London Borough of Camden Planning Services 5 Pancras Square London N1C 4AG

Hines

27th July 2023

Planning application ref. 2023/2245/P 160 – 161 Drury Lane, London, WC2B 5PN

Dear Enya Fogarty,

I write on behalf of Hines, developer of Grain House, a mixed-use development scheme, located directly opposite the application site on Drury Lane and within the borough of Westminster City Council.

Grain House secured planning permission in February 2019 for alterations, extensions and refurbishment to the existing city block on site, providing office floors at upper levels and flexible commercial space at ground and lower floor. We are now nearing completion on site and with the majority of the floorspace let.

Hines supports the development proposals put forward by McAleer and Rushe.

The proposed development seeks to retain, enhance and optimise the existing building. The proposed design of the scheme is welcomed and would contribute to the regeneration and transformation of the area, contributing to the wider townscape, the setting of the Seven Dials (Camden) and Covent Garden (WCC) conservation areas, as well as the local streetscape.

We understand the applicant is also proposing the removal of the columns of at ground floor, which hopefully will help deter some of the littering and anti-social behaviour we have witnessed.

Yours sincerely,

Jake Walsh Managing Director

HINES UK LIMITED 5 Welbeck Street London, W1G 9YQ P +44 (0) 20 7292 1900 F +44 (0) 20 7292 1901



[EXTERNAL EMAIL] Beware – This email originated outside Camden Council and may be malicious Please take extra care with any links, attachments, requests to take action or for you to verify your password etc. Please note there have been reports of emails purporting to be about Covid 19 being used as cover for scams so extra vigilance is required.

Dear whomever this may concern,

Please see the forwarded email below for my objection to 2023/2245/P. I have already sent an email regarding this objection but my attached objection was not uploaded so I have sent it in email form to be uploaded.

My name is Manon Toulemonde and I live in the self-contained studio that belongs to flat 6, which is on the fifth floor of 12 Parker Street.

My address is Flat 6, Market House, <u>12 Parker Street</u>, <u>London</u>, <u>WC2B 5PH</u>.

I have already sent all of the attachments referenced in my objection in my previous email.



Hi Enya,

I have seen that the main text of my objection hasn't been uploaded so I wondered if it was easier to add it as an email rather than an attachment. Below is my objection to 2023/2245/P.

Dear Enya,

I am writing to object to planning application 2023/2245/P as a resident of the self-contained studio belonging to flat 6. It is on the 5th floor of <u>12 Parker Street</u>, therefore I am severely negatively impacted by the proposed Drury Works development.

As is stated in the attached Daylight and Sunlight report, a crucial misrepresentation was made in the Applicant's respective report when stating that the self-contained studio's key room is a bedroom, and thus the detrimental impact to the light I receive is less important. This is incorrect as the main large window to the studio primarily serves the only living space, which also acts as my study area; these are areas which I use the most and thus should be primarily considered.

The secondary window to the studio is recessed into the room because of the sloping mansard roof so provides less light than the primary one, and thus is of less importance. Two of the windows named in the Applicant's Daylight and Sunlight report serve enclosed rooms (kitchen and bathroom) and thus do not contribute to the light received in the living area, study space or bedroom.

The living area, doubling as my study space, is particularly important to me as I am a student at the London School of Economics, so I rely on them every day as a work space. I am going into an intense and crucial last year of my undergraduate degree, with plans to then complete a master's degree, and so having workable space in my home is essential. The proposed development would destroy my ability to study at home due to the large reductions in light and the daily construction noise. As the area is primarily residential, I am sure that many other residents have similar concerns over working from home, which is increasingly prevalent. I myself am likely to work from home in the future, meaning the development's prevention of having a workable home space is a long term, deeply concerning, issue.

