclined columns, providing specially designed pigeon platforms beneath each window. Projecting brick clad horizontal bands, since when did that become the way to use brickwork?</p> <p>Block B, increased from 7 to 8 storeys and an extra 2.8 metres in height. The aerial view of this block (Page 38) shows projecting balconies within the courtyard, but there is no indication of these on the plan (Page 34). It has also been decided to introduce exposed rainwater downpipes (Page 43) on an 8 storey building. Obviously another "design improvement"? They surely can't be serious?</p> <p>Block C, one part increasing from 10 to 11 storeys and 1 metre higher. one part increasing from 8 to 10 storeys and 4.7 metres higher. The perspective of this block shows the specially designed pigeon nesting areas, between the introduced "roof" of one balcony and the floor of the one above.</p> <p>Block E1 gains another 2.4 metres</p> <p>Block F – the proposed 2 storey addition shown on Page 72, North elevation, is dramatically worse with the apparent 2 storeys on the left hand side.</p> <p>The developer claims repeatedly that "the increased heights are not significant".</p> <p>Just how awful these proposed buildings really are, are best illustrated on Page 73. Is this jumble of materials and elevational treatments really intended?</p> <p>Finally, and I appreciate that Building Regulations are entirely separate from Planning Approval, but has the Grenfell Fire, with 72 deaths already been forgotten?</p> <p>Immediately following the tragedy, The RIBA set up an Expert Advisory Group. In October 2017 it made a report to the Independent Review of Building Regulations and Fire Safety. The main clause regarding</p>

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2020/3116/P	Sammy Bikoulis	18/08/2020 17:19:17	OBJ	<p data-bbox="875 129 1272 148">residential buildings reads as follows:</p> <p data-bbox="875 193 2054 244">"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".</p> <p data-bbox="875 284 2054 399">All of the blocks in this development have residential units above 11 metres, yet none of the blocks has a secondary staircase. Regardless of the fact that the Building Regulations have not yet been modified, how will these architects justify their designs in a Court of Law, when they contravene the specific guidance of their professional institute?</p> <p data-bbox="875 438 2054 521">Usually planning applications are not made unless a planning officer has given general support. I cannot believe that in this case this can be true. The original scheme should never have received planning permission. Please refuse this application, which makes a bad scheme substantially worse.</p> <p data-bbox="875 561 2054 612">Furthermore, we cannot continue to build blocks that potentially repeat the horror of Grenfell. This scheme requires a complete re-appraisal.</p> <hr/> <p data-bbox="875 651 2054 979">I would like to object to the renewal of the above development. The submitted scheme is even taller than the already approved scheme and to me that would harm massively the surrounding area. There is no inclusion of a green public zone through the site as the Local Plan had previously allocated. The elevational treatment is erratic with no real reference to the surrounding area and the local vernacular. It will certainly over-bare with its scale and mass the neighbouring residential areas, dominating the skyline. The original plans bore no relation to Camden's own Development Plans for the area, and these depart even further from them. The nearby flats in Hawley Wharf have been used as holiday accommodation, and not sold as planned. The social housing in Hawley Wharf, run by Origin Housing, is not occupied although it was handed over to Origin twelve months ago. All this suggests Camden has not identified a need for more housing in this area.</p>

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2020/3116/P	John Chamberlain	23/08/2020 21:27:46	OBJ	<p>This response to the revised application 2020/3116/P to modify the height and layout of the buildings and increase the number of homes proposed for the Morrison's site on the Camden Goods Yard is from Camden Cycling Campaign, the local borough group of London Cycling Campaign (LCC). We represent the interests of cyclists living or working in the borough of Camden.</p> <p>We note that the proposal is to increase the number of residential units from 573 to 644, a 12% increase. We are extremely concerned about the effect this will have on access to and from the site for pedestrians and cyclists. Access is already totally inadequate, as we have pointed out in our responses to the consultations on the Planning Framework and the previous application, and this increase in number of units will make it worse. We note that according to the Transport Assessment Addendum, walking access trips are expected to increase by 7% and cycling trips by 10%, which seems inconsistent with the 12% increase in residential units.</p> <p>We disagree with the conclusions in the Transport Assessment Addendum section 1.11 as this report seeks to demonstrate that the proposals will continue to be served by a safe and suitable site access.</p> <p>The already inadequate access from Chalk Farm Road via Juniper Crescent will be further stressed by this increase in numbers. If the revised application is approved, it must be accompanied by a commitment to improve access for pedestrians and cycles either via Juniper Crescent or from Oval Road, including, for example, a commitment to the proposed Stephenson Walk.</p> <p>John Chamberlain Coordinator Camden Cycling Campaign W: camdencyclists.org.uk E: john@camdencyclists.org.uk</p>
2020/3116/P	Dominic Kempes	18/08/2020 16:37:34	OBJ	<p>the adjustments to the plans puzzle me. they do not appear to improve the scheme. whilst the increases in height appear modest, the approved development was already too crowded and allowed to grow several stories too high. The increases therefore do not improve the scheme at all. the most significant deleterious effect of the scheme is the removal of trees. in addition to affecting the visual appeal of the neighborhood, it sets an awful precedent for large scale developments. if concentrated housing developments are to be approved (which in principle i am fine with), it should ensure more open spaces and an increase of trees over what exists before. the removal is therefore not keeping with the neighborhood and nor is it environmentally friendly.</p>
2020/3116/P	Elizabeth Nisbet	15/08/2020 11:29:38	COMMNT	<p>This is a massive overbuilding of the land and completely out of keeping with the area. It is also likely to be a magnet for crime in Camden. The increased height is unnecessary and will not help the housing needs in Camden but merely provide dangerous space that will block the light.</p>
2020/3116/P	Elizabeth Nisbet	15/08/2020 11:29:40	COMMNT	<p>This is a massive overbuilding of the land and completely out of keeping with the area. It is also likely to be a magnet for crime in Camden. The increased height is unnecessary and will not help the housing needs in Camden but merely provide dangerous space that will block the light.</p>