

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2023/3420/L	Kin Yu	17/09/2023 17:53:33	OBJ	<p>I am writing as a 20-year resident of the Beauchamp Building EC1N 7SX to OBJECT to this planning application.</p> <p>Developers need to run a transparent process and engage with the local community</p> <p>Our flat faces directly the proposed demolition and construction project. Not a single resident of any of the 10 flats were aware of the application until a flyer was put through our door on 1st September 2023, where the applicant claims to have already carried out a thorough consultation. The developers have failed to agree to an open meeting but are instead holding a drop-in. This allow them to be non-accountable for their actions as there will be no agenda and minutes and they can claim that all concerns were addressed.</p> <p>Camden needs to stop supporting greenwashing by developers</p> <p>Approval of this application would be at odds with Camden's own green policy where "the council has committed to doing everything it can to reduce CO2e emissions from the borough to net zero by 2030. To achieve this challenging target, the council will need to do everything it can to reduce emissions from its estate and operations over this decade."</p> <p>In addition, the GLA only mentioned in March 2023 that "it is widely recognised that if developers demolish and rebuild, it uses more carbon than if the developer were to renovate the building".</p> <p>The applicant has not provided any details on the full carbon life cycle and how a demolition is better and creates a lower environmental impact than a retrofit. We have heard from Sadiq Khan who has been hammering on about how clean air "is a right not a privilege". The applicant has taken the easiest option and Camden Council would be complicit in greenwashing if they were to approve this project. There needs to be a full, independent and verified study on how this helps Camden achieve its target of being net zero by 2030, not by counting emissions after the building has been put up but back counting them from the start of the re-development.</p> <p>Camden needs to consider the local community's well-being and physical health</p> <p>There are numerous buildings which have already been demolished in the vicinity in the recent past (one of them literally next to this new project). If Camden Council gives developers the green light to demolish every existing building in the borough, the local community will be left unable to breathe. NB: St Alban's CoE school is located in the vicinity and this is yet another of many projects within a 200m radius from the school playground to take place over the last two years.</p> <p>The proposal will add an extra storey to the existing building which is not supported by the demand for office space. Since the pandemic it is well documented that the shift to hybrid working is enduring, leading to a fall in demand for office space. How can it be justified to add an extra storey which will lead to a loss of light for many local residents?</p>

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2023/3420/L	Benoit Danzin	17/09/2023 16:53:04	OBJ	<p>The noise and dust during the construction process will make it unbearable to be able to live in and work from home. This area is mostly residential and this fact seems to have been entirely ignored in this application. There needs to be transparency about how many local residents will be affected by this project.</p> <p>My three children and another three children in our building are going through their seminal years with GSCE and A-Levels looming. Having gone through the anxiety and disruption caused by the Covid pandemic, the noise, the vibrations, the lack of light and the inability to open our windows will place another level of stress and mental anguish on them during the 2-3 years that it will take to complete demolition and construction. It is simply not acceptable to ask children to go through this.</p> <p>Conclusion</p> <p>I urge you to reject this application and wholeheartedly embrace a transparent agenda where Camden Council will have done everything they can to mitigate the additional effects of releasing greenhouse gases into the air and contributing to the climate emergency.</p> <hr/> <p>I object to this construction for the following reasons:</p> <p>Noise-I am afraid that three years of building works will be disruptive during the most important and stressful period of my education, my GCSEs then A levels</p> <p>Danger-the highly active building site 24/7 will increase health risks in an area that is key to accessing both Chancery Lane and Farringdon, two key stations that I need to access</p> <p>Pollution-the works will create a lot of dust and grime that will, since we are on the lowest level of the building, affect my health and put me at increase of developing health issues related to pollution (air particules)</p> <p>Light-the new height will mean that the already pinpoint light will be completely lost and I will be deprived of natural light essential to well-being and sanity</p> <p>Thank you for obliging to my points,</p> <p>Benoit 14y old</p>

