

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2023/0266/P	Michael Moriarty	06/05/2023 11:22:56	OBJ	<p>We did not receive notice of this application and have heard about it only through our neighbours.</p> <p>We strongly oppose this application.</p> <p>The primary basis for our opposition is the significant reduction of light to our apartment. We note that the applicants have commissioned a light survey as part of their application but take issue with the results of the survey.</p> <p>Based on the survey report submitted, our flat will experience 13.51% and 10.87% of a reduction of VSC (Vertical Sky Component) and a 0% reduction in Daylight Factor. I note that this goes as high as 33% for our neighbours and consider that the impact of this development on the light available has not been sufficiently brought to the attention of the properties affected.</p> <p>Leaving aside our objections on the validity of the survey, even if we accept the results of the report, we do not consider that a 13.51% of a reduction of VSC is acceptable considering that this window is the sole source of light to a bedroom (which is also used as an office for someone who works from home 100% of the time). It is used as our primary bedroom and office given the street noise in our only other bedroom (which overlooks Euston Road). The proposed reduction of light will affect our use and enjoyment of the room and is likely to require us to use significant amounts of artificial light to work in the room.</p> <p>We have not had the opportunity to conduct our own survey of the impact of the development on our access to light but we dispute the results of the survey for the following reasons:</p> <p>(a) This survey was taken in December, the darkest month of the year. This is unlikely to yield representative results which show the light that our flat receives, and will receive, following the construction. We accept that in December the light we receive from the central courtyard area is low given the limited daylight hours and general lack of sunlight. However those rooms are much sunnier in spring, summer and autumn when they get direct sunlight. We rarely use artificial light in those rooms during daylight hours in the spring to autumn months and are concerned about needing to rely on artificial light following the development,.</p> <p>(b) We consider it unlikely that a development which adds an entire floor across warren court and which reduces our VSC can have a 0% impact on our daylight factor and daylight distribution. Limited explanation has been provided by the applicants and we suggest that a meeting should be held to consult on the proposed development and to explain the impact of the development on the light available to the surrounding flats.</p> <p>(c) The room sizes used are incorrect.</p> <p>We also oppose the development for the following reasons:</p> <p>(a) Noise and disturbance resulting from use – the new development includes a wraparound terrace which is likely to contribute to noise disturbances in the internal court yard area. Any noise in the courtyard area (which is completely enclosed and surrounded on all sides by flats) reverberates around the enclosed court yard. We can hear when any neighbours have loud music on and expect this will get worse when there isn't a window between the noise and our original single glazed windows. We also note that the building appears to be mostly tenanted by students and noise from parties has been an issue which we have written to the management of</p>

Application No: Consultees Name: Received:

Comment:

Response:

Warren Court about multiple times before. If the terraces are brightly lit, this may also result in light pollution in the central courtyard area.

(b) Loss of privacy – from parties/people walking around on the terrace. We note that these terraces will overlook our flat.

(c) Lowered air flow – an additional floor is likely to result in a reduction in the amount of air flow in the central courtyard area. We note that the central courtyard area is the primary source of ventilation for our bedroom and for a large number of other rooms which overlook this court yard, and that this courtyard is completely enclosed.

(d) A similar proposed development has been rejected previously. While this development is a floor lower than the last proposal, the development will result in Warren Court being significantly higher than 295 Euston road. We consider that this development is too high and will result in an oppressive and intrusive feeling in the central courtyard area which is not significant in size considering the number of flats which rely on it for ventilation and light. The addition of additional flats across the entire top floor will lead to the entire development and area feeling much more enclosed and claustrophobic.

(e) The type of housing proposed is not in line with local housing need. We note that there are still multiple new built apartment blocks which remain unsold in the area and appear to be mostly vacant in the area. We also doubt that terrace apartments facing a major road will be popular. We also consider that the density of the Warren Court development will be too high following this development. The building is already very densely populated and the proposed development consists of four additional apartments.

While this development will be financially beneficial for the applicants, we do not consider that this development will benefit the surrounding area, and will instead have a negative impact on the apartments surrounding this development.

