

---

**From:** [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** 21 July 2023 15:09  
**To:** Planning Planning; Enya Fogarty  
**Cc:** friendsofparkerstreet@gmail.com; [REDACTED]  
**Subject:** Drury Works objection from 8 Parker Street  
**Attachments:** Core Objections to Drury Works.docx; Personal Objections to Drury Works.docx

Good afternoon,

I understand from our neighbour that you will be kind enough to upload and register our objection to the application relating to Drury Works, 160 - 161 Drury Lane.

My name is John Carson, and we are the owner residents of 8 Parker Street, WC2B 5PH, London

Camden's application reference is **2023/2245/P**

I outline our objections below, and also attach this in a word doc, along with the core objection details we share with our neighbours.

Thank you taking the time to do this for me,

Kind Regards,  
John

#### **OBJECTION**

Our home shares a party wall with the proposed development, being immediately next door to Drury Works on ground and first floors. We strongly object to the proposed development of 160 - 161 Drury Lane, LONDON, WC2B 5PN, for the following main reasons:

1. Neighbouring properties were not properly consulted ahead of the 2019 proposal therefore there no comparison should be drawn, nor precedent set for this application. Furthermore, we again have not been consulted properly for this application, with requests to meet ignored. Nor have any points made by residents changed anything from the initial plans.
2. There have several similar schemes with rear first floor extensions and additional floors which Camden rejected due to the detriment these would cause to neighbours. This is a similar if not identical application, which we ask be rejected due to these precedents.
3. The proposed first floor extension, bulked out fourth floor, and new fifth floor are vertical extensions and/or hard raised walls rather than a softened set back mansard roof. As a result, these will block our current view of light and sky, will overshadow our rare and loved outside space, will result in an increased sense of enclosure, a reduction in outlook and light in living and sleeping areas, and will be overbearing.
4. We employed a light surveyor who found our light would be reduced.
5. A new terrace proposed is not a replacement on an existing one. In fact this is intentionally misleading. If granted, this too would add to a reduction in light, and outlook, overbearing and shadowing, and would decrease the amenity of our homes due to noise nuisance it would likely cause. Just by its scale, it should be clear how disruptive it would be, but any noise in this atrium space would be increased as would reverberate due to the proximity of walls. It would also mean a massive reduction in privacy.

6. The proposed bike and bin storage area had been placed immediately on the other side of our living area, which is incredibly inconsiderate both from the perspective of noise, and possible smells but also from the proposed increased door size (v 2019 plan), and proposed location closer to us. We ask this be moved to Drury Lane, historically a much busier roadway, and one which would only neighbour a daytime commercial premises.
7. Another concern is around the ground floor cafes ability to easily convert to a restaurant and/or other licensed venue when the area is already severely impacted by day and night time anti-social behaviour and excess noise resulting from entertainment venues, and alcohol consumption

Please refer to the Core Objection document for photos and further details of all concerns.

#### **Lack of consultation detail**

The previous application in 2019, by a previous owner of this site, was flawed as erroneous information was contained in the application. Importantly some data on overshadowing was missing and not represented. Neighbours were also not properly consulted, so did not have the change to raise issues. This was subsequently passed by delegated powers, despite significant levels of objections from those who were aware of the application.

We ask that Camden planning do not consider the granting of the 2019 as a precedent for the current 2023 application, one as the 2019 application expired in October 2022 and due to the issues outlined above. We urge this application is reviewed on a stand-alone basis.

In 2023, the current public consultation was lacking as immediate residents were missed from communications, little notice was given of "public meetings", meaning there was no opportunity for many resident them, or effective challenge to the application. We had asked the developer about plans for the property in early 2023 as we wished to refurbish our rear garden. This has been on hold due to the previous plans not being actioned yet. In fact that developer had offered to do a refurbishment of the yard for us! It would appear when the current developer replied to these requests, they did not answer honestly answer as they were already in discussions with Camden about their plans. And despite this direct contact, we had a standard information letter put through our door, while other neighbours did not. Again not all residents were properly informed of the proposal. Also despite many concerns being raised in meetings and by emails, none of these were taken into consideration. In fact the final plans submitted were not altered or modified in any way. It could suggest the public consultation was just 'window dressing' and a formal 'tick box' exercise?