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2023/3420/L	Marthe Danzin	17/09/2023 17:29:21	OBJ	<p>I am writing to object to the above Planning Application</p> <p>1) Mother of three children (10 to 16) I feel really unsecure about their journey to school from home to chancery Lane station. With previous experience on Brooke's Market newly built, I witnessed too many times lorries and trucks blocking the road, engaged on the pavement without consideration for residents and especially vulnerable one. I feel this major building site will endangered my children on their daily way to school and put them at risk in what is supposed to be a familiar and safe environment</p> <p>2) Secondly, I opposed to this planning as a mother again - after 3 years of pandemic (Covid 2020-2022) and several lockdowns, children have suffered enough instability and anxiety from the outside world. They deserve to be able to mend the scars from this pandemic without being troubled by high levels of noise, vibrations and loss of sight.</p> <p>3) Thirdly, this new building will generate a very high level of pollution which seems to be in contradiction with Camden borough's commitment to provide a safer and greener place to live and work in. Dust, air pollution, and noise pollution will increase risks to the level of health issues, well being and anxiety within the local community and put everybody leaving and working around at risk.</p> <p>4) I also wonder how the safety of the general public will be monitored. I witnessed already several near missed during the new built on Brooke's street when large lorries blocked the road and the pavement on both sides without any consideration for people commuting on this part of town. Moreover I wonder how emergency services but also daily services such as grocery delivery, post office etc will be able to carry their business within this area when the only road to access local residents will be blocked by lorries loading and unloading on a daily basis. I wonder how emergency services often called at The Lodge for example will be able to help fellow citizen without easy access to the square.</p> <p>5) Statistics show that London workers spend 2.3 days a week in the office. This part of Camden doesn't need more offices. I question the pertinence of having new office spaces when already all local businesses around are suffering from the lack of daily workers since the end of pandemic (all markets traders and local shops on Leather Lane, Theobald Road complain about the decrease of frequentation)</p> <p>In conclusion, I urge to reject this application</p>

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2023/3420/L	Marianne Yu	17/09/2023 18:36:13	COMMNT	<p>I do not want the building to be demolished and here are my reasons why.</p> <p>I am 12 years old and I have been living next to this building my whole life. I can see it all the time from the windows of our home. If you start construction works next door to my home, you will affect everyone's life around. Some people might have to move if they have poor health or breathing issues because your works will pollute the air a lot.</p> <p>Having a big construction site next to our home really isn't fair for us as children. We have already gone through a huge disruption with school during Covid. My brothers and I will be taking our GCSE or A levels in the coming years and so we won't be able to concentrate and we will not get the results that we hope to achieve because you think it's a good idea to start making a new office space. It will be terribly noisy all the time. Maybe we will even feel vibrations and our flat will be a lot darker.</p> <p>This building that you want to make even bigger than now has been empty for a long as I can remember. There are many other offices in the area and many also look rather empty. I am sure the children of the neighbourhood would prefer to use your existing building as a playground!</p> <p>There are also many elderly people living in our neighbourhood and they will have a greater risk of lung cancer than before. I am worried for my parents and my neighbours. I am also worried there will be a huge crane near our home and many noisy and smelly trucks on my way to school.</p> <p>Please do not transform my neighbourhood in a huge construction site. Many people live here and our lives will be damaged for a long time.</p>

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2023/3420/L	Catherine Mayer	16/09/2023 11:55:06	OBJ	<p>I am writing as a local resident of 25 years' standing to object to this Planning Application and to the process to date, including false claims made by the developer.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Applicant wrongly claims to have undertaken a consultation with local residents. <p>I live at the Beauchamp Building, EC1N 7SX, directly adjoining the proposed demolition and construction project. Until leaflets were left at the Beauchamp Building on 1 September 2023, not a single resident of any of the 10 flats here, nor any occupant of the three commercial units in the building, nor anyone involved in the Beauchamp Building's management had been made aware of the Application. I have spoken to residents of adjoining buildings including Langley House and Cranley Buildings and in nearby flats on Leather Lane, including people living directly opposite 2 Waterhouse Square. None of them knew about the Application before the 1 September leaflet drop either. Nevertheless, the Applicant claims in the Application and in separate emails to have already conducted a thorough consultation. In an email to three Camden Councillors, Harry Sorensen, Senior Account Manager for the 2 Waterhouse Square consultation team, refers to a public consultation held "earlier this year". He sent this email on 13 September after local residents, finally alerted to the proposed scheme by the September 1 leaflet, pushed for a public meeting with the Applicant. The Applicant has not scheduled a meeting but is instead holding a drop-in on 19 September. This risks being nothing more than a tick-box exercise to railroad the Application through. The failure to agree to an open meeting means there will be no transparency or verifiable record of any conversations that take place at the drop-in. There is also no proposal by the Applicant to extend the consultation period to redress the abject failure to engage with the local community.</p> <p>To date, the Applicant has not to my knowledge consulted residents or local businesses about the impacts of the scheme apart from erecting an exhibition about it without publicising the exhibition or Application, much less meeting the threshold of meaningful consultation as defined by Camden Council under its Construction/Demolition Management Plan. ("The Council expects meaningful consultation. For large sites, this may mean two or more meetings with local residents prior to submission of the first draft CMP. Please ensure that any changes to parking and loading on the public highway are reflected in the consultation.")</p> <p>I will set out my concerns about the proposed building below, but even if I were in favour of it, I would be deeply worried by the Applicant's reluctance to engage with residents and the other core components of this community, local charities, small businesses, the church, the mosque and other community-based organisations. This sends worrying signals about all aspects of the development should it proceed. A significant number of residents in this and neighbouring buildings have limited mobility, suffer poor health and/or are vulnerable in a number of ways. There are also many young families. Increased traffic alone represents a danger as well as a nuisance. Many of us live and work here (and working from home has increased dramatically since the pandemic in this community as across the country). We would potentially be unable to continue to do so if access were impeded or noise and pollution increased. It is hard to see how these problems could be mitigated, but the Applicant has not attempted to explore these issues with any of us.</p> <p>Whatever happens, any decisions relating to the Application should be delayed pending a consultation that meets Camden's own requirements and standards.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Applicant wrongly claims that the "the surrounding area is predominantly commercial office and retail properties".

