

**From:** Laurene O  
**Sent:** 15 July 2023 19:57  
**To:** Planning  
**Cc:** David Fowler; Save Museum Street; Rosamund Oudart  
**Subject:** Planning Objection - Application Number 2023/2510/P

Laurene Oudart  
On the behalf of  
Rosamund Oudart

Dear David Fowler,

I am writing to formally object to the planning application referenced above on behalf of my elderly mother, Rosamund Oudart, who resides in flat 3, 14 West Central Street, which is situated at the boundary of the proposed development site. As I have legal power of attorney for my mother, I have the authority to represent her and raise objections on her behalf. Having carefully reviewed the new application, I am compelled to raise several significant concerns that indicate a lack of consideration for the well-being and rights of current residents as well as harm done to the conservation area.

To begin, it is important to clarify that I am not fundamentally opposed to the redevelopment of the area. However, I have noticed several major issues that indicate the developer's disregard for the existing residents. For example, when I raised concerns regarding the impact of the development on the daylight and sunlight levels in my mother's property, I was met with a dismissive response and advised to seek legal advice. No attempt was made to find an amicable resolution to the problem. I refer you to the letter from the chartered surveyor we appointed, which has been duly lodged as an objection.

The proposed development would have a significant adverse impact on my mother's property, particularly in terms of daylight and sunlight. According to the developer's surveyor's assessment, her living room would retain only 10% of Vertical Sky Component (VSC), while her bedroom would retain a mere 9%, both of which are in direct violation of the BRE guidelines. It is worth noting that the mitigating factors put forth in the daylight/sunlight assessment, such as the projecting wing, can be challenged as an assessment has not been conducted with this factor removed. This raises the question: is the position of the windows the problem, or is it the unreasonable scale of the proposed development itself?

Furthermore, the developer acknowledges that reducing the height of the new housing from six to four storeys would have no impact on daylight and sunlight levels. However, they neglect to take into account the massive scale of the proposed tower, which will inevitably have an impact. In addition to the detrimental effect on the right to light, the development would also lead to a loss of outlook for my mother. We firmly believe that this constitutes an unacceptable harm to her enjoyment of the property and overall well-being. Regrettably, the developer's approach has left us with little choice but to consider seeking an injunction from the court. We deeply regret that no amicable solution was offered.

I would like to add several further points to strengthen my objection. Firstly, the proposed tower is undeniably excessive in height and bulk. The current tower, standing at 50 meters, is already one of the tallest in the area. The proposed tower, at a staggering 74 meters, would significantly impact the neighbouring Bloomsbury conservation area and be visible from numerous heritage sites, including the British Museum and St. George's House. The developer's plan appears to lack careful consideration for the conservation area and could potentially harm buildings that currently make a positive contribution.

Additionally, the proposed increase in housing is insufficient and of low quality. The developer fails to mention that 24 existing housing units will be demolished, only to be replaced by a mere 44 new residential units, of which only 19 are designated as affordable housing. It is highly likely that the quality of these affordable units would be compromised, as they are unlikely to receive sufficient natural light. It appears that the developer has concentrated all the housing in West Central Street solely to justify the construction of their speculative office tower. It is worth noting that even the developer recognizes the insufficiency of the number of housing units, as they offer payment in lieu. The Camden Local Plan (2017) indicates that Camden commits to maximize housing supply within the borough. The current proposal falls short of being a positive step towards meeting this commitment.

Furthermore, I want to emphasize that the proposed development's approach of demolition instead of retrofitting existing structures will have a negative impact on the environment and contribute to climate change. This goes against Camden's Climate Action Plan 2020-2025, which emphasizes the need for sustainable development and reducing carbon emissions. The demolition and subsequent construction of a new tower not only waste valuable resources but also contradicts the council's commitment to environmental stewardship.

Moreover, I must express deep concern regarding the well being of local residents during the demolition process. The noise and vulnerability impact assessment does not adequately include the potential impact on nearby properties. This shows a disregard for the well-being and comfort of residents who will be directly affected by the construction activities. I would like to request that the noise and vibration impact assessment prepared by Scotch Partners includes a comprehensive evaluation of the impact of demolition on neighbouring properties, ensuring that the concerns of residents are duly considered.

Additionally, I request assurance that appropriate measures will be implemented to address air quality concerns during the demolition process. The air quality report indicates a medium risk to human health for residents within 20 meters of the site. It is crucial that adequate measures are in place to mitigate these risks and protect the well-being of neighbouring properties. We strongly urge the developer to provide alternative accommodation options within the Bloomsbury area for affected residents during the demolition phase if satisfactory living conditions are not ensured. This would ensure that residents are not unduly exposed to the potential health related risks and disruptions associated with the demolition process.

In addition to the aforementioned concerns, I would like to address the issue of the timeline for objections. It is evident that the proposed timeline for objections should have been extended. As of the time of writing, the daylight/sunlight assessment commissioned by Camden Council is still not visible on the website. This lack of accessibility hampers our ability as concerned residents to thoroughly review and assess the impacts of the proposed development. It is essential that all relevant information and assessments be made readily available to allow for comprehensive and informed objections.

In light of the above concerns, I urge the Camden Council to carefully consider the objections raised and reject the planning application. I request that a comprehensive review be conducted, considering the well-being and rights of current residents, the impact on the conservation area, overall housing supply, environmental considerations, and the council's climate action commitments.

Thank you for your attention to this matter. I trust that the council will fulfil its duty to protect the interests of its residents and ensure responsible and sustainable development within our community.

Sincerely,

Laurene Oudart