

---

**From:** Susi Gorbey [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** 21 July 2023 08:28  
**To:** Planning Planning  
**Cc:** Enya Fogarty; friendsofparkerstreet@gmail.com  
**Subject:** Objection to 2023/2245/P  
**Attachments:** Updated 18-Jul-23 Core Objections to Drury Works.docx; Updated Daylight Sunlight Overshadowing Report - Grounds for Objection.pdf

Dear Camden Planning Officer,  
I strongly object to the Drury Works application **2023/2245/P**.

I have attached the report from the local residents with advice from a planning consultant. I endorse the points in the document. I also attach a report from an independent light consultant that shows the damage to light for our property. I would ask you to read these documents carefully as they point out anomalies in the application and the key objection points. But please continue to read the points that I would like to make here.  
I support a comprehensive refurbishment to make the Drury Works more attractive for tenants and more environmentally friendly, but I cannot support the proposed plan to overbulk.  
I note that the council has refused 2 applications similar in character to 2023/2245/P; In 1077/5659/P an application for a roof extension for additional office space was refused because a 4th floor extension would be 'utterly dominant' in nearby Neal Street.  
Also application 2019/3133/P in Farringdon Road was where very extensions to the main bulk and the rear of the building would be "excessively dominant and overbearing to the detriment of the visual amenity....contrary to policies D1(design) and D2 (Heritage)..."

This application must be refused. The council community fund payoff is just not enough to warrant the damage to the residents and streetscape. Our area doesn't need economic stimulus - the area is heaving.

**1. The site is already fully developed, indeed overdeveloped in many places.**

There is no case for the bulking out and height increases that are proposed:

- London does not need extra office space, that is clear to all. 30% of Camden's office space is empty. Properties need to be maintained and updated. No one has a problem with that.
- Covent Garden historic buildings and streetscapes are protected by the conservation area status. The Drury Works building is already at maximum height for the area. The standard is 4 floors. As Drury Works has a commercial floor stud, the building is higher than the adjoining residential buildings. Adding a floor will leave an ugly streetscape as the extra height dwarfs the adjoining properties. The developers have kindly supplied examples where there are tall flank walls in the area. The most shocking of these is 41-44 Great Queen Street (corner with Drury Lane), that Drury Works developers aim to benchmark themselves to. This is a development that would never get approval now given the listed status of smaller adjoining properties. It is indeed a problem building. Please don't benchmark to this property as it is an outlier not the standard. Ugly flank walls should be a thing of the past.

**2. For residents of Market House, Great Queen Street properties and 158 Drury Lane the most important aspect is our rear aspect.** The two primary reasons for this are **light and noise**.

- Market House gets its primary light from the rear and southwest side angle. The front windows get practically no direct sun - the angle is acute.
- Market House properties have balconies, terraces, and French doors at the rear.
- Great Queen Street get afternoon light from the rear.

- Noise is a big issue for all properties. The rear rooms are where we go for sanctuary from the noise of the streets; from the revellers, theatre goes, rubbish collections etc.

The Drury Works proposed development, by massing out at the rear and pushing up, both on the roof (it is effectively two extra floors due to the plant floor) and the extra floor at the rear, **will be reducing massively the light to our properties, our ground floor communal garden, private gardens, balconies, and terraces.**

In addition, the request for a **rear terrace should be declined** due to privacy breaches and noise to the residents. If commercial tenants want a place to socialise, there are plentiful hospitality venues in the area, all of which would be grateful for their support.

**IN MY CASE:**

**In my case**, Flat 6 have primary windows facing Southwest and Southeast. With the extra bulking and height of Drury Works, **we lose light, and we lose sky outlook beyond the guidelines. The proposed bulking is overbearing making our spaces over-enclosed. This is a big deal – we live here. All the time. Please don't underestimate how important light and outlook is to residents in their homes. We will be looking out at brick walls instead of the sky.** This is especially true for the studio, but also the living and open plan kitchen of the fourth floor.

**In my case** I am a keen gardener, as are some other residents. I am acutely impacted. The **development violates daytime loss of light boundaries within our living spaces and especially our terrace** – and they are hard to violate, as we are discovering.

We use the terrace all year. It is especially important in the darker winter months to get outside time. Sitting out, wrapped in a blanket, in the winter sun with a cup of tea is magic. In Feb-Apr we have the winter bulbs flowering in the containers and it is pretty. **Outside space is not just for summertime, if anything, it is more valuable in the darker months.**

You know about the urban heat island effect – we are in such a zone. You should be encouraging those that develop green spaces that are shown to reduce urban heat.

My outside area is key for my wellbeing. I have a stressful job and I live in a noise urban area. It brings me a sense of peace to tend the plants and watch them grow and sit amongst them. Among other things, I have a mature Olive tree, a fruit tree, a climbing rose bush, and an evergreen Clematis. I grow vegetables in the summer and look forward to the bulbs coming up in the spring. I love flowering perennials. All these plants need sun. The proposed development turns my space from a partially sunny site to a shady site. I will not be able to do what I do now with my outside space; I will not be able to grow vegetables.

Our communal garden at the rear also brings out residents together. The development is going to significantly overshadow our outside spaces, reducing the enjoyment we get from it.

Further I have two requests:

1. I made a request to Drury Works do a light assessment on the listed building Freemasons Lodge – they declined. Freemasons Lodge glows in afternoon sun, which lights up the area as the white stone reflects the sun. Currently there is an ugly shadow from the overly tall building on the corner of Great Queen Street and Drury Lane (41-44). I expect that the height increase proposal for Drury Works will mean the shadow will increase down the side of the Freemasons Lodge in the late afternoon. The public space outside the Lodge will suffer, as will properties that benefit from the reflected light.
2. I request that the developers provide a view from Parker Street head on (as per the one they use to illustrate the flaws in the 2019 design) and one from the East side of the site on Parker Street, to illustrate the damage to the close to perfect building height line on Parker Street. I can only assume they have not supplied these views as they are damaging to their application.

And finally, I want to just say how shameful the developers attempt at contacting residents has been. In many cases, we were the first source of notification for other heavily impacted residents. And we found out via a neighbour, despite being one of the most impacted and living next door. They only contacted us when we complained they hadn't.