Application No: Consultees Name: Received:

Comment: Response:

This is, to use the technical term, nonsense. Three of the four sides of the square formed by Beauchamp Street (location of the main elevation of 2 Waterhouse Square), Brooke Street, Dorrington Street and Brooke's Market are residential. Although there are three commercial units in the Beauchamp Building, they all face Leather Lane and represent only a small percentage of the overall building. All the other buildings are purely residential, a mixture of council housing, housing trust and privately owned accommodation and also the Lodge, which provides shelter to some of the most vulnerable and marginalised people. There is also a large block of flats overlooking the east end of the proposed development. Many other nearby residential properties would also be heavily affected.

- There is no need for the redevelopment of 2 Waterhouse Square.

The Applicant has been unable to rent out the space and is responding to that problem by proposing to build a bigger space, including adding an extra storey to it. This ignores the reason for the vacancy. As per the Financial Times of 6 July 2023, "the length of UK office leases has fallen to the lowest level on record while vacancies rates have soared close to a decade high as the shift to working from home shakes up the market." UK office vacancies are at a nine-year high and expected to get higher still. These figures are UK-wide; in this part of Camden, vacancy rates are higher still, not least due to the boom in speculative construction, which has added additional capacity without any demand.

I am not opposed to development. On the contrary: there are severe affordable housing shortages, a damaging lack of community facilities too, here and across the countries of the UK. The Architect's Journal reported in June 2023 that "an estimated 7,000 local authority-owned commercial and business premises across England, Scotland and Wales had been vacant for more than 12 months as of 2020, an average of 18 properties per council." The report added that these properties could be repurposed for affordable residential use.

The Applicant apparently considered adding housing units but rejected the idea. If given the go-ahead, there is nothing to stop the Applicant from building a white elephant and keeping it empty for years.

- There is a mismatch between the description of the proposed building and its appearance.

The Applicant states that the "scheme has aspirations to re-use as much of the building's existing fabric as possible on or off site" but there is no sign of that in the plans. Nor is there any justification for building upwards in a way guaranteed not only to block light to nearby residents but also infringe on their privacy.

- The Applicant frames the scheme as environmentally beneficial, another nonsense and one that Camden Council should call out rather than turning a blind eye for the short-term revenue.

There is no reason why the existing building could not be retrofitted to improve its carbon output and energy use and its desirability as a rental space. Demolition and construction are extraordinarily carbon spendthrift and would inflict multiple additional environmental impacts on the area and on residents, in terms of pollution, noise pollution, and the unnecessary use of materials and energy.

Camden Council's Climate Action Plan 2020-2025 commits the council—and this is to quote from its own

Application No: **Consultees Name:** **Received:****Comment:** **Response:**

website—"to doing everything it can to reduce CO2e emissions from the borough to net zero by 2030. To achieve this challenging target, the council will need to do everything it can to reduce emissions from its estate and operations over this decade." Permitting this unnecessary demolition to proceed stands entirely at odds with that aspiration. At very least, Camden Council should insist on a whole-life carbon assessment of the proposal before any further consideration is given to it.