#### **Design**

The properties surrounding, and adjacent to, 160 -161 Drury Lane are predominantly residential both on Drury Lane and Parker Street and key aspects of this proposal will be detrimental to these residents.

The new first floor rear extension, new terrace, bulking of the upper storeys, and new 5<sup>th</sup> floor will have a significant detrimental reduction for outlook, daylight, sunlight not only directly affecting my flat but for several adjoining neighbours, who will also suffer from light reduction, and overshadowing of their terraces, balconies and the garden at the rear of Market House, and of Parker Street. Our garden and adjoining number 10 is used by residents and their families all year round, and is a unique space for the area, so any reduction in light and amenity would not be welcomed.

The proposed 1<sup>st</sup> floor extension will significantly reduce the amount of light which hits the ground on both our ground floor garden, as well as our first floor recently expanded terrace. We use this space a lot, and the first floor terrace was extended from one half to the full length of the property in order to gain more light. The new extension will significantly block the day light and sunlight which hits this area, built at great expense and as part of our commitment to this area. Furthermore from our bedroom, from our current view of small wall and sky, we would now look out at a vertical wall with much reduced light.

We appointed ROLC an independent light consultant, because we had concerns that the proposed development will have an oppressive and overbearing impact on my life and the way we enjoy our property. The BRE site layout planning for daylight and sunlight 2022 states that people expect good natural lighting in their homes. ROLC has independently reviewed the daylight and sunlight study prepared by the applicant and is an integral part of their application and the results indicate that the proposed development will impact both the daylight and sunlight by

residents of both Parker Street and Drury Lane. We instructed ROLC to undertake an independent study of the effects of the proposal on our daylight and sunlight using both internal and external scans and therefore is more accurate than the applicants study, as they relied on modelling when reviewing my property, which in our opinion is inadequate. The results of the ROLC survey shows that we would suffer a loss of light daylight and sunlight levels both VSC and daylight distribution factors are adversely affected, which we find unacceptable. There's no upside in this proposal for us. The ROLC survey also studied the proposed development with regards the adverse effects of overlooking and privacy. It found and quoted: "the 1st floor bedroom (the principle bedroom of 8 Parker Street) and terrace space will be impacted by the increased sense of enclosure, loss of outlook from the proposed terrace space from an oblique angle". We find this unacceptable.

**Terrace:** On top of this first floor extension, it is proposed to create a second floor terrace. In the application, it is stated that the current first floor was currently used as a terrace. This incorrect and is purposefully misleading. We have lived in this maisonette since 1999, and have had an outlook to this vicinity since 1994. This first floor level has never been used as a terrace, and as it currently houses a very large fire escape it is solely a means of escape, in cases of emergency, and to accommodate multiple large A.C. units. No social gathering has taken place here as there is little free space to socialise. Also in many previous council documents, its use was clearly limited as a means of escape and not for use as a terrace. In the 2019 decision notice it states: "*that the second floor rear terrace shall be restricted for escape or maintenance purposes*"..... "*to safeguard the amenity of the adjoining occupiers at 158-159 Drury Lane*".

We request that these restrictions are imposed, no terrace is permitted. Granting this terrace, will mean a substantial loss of privacy for multiple properties as anyone standing on the terrace will look directly into our bedroom, down to our terrace, or into other people's bedrooms, and/or living areas. It has been suggested that screening of the terrace would minimise this loss of privacy but that would have a further loss of daylight/sunlight, would add to the bulking of the scheme and increase a sense of overbearing and enclosure. Also granting permission for use as a terrace will substantially increase noise pollution to nearby workers and residents, if this offices workers were to use the terrace to socialise. This is unacceptable and an invasion of our peace and quiet.

Camden planning, should maintain its stance of 2019 and stipulate that this terrace should only be used for emergency access and not as a socialising terrace.

We object to the 4<sup>th</sup> floor extension, due to concerns of overshadowing of the residential terraces, balconies, gardens at the rear of Market House, Parker Street and to those of 158 Drury Lan. This extension would severely reduce daylight, sunlight nearby residential properties, which would also experience overshadowing and an increased sense of enclosure. All of which we find unacceptable. The 4th floor footprint should remain unchanged.