I also have grave concerns about the overshadowing of the 5th floor studio's terrace (details contained in the attached Daylight and Sunlight Report). The terrace that I and my family use often, and all year round, as an amenity space would see a large reduction in sunlight, with the overshadowing results from the terrace being significantly below the BRE recommendation of 50%, at 36.8%. As London, especially Covent Garden and Holborn, is very developed, there is little amenity space anyway, and the private element is a huge factor. I sit out there all times of year to get sun and air, providing mental health benefits, especially when I have been working inside all day. I, with my Mum, also upkeep many plants on the terrace, providing environmental benefits, although these would struggle to survive due to the development's overshadowing.

The proposed roof extension would leave me with a 5 meter plus wall directly in front of me, not only severely disrupting the light I receive but also the ability to see the sky from the living room and bedroom, which is greatly beneficial. I have attached photos showing the current view from the living area out onto the terrace, to aid with visualisation of how the roof extension would detrimentally impair my amenities. The impact to my property is so massive that I must object to the fifth floor extension, which is not recessed from the terrace at all. I please ask that the Council protects my residential amenities, including essential work space, based on the reasons stated above, and either fully reject or impose design amendments at the 5th level which could mitigate the impact on my amenity (such as a recession of the roof extension from the 5th floor terrace).

Previous refusals

Refusal of planning application 2017/5659/P by LB Camden

A similar planning application for 39-49 Neal Street London WC2H 9PJ, which is a 4 minute walk away from the Drury Works site, was refused by Camden Council in September 2018. This development proposed a roof extension for additional office space, as does the Applicant's proposal. The first reason for refusal was that the proposed roof extension would be "unduly dominant" (see attached Decision Notice for 2017/5659/P). The Neal Street proposed roof extension would have created a fourth floor, whereas the Drury Works development goes further by proposing a fifth floor roof extension. If the Council is to remain consistent in its outlook, surely the Drury Works proposal cannot be acceptable.

Refusal of planning application 2019/3133/P by LB Camden

Another similar planning application for 49-51 Farringdon Road London EC1M 3JP was refused by Camden Council in May 2020. The development proposed a roof extension at fifth floor level and rear extensions at first and second floor levels to provide office floorspace, which is extremely similar to the roof extension and rear extension proposed by the Applicant. The first reason for refusal is that the proposed rear extension would be "excessively dominant and overbearing to the detriment of the visual amenity of the properties to the rear contrary to policies D1 (Design) and D2 (Heritage) of the London Borough of Camden Local Plan 2017." The second refusal reason is that the proposed development, without legal agreement, could not "be implemented without causing detrimental

impact to residential amenity". This issue also arises with the Applicant's proposal, as my amenity spaces, including the terrace and the building's communal courtyard, would be severely negatively impacted, along with an inability for me and other residents to work in our homes due to incessant construction noise and large light reductions.

Considering the similarity between this planning application and the Applicant's planning application, the reasons for refusal that applied previously should also be applied presently as the same issues of overbearing massing and detriment to residential amenity arise.

I have requested the Decision Notice for the 2019/3133/P planning application as it has not been published. For your reference, I have attached the reasons for refusal for this application from Camden Council's website in the meantime, but will send over Decision Notice when I receive it.

Overestimation of protection of office space

Policy E1 of Camden's Local Plan pertains to office space in the borough. In order to fully understand this policy, and how it manifests in reality, its is important to examine its evidence base. The Camden Employment Land Review 2014 (attached) has been used to inform this policy, with the local plan stating:

"The Camden Employment Land Review 2014 forecasts that the demand for offices will increase by 695,000sqm between 2014 and 2031."

"The majority of demand will be met at King's Cross, through the implementation of 444,000sqm of permitted office space in King's Cross Central. There are plans for further large-scale office development in Euston, where the Council envisages in the region of 180,000 to 280,000sqm of business floorspace being provided in the second half the plan period."