All Camden residents are acutely aware of the financial stresses on the Council and have seen (and felt) the cutbacks in vital services that result. Councillors may not be to blame for the funding shortfalls but they—and this is an overwhelmingly Labour-dominated council in Keir Starmer's own constituency—remain responsible for the choices they make in these tough circumstances. Ignoring commitments to improving the environment and to safeguarding the health and wellbeing of residents cannot be the answer.

- In conclusion

The Applicant has failed to consult on these plans or to demonstrate any benefit to them. I urge you to reject the Application.

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2023/3420/L	Samantha da Soller	16/09/2023 10:08:36	OBJ	<p>I am writing to object in the strongest terms to the above Planning Application.</p> <p>A - Impact on our children's mental wellbeing and school achievements</p> <p>I have three children whose life has recently been significantly adversely affected by the Covid pandemic over a 2-3 year period (2020-2022), with potential long-term impact on their mental wellbeing and school performance (a problem extensively documented through numerous national surveys since then).</p> <p>Living 10 metres away from a major building site for a subsequent period of 2-3 years (with a high level of noise in the background as well as vibrations and significant loss of light) will undoubtedly affect their mental wellbeing again as well as impeding their ability to focus and prepare for their upcoming exams (GCSE and A-Levels).</p> <p>B - Impact on our children's physical health</p> <p>I am also concerned about the increased risk of accidents that will result from site traffic, in particular numerous lorries using the narrow road outside our home as my children make their way to and from school...</p> <p>Beyond the obvious physical danger, there will be even more worryingly the invisible and silent long-term effects of air pollution on my children's lungs (again well documented and with damaging consequences). The levels of noxious particles which they will have to breathe on a daily basis as a result of the demolition and construction works and lorries' fumes is simply not acceptable. As London mayor Sadiq Khan recently reminded all Londoners when Ulez was expanded: "Clean air is a right not a privilege" and "4,000 premature deaths a year are linked directly to air pollution". I do not wish to add my own children to this dreadful count.</p> <p>C - Impact on the enjoyment of our property and financial consequences</p> <p>With a scaffold likely to be located 7-8 metres away from our flat, the loss of light during the works would be immense and our ability to live in and work from our home seriously affected. Adding an extra level to the building facing us as part of the construction works would thereafter permanently impact the levels of light which my family has enjoyed over the past decades.</p> <p>Because of my serious concerns for my children's physical health and wellbeing, I would not feel comfortable living in the area during the construction period. I would therefore be faced with an impossible choice between crippling financial losses and long-term potential health damage to my family: we would either have to move out (with limited prospects of being able to rent our own property) or we would have to stay and one day face the damaging consequences to our mental and physical health which will undoubtedly materialise.</p> <p>Finally the building I live in will have to go through a costly external redecoration process once the construction works are completed (likely cost c £150,000 based on previous experience and inflation since). And windows will require regular cleaning throughout the period of the construction works, which will also come at an additional cost.</p> <p>D - Absence of a demonstrable need for more commercial spaces in the area</p>

Application No: Consultees Name: Received:

Comment: Response:

The building located at 140 Holborn / 2 Waterhouse Sq which the demolition and reconstruction proposal relates to has been more or less vacant for a number of years (not only during the Covid pandemic but also after it) and it was sparsely occupied before 2020.

Numerous options for high-spec co-working and office spaces exist in the area – many were built in the mid to late 2010s in anticipation of the Elizabeth line opening at Farringdon (WeWork on Leather Lane and The Office Group on Greville St are two among many). Following the Covid pandemic and the introduction of hybrid working practices, none of them have gone back to full occupancy and therefore adding more commercial space in the area seems completely unnecessary as it fulfills a need which doesn't exist (it would just add more capacity right next to "150 Holborn" which has just redeveloped by Perkins & Wills).

E - Incoherence of local environmental policies

Camden Council has positioned itself in favour of "green policies" over the past few years, notably by encouraging the development of cycling lanes in the area during and after the pandemic.

It would now seem completely incoherent for the Council to authorise the demolition of a commercial building located in the middle of a largely residential area in the absence of any underlying business needs. This would immediately generate an enormous carbon footprint.

