
From: Guy Burkill [REDACTED]
Sent: 11 September 2022 10:24
To: Planning Planning
Subject: RE: Comments on 2022/3352/HS2 have been received by the council.

[REDACTED]

Thank you for your acknowledgment below.

I submitted the text below online. However your online form did not offer any way to include attachments. I have therefore sent my summary below, together with a fuller statement including reasons and details, by email to you.

I would therefore be grateful for your confirmation that that statement attached to my email has been received and will also be considered as part of my objections.

Thank you for your kind attention to this! - Guy Burkill

[REDACTED]

Subject: Comments on 2022/3352/HS2 have been received by the council.

I have attached a full statement of my objections to the application in pdf form. I summarise them briefly below, and refer to the statement for full supporting reasons.

My home is at 8 Park Village East, immediately opposite the site of the proposed headhouse which is the subject of this planning application. I live here with my [REDACTED]

My objections to HS2's planning application No 2022/3352/HS2 may be summarised as follows:

- The design is unsuited to the overall setting. This part of Park Village East is Grade II* listed, and lies in a conservation area. The design pays insufficient attention to the enormous historic significance of the site.
- The headhouse is not shown to be necessary and/or the application is premature. There are multiple closely adjacent headhouses also proposed. Design of the tunnelling beneath it is still incomplete, and until that has been finalised, it cannot be shown that this headhouse is necessary.
- The application does not give a fair representation of the likely overall appearance in the context of the setting. It does not indicate just how out of character the proposed headhouse, with its enormous gates, sprawling along a significant length of the street, will be in relation to the Nash architecture in the rest of the street.
- The provision of a large car parking area is unnecessary and inappropriate to the setting.
- The proposed entrance gate is now situated some distance along the road due to the presence of the car park and therefore increasing the overall damage to the setting. Still further, the extravagant design of the entrance gate is excessively dominant and intrusive.
- The proposed lighting scheme is unnecessary or excessive, and likely to be very detrimental to local residents and in particular to their sleep at night.

See attached full statement for reasons and details. I also agree with each of the various points made by the Camden Town Conservation Area Advisory Committee, (CTCAAC) in their objections filed on 26 August 2022.

Comments made by Guy Burkill of 8 Park Village East, London, NW1 7PX Phone [REDACTED] Email [REDACTED] Preferred Method of Contact is Email

Comment Type is Objection