
From: Simon Green [REDACTED]
Sent: 21 July 2023 15:19
To: Enya Fogarty; Planning Planning
Cc: Erwan Toulemonde
Subject: Objection to 2023/2245/P 160-161 Drury Lane
Attachments: Updated 18-Jul-23 Core Objections to Drury Works - Wednesday.docx; 160 Drury lane 158 - latest.docx

[REDACTED]

From:

Simon Jonathan Herron Green
Flat 5
158 Drury Lane
LONDON
WC2B 5QG

Flat 5 is one of the top floor flats at 158 Drury Lane

Please see attached Core Objection document and my Objection

Objection to the proposal : 2023/2245/P

From: Simon JH Green, Flat 5, 158 Drury Lane, LONDON, WC2B 5QG

I am the owner of Flat 5, 158 Drury Lane and strongly object to the proposed development of 160 - 161 Drury Lane, LONDON, WC2B 5PN, on the following grounds:

The previous application in 2019, by a previous owner of this site, was flawed as erroneous information was contained in the application. More importantly some data on overshadowing was missing and not represented. In addition, the public consultation was lacking (nearby residents were missed from communications) and therefore there was no opportunity for them, or effective challenge to the application, which was subsequently passed by delegated powers.

Camden planning should not use 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 flaws outlined above. Camden planning are urged to review the current application on a stand-alone basis.

In 2023, after partial consultation with some affected residents (again not all residents were properly informed of the proposal), issues raised by the residents and other affected parties, were not taken into consideration. In fact the final plans submitted were not altered or modified in any way. One would question if the public consultation was just 'window dressing' and a formal 'tick box' exercise?

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 all of the residents.

The proposed 5th floor extension is a vertical extension rather than a mansard roof. A mansard roof would by its very nature be set back, causing 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 4th floor.

I object to the 4th floor extension, due to concerns of overshadowing of the residential terraces, balconies of 158 Drury Lane and the garden at the rear of Market House, Parker Street. Due to the 4th floor extension, nearby residential properties will be severely affected to reduction in daylight, sunlight and will experience overshadowing. I commissioned an independent light survey and the results show I will experience a loss in light levels, which I find unacceptable. The applicant, has not actually visited my flat to conduct a light survey, but relied on 'modelling', which I suggest is not 100% accurate.

The 2019, there were several errors in the application regarding the 4th floor extension and one directly related to my flat (Flat 5, 158 Drury Lane), relating to the outlook impact on my flat. This was a significant error as the 4th floor extension will adversely affect the enjoyment of my flat, and will impact the view from both floors, both a kitchen and dining area, bedroom and the only outside area and views my property enjoys.

The 4th floor extension will contribute to an increased sense of enclosure, a reduction in outlook, and will be overbearing. All of which I find unacceptable.

Therefore, the 4th floor footprint should remain as is i.e. unchanged.

With regards to the proposed 5th floor extension, I 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 which will make residents lives a misery.

The 5th floor extension should be removed from the application and not granted.

Please refer to the Core Objection document for photos and further details of my concerns, attached to this objection.

The proposed 1st floor extension will mean that I would now look out at a vertical wall rather than the current clear view in the current light well. 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 is incorrect. I have had owned my flat since 1994 and this first floor level has never been used as a terrace. Occasionally, office workers may step out to take a phone call, but nothing else. It is currently solely a means of escape in cases of emergency, and to house multiple large A.C. units. There is little free space to socialise, and 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"*.

I request that these restrictions are imposed, no terrace is built, and if so granted, the terrace not be used at all for recreational purposes. Granting this terrace, will mean a substantial loss of privacy for multiple properties as anyone standing on the terrace will look directly into my rear bedroom, other resident'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 detrimental effect on my daylight/sunlight and would add to the bulking of the scheme and would 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.

The new first floor rear extension, and bulking of the upper storeys, as previously mentioned will have a significant detrimental impact on daylight, sunlight not only directly affecting my flat but my adjoining neighbours, who will also suffer from overshadowing of their terraces, balconies and the garden (used regularly by residents and families) at the rear of Market House, and of Parker Street.

I have severe concerns of the prospect of a retail unit on the ground floor, which if I 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, is not 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 I 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 also ask that the bike and bin store be moved from the proposed site on Parker Street to the current site on Drury Lane which is adjacent to the current 'Boris' bike stand. Any ventilation of the bin/bike store should be passive utilising air bricks and not electric ventilation, to minimise background noise. Refuse deliveries should be strictly limited to normal office hours of 09-00 to 17-00, to minimise disturbance to residents.

I 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. I 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.