

Statement of Case

Mark Nash
Guilford Court Freehold
Guilford Court Residents (pending survey)
Queen Court Management (tbc)

Proofs of evidence

1 Email to David Joyce 24 June 2017 forwarding email of 29 November 2015

Witnesses

Isaac Julien CBE Guilford Court resident
Michael Corker Queen Court Management (tbc)

I am here today both in an individual capacity as a Camden resident living in Guilford Street, and representing the freeholder of Guilford Court 51 Guilford Street, Guilford Court Freehold (GCF).

In 2015 individual leaseholders were canvassed as to their views on the Camden scheme. All leaseholders were opposed to the scheme, for more or less the same reasons – the increase in traffic congestion on Guilford Street, with the effects of increased pollution together with the increase in northbound traffic on Southampton Row as a result of the closure of Gordon Square to westbound traffic.

In the enquiry therefore we wish to hear from and cross-examine if necessary those council officers concerned with pollution monitoring, traffic flow, and highway design. GCF doesn't think that LB Camden has taken sufficient notice of the increase in pollution in the area adjacent to Tavistock Place.

It would also be important to see what calculations have been made regarding increased travel times by public and private transport. Anecdotal evidence suggests that journey times can be increased by 10 to 15 minutes on a bad day (this affects all classes equally, whether in taxi bus or car, since there is no bus lane in the section of road from Russell Square to Tavistock Place.

We note the wide range of policies that Camden has to take account of in making planning decisions, but we wonder if the Council has embarked on an ecological overview of the project. Does the project increase or decrease the traffic carbon footprint? How to balance the improvement in facilities for cyclists and residents of Tavistock Place against the evident disadvantages to the rest of the neighbourhood.

As an individual resident I would add that I myself use all forms of transport – walking, cycling, bus, car and taxi!. I personally approve of the efforts to improve facilities for cycling for all the reasons laid out in the Camden proposals. Many older cycle lanes are badly designed, too narrow and not properly cleaned. However I used the old scheme for 5 years when cycling to the Royal College of Art in S Kensington, it worked reasonably well before the current reworking.

If I need to take a taxi or drive westbound I am acutely aware of the disadvantages of the scheme. Journey times are increased by a good 5 minutes on an average day, and the distance travelled to get west of Tottenham court road into Howland Street is more or less doubled. If you consider the weight of traffic, the scheme results in considerable increase in fuel consumption and associated pollution.

I have recently been diagnosed with Cough variant asthma. The onset of this condition coincided with the new traffic scheme for Gordon Square/Tavistock Place. I cannot of course claim that the increase in traffic 'caused' my asthma. But it clearly is an aggravating factor. I would be curious to know what the GLC's position is on schemes like the one currently under appeal

Mark Nash
Guilford Court Freehold
11/9/17