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2023/0266/P	PAUL CHAMBERS	07/05/2023 23:02:42	OBJ	<p>OBJECT ON THE FOLLOWING GROUNDS:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none">1. Significant reduction of light to our apartment - the lightwell is the only source of light for our kitchen, hallway and bedroom.2. Noise, disturbance of anti-social behaviour from proposed terrace - Warren Court is fully rented out and often there are issues with noise from parties and this will be more so from external terrace areas.3. Possible security issue with access from terrace to the lightwell and into our apartments.4. Light Survey is deliberately misleading - done in the darkest month of the year and the measurements for our properties are distorted in favour of the developer.5. Invasion of privacy from the terrace proposed.6. Substantial and extremely detrimental noise nuisance for construction7. Loss of airflow to us.8. No local need for 4 more flats - the area has substantial rental stock.

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2023/0266/P	Nicholas Hansen	08/05/2023 15:49:52	OBJ	8 May 2023

Dear Camden Council

I am writing in opposition to the planning application 2023/0266/P at Warren Court, for many of the same reasons as my previous objection in 2016 to similar activity at the same location. It should first be noted that, as in 2016, neither I, nor to the best of my knowledge, any of my neighbours have been consulted by the applicant.

The core aspect of this opposition remains the demonstrably negative effect of access to light in the interior lightwell at 295 Euston Road, which is an important and significant architectural feature for the flats herein (circa 7m in width and up to 1.5m in height of light space).

In the submitted planning statement, at Section 7.4, the planning statement refers to the previous refusal for planning consent APP/X5210/W/17/3176366, and acknowledges that "significant adverse effects in regards to daylight" (sic) was a main cause for the refusal of the past planning application.

In Section 7.6, it is asserted by the planning statement that the reduction in project size from two storeys to one storey "does not give rise to any unacceptable impacts in relation to daylight [...] of 295 Euston Road", further asserting, in Sections 7.7 and 7.8 that this prior reason for refusal has been adequately addressed. Similarly, in the Daylight and Sunlight report, at Section 6.16, it is asserted that there would be "no unacceptable effects to existing natural light amenity".

However, this is not the case. The proposal is still of a great physical size, and would afflict a consequential reduction to the amount of light in all of the flats at 295 Euston Road. Furthermore, the results of the light survey submitted by the applicants are misleading. The actual size of the room in the survey does not correspond to reality, but more significantly, the data projected was taken in December, at the nadir of low light in London. It is otherwise the fact that during the spring, summer and autumn months, the room receives direct sunlight on clear days and sufficient ambient/natural light on cloudy days, the withdrawal of which certainly would negatively affect its use.

In any event, it is insupportable to envisage "no unacceptable effects to existing natural light amenity" (Ibid.) when, on the third floor in the room marked 'bedroom', it was asserted that a 14.67% reduction in vertical sky component and a 8.93% reduction in daylight factor would take place. Even if these projections have some basic grounding in reality, the admitted deminuations must be seen as a bare minimum, because as stated, this reduction in light will be quite more severe for the majority of the year, given the greater seasonal luminosity compared to the December survey period.

Therefore, the report does not "adequately address these concerns" as per Sections 7.7 and 7.8 above, particularly as the room serves a dual purpose as a study during the daytime, and is in constant use as such throughout the year. This is all made even more significant when the applicants have never made contact to discuss their application.

In sum, if this proposal "has been designed to minimize (sic) any impacts on neighbouring amenity and will be a significant improvement on the previous proposals" (Design & Access Statement V7, Section 4.6), any such

Application No: **Consultees Name:** **Received:**

Comment:

Response:

improvement per se still falls below the threshold of acceptability.

As ancillary matters, I also object to planning permission being granted due to the loss of privacy by adding new residential units with inward-facing outdoor terraces, which will overlook all of our properties at 295 Euston Road. This is in addition to increased noise and light disturbance which will reverberate in the concrete canyon. As the aforementioned bedroom window into the interior lightwell is the primary form of ventilation during sleeping hours, particularly in a building lacking air conditioning, and in view of ever-increasing summer temperatures, this is a worry. The non-responsiveness of Warren Court's management to respond to numerous noise complaints from the large number of students living in bed-sits in the building is also a genuine cause for concern.

The planning application should therefore be refused.

Yours faithfully
Dr Nicholas Hansen