With regards to the proposed 5<sup>th</sup> floor extension, we note that it is proposed for this to be 1.5m deep. This will add additional bulk and mass to an already substantial building increasing an overbearing affect, reducing the comfort and amenity of residents. The proposed 5<sup>th</sup> floor extension is a vertical extension rather than a mansard roof, with the latter by its very nature set back, so as to cause less impact to the neighbours. Camden in its pre-application response mentioned a concern of overbulking, but it is still in the proposed application, as is the bulking of the 4<sup>th</sup> floor. The 5th floor extension should be removed from the application and not granted.

#### **Bike/Bins**

We also have serious concerns about the proposed location of this, and ask that the bike and bin store be located away from the proposed Parker Street location, to the current bike site on Drury Lane, adjacent to the current 'Boris/Santander' bike stand. The current proposal is to locate these facilities immediately on the other side of the party wall which is our living and kitchen areas. The proposal is a matter of a few feet from our kitchen window which we have open all year round for fresh air and ventilation as we do not have air conditioning. This is incredibly inconsiderate both from the perspective of noise, but also possible smells. Also, there is a significant proposed increase in door size (v 2019 plan), and at a location closer to us. In fact we can see no example in all of Parker Street where two residences doors are so close to one another. Surely this is basic design and planning so neighbours do not disturb each other with their coming and going, let alone if you would add in the incredible noise which could come from bikes and large bins being moved. Relocating to Drury Lane, next to 158 Drury Lane, would be a far better location, less disruptive as Drury Lane is historically a much busier roadway (and likely to be again). Also as this spot would only neighbour a commercial premises, which operates from 9am to early evening. Whatever the location, ventilation of the bin/bike store should be passive utilising air bricks and not electric ventilation, to

minimise background noise and should be directed back into the office and not out and towards neighbouring properties. Refuse deliveries should be strictly limited to normal office hours of 09-00 to 17-00, to minimise disturbance to residents.

#### **Retail**

We also have concerns of the prospect of a retail unit on the ground floor, which if we understand correctly, if granted could be turned into a café/restaurant without any further planning consideration. We all currently suffer from late night noise and anti-social activities and having an additional late-night venue, would not be welcome. In the 2019 decision notice, it stipulated that no cooking of food should take place, to eliminate the need for extraction equipment and the associated noise that this would create. A limit on the hours of operation were also imposed, as was a limit so that no music should be heard from the premises. The situation has worsened with noise and anti-social behaviour since 2019, so we ask that these restrictions be imposed again on the 2023 proposal, with the hours of operation be reduced from 22-30 & 23-00 to 20-00 on all days.

We refer to the core objection document, where at the end of the report it highlights two cases where Camden Planning has refused two similar schemes which were proposing roof extensions that were going to create similar issues to this proposal. We request that Camden Planning do not use the 2019 decision as a precedent but refuse this application for the same reasons as 2017/5659 & 2019/3133 applications

Finally, any construction work that maybe undertaken should be strictly controlled by a CMP, agreed by the residents. This is a difficult site, on a busy junction and as already explained surrounded by resident neighbours. Therefore, hours of construction should be restricted to 09-00 to 17-00, Monday to Friday and no working at the weekends or bank holidays. Any noisy core works, be restricted to 10-00 to 14-00, one hour on, one hour off. Deliveries to be restricted to 09-00 to 17-00, Monday to Friday.

John Carson, 8 Parker Street, London, WC2B 5PH  
Telephone [REDACTED]

This message is for information purposes only. It is not a recommendation, advice, offer or solicitation to buy or sell a product or service, nor an official confirmation of any transaction. It is directed at persons who are professionals and is intended for the recipient(s) only. It is not directed at retail customers. This message is subject to the terms at: <https://www.cib.barclays/disclosures/web-and-email-disclaimer.html>.

For important disclosures, please see: <https://www.cib.barclays/disclosures/sales-and-trading-disclaimer.html> regarding marketing commentary from Barclays Sales and/or Trading desks, who are active market participants; <https://www.cib.barclays/disclosures/barclays-global-markets-disclosures.html> regarding our standard terms for Barclays Corporate and Investment Bank where we trade with you in principal-to-principal wholesale markets transactions; and in respect to Barclays Research, including disclosures relating to specific issuers, see: <http://publicresearch.barclays.com>.

---

If you are incorporated or operating in Australia, read these important disclosures:  
<https://www.cib.barclays/disclosures/important-disclosures-asia-pacific.html>.

---

For more details about how we use personal information, see our privacy notice:  
<https://www.cib.barclays/disclosures/personal-information-use.html>.

---