What is the "green logic" in creating a massive environmental damage now for better energy efficiencies in the future? Better energy efficiencies should be achieved through a retrofit first approach, not demolition plans. The developers should have shared the cost and benefit modelling used to justify their choice of redevelopment method. But the fact is that retrofits are complicated and this shows the limit of the developers' green ambitions: yes to green policies as long as it doesn't create too much burden to them and regardless of the damage to the local community in the meantime.

I understand the need for commercial buildings to be transformed (when there is a business need!) and the need for Camden Council to generate revenues, but the Council should remember its own commitments to net zero and cleaner air targets. Half a dozen buildings have been or are currently being demolished with 500m of the proposed construction site. If the Council continues to allow for buildings to be demolished rather than retrofitted, the Council will surely breach its own policies in the short-term at least. There is a sense amongst the local community that the Council is disingenuous, portraying themselves as pro clean air by adding cycling lanes while simultaneously allowing for enormous environmental damage to be done by consenting to developers using the cheapest methods available to become more energy efficient.

Finally the local community would certainly welcome improvements to the area such as adding trees on empty squares (but not benches which have in the past attracted anti-social behaviour); but these green initiatives can be implemented without the redevelopment of a commercial building next door and planting three trees will certainly not compensate for the environmental assault which is being proposed through this project. This is a very poor attempt at greenwashing by the developers.

F – Road access to our building seriously compromised, notably for emergency services

Application No: **Consultees Name:** **Received:****Comment:** **Response:**

The applicants are assuming that they will service the demolition and construction site from Beauchamp Street. It is therefore likely that lorries will be queuing up in this area (waiting to take away demolition materials and deliver new materials...), thus preventing anyone from coming to or leaving our building.

This will affect any deliveries which the local community might be relying on, visits by contractors doing works (e.g. plumbers) and any forms of transport which residents might have to rely on; there is notably a serious risk that emergency services will not be able to reach us in good time anymore (e.g. ambulance, firemen...) and that taxis refuse to come and pick up us (we have elderly residents with reduced mobility in our building who need to take taxis to attend doctors' appointments now that bus lines have been discontinued).

G - Conclusion

I urge you to reject this application. It is an unnecessary demolition of a building, significantly adding to the carbon footprint and at complete odds with the green policies promoted by the Council and the Mayor of London. It will most certainly cause lasting damage to the physical and mental health of the local community, notably the children of the neighbourhood; it will affect our daily lives beyond measure and will jeopardise the fragile ecosystem of the local community which has been re-created over the last few years.

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2023/3420/L	Maximilian Yu	17/09/2023 18:48:06	OBJ	<p>I am writing to express my deep concerns and objections regarding the proposed construction site near my residence at EC1N 7SX. As a resident of this community, I firmly believe that it is my duty to voice my opinion on matters that directly impact our neighbourhood and affect our quality of life.</p> <p>Firstly, let me state that I fully understand the need for urban development and the importance of progress. However, this proposed construction site, if approved, could have significant negative repercussions on the well-being and tranquillity of our community. I want to bring to your attention several key points that highlight the potential adverse effects that this project could have:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Environmental Impact: Construction activities in this area will degrade the air quality in the area, forcing any residents near the demolition scene to not be able to open their windows any more for fresh air which becomes especially problematic in the summer months, when London becomes unbearably hot. 2. Noise and Air Pollution: Construction activities, particularly excavation and heavy machinery usage, generate considerable noise levels and release harmful air pollutants. These noise levels would be extremely disturbing to young people like me, preparing for their GCSE exams and others in the same building preparing for their A levels, potentially drastically affecting the outcome of our life-changing grades as a result. I would also like to point out that this would not be the first disturbances to people like me, in their years of study, having already had interrupted education during the covid lockdowns. With regards to the harmful air pollutants which would be released, if the plan to demolish the entire building goes ahead, it will be understood that the council does not care for the health and well-being of these residents, particularly vulnerable groups such as children, the elderly, and those with respiratory issues. 3. Traffic Congestion: The proposed construction site is situated in an already congested area with much traffic passing through every day. The additional traffic generated by construction vehicles and workers could exacerbate the traffic situation, leading to further inconvenience and safety concerns for residents, affecting many young people's commute to school as well, not to mention the further negative effect this would have on the air quality of this area. <p>Considering these concerns, I implore you and the Camden Council to thoroughly reconsider the approval of this proposed construction site near our community. I kindly request