The Employment Land Study 2014 states:

"With regard to LB Camden's economic strategy, Policy CS8 confirms that the Council will promote the provision of 444,000 sqm of permitted office floorspace at King's Cross and approximately 70,000 sqm of office provision at Euston. This equates to over 80% of projected employment demand in LB Camden." (Emphasis added)

Both the Camden Local Plan and the Camden Employment Land Review were published before the Covid-19 pandemic and therefore do not account for the significant changes to office demand that the pandemic caused. The property consultancy Lambert Smith Hampton published the 'Thames Valley & South East Office Report 2022' (attached), within which businesses' survey answers indicated "an overall reduction in space requirements of 15-20%" (emphasis added).

Considering that 80% of projected employment demand in Camden is already accounted for, and that there has been a 20% reduction in demand for office space that the Local Plan was not able to account for, the additional office space that the Applicant proposes seems highly unnecessary. This is further supported when the detrimental impact of the development on the residential nature of the local area, and the residents themselves, is simultaneously considered.

I am in full support of the core objections submitted by the Friends of Parker Street, which you will also find attached.

Kind regards,

Manon Toulemonde

Please let me know if you have all of the attachments I reference above (they are all attached in my initial email).
Kind regards, Manon Toulemonde
On Fri, Jul 21, 2023 at 10:47 AM Manon Toulemonde < manon.toulemonde@gmail.com > wrote: Hi Enya,
My apologies, thank you very much.
Kind regards,
Manon Toulemonde
On Fri, 21 Jul 2023 at 10:36 am, Enya Fogarty < Enya. Fogarty@camden.gov.uk > wrote: Hi Manon,
Your objection was only submitted yesterday. Officers are very busy, your objection will be uploaded shortly.
Kind Regards,
Enya Fogarty Planning Officer Supporting Communities London Borough of Camden Telephone: 020 7974 8964 Web: camden.gov.uk
5 Pancras Square London N1C 4AG



Find out more at lovecamden.org



Please consider the environment before printing this email.

From: Manon Toulemonde < <u>manon.toulemonde@gmail.com</u> > Sent: 21 July 2023 10:34 To: Planning Planning < <u>Planning@camden.gov.uk</u> > Cc: Enya Fogarty < <u>Enya.Fogarty@camden.gov.uk</u> >; <u>friendsofparkerstreet@gmail.com</u> Subject: Re: Objection to 2023/2245/P
[EXTERNAL EMAIL] Beware – This email originated outside Camden Council and may be malicious Please take extra care with any links, attachments, requests to take action or for you to verify your password etc. Please note there have been reports of emails purporting to be about Covid 19 being used as cover for scams so extra vigilance is required.
Dear Enya,
I have seen that only the core objections document I attached has been uploaded to the application document page, not my actual objection statement or any of the other documents I attached.
Please can my objection, at least, be published as a response to the application on the application document page.
Kind regards,
Manon Toulemonde

On Thu, 20 Jul 2023 at 1:48 pm, Manon Toulemonde < <u>manon.toulemonde@gmail.com</u>> wrote:

Dear Enya,

Please find attached my objection to 2023/2245/P. My name is Manon Toulemonde and I live in the self-contained studio that belongs to flat 6, which is on the fifth floor of 12 Parker Street.

My address is Flat 6, Market House, 12 Parker Street, London, WC2B 5PH.

I have also attached the core objections from the Friends of Parker Street, of which I am in full support, along with the Daylight and Sunlight Report they commissioned.

Any supporting documents that I have mentioned in my statement of objection are also attached to this email.

Kind regards,

Manon Toulemonde

This e-mail may contain information which is confidential, legally privileged and/or copyright protected. This e-mail is intended for the addressee only. If you receive this in error, please contact the sender and delete the material from your computer. See our new Privacy Notice here which tells you how we store and process the data we hold about you and residents.

data we hold about you and residents.

This e-mail may contain information which is confidential, legally privileged and/or copyright protected. This e-mail is intended for the addressee only. If you receive this in error, please contact the sender and delete the material from your computer. See our new Privacy Notice here which tells you how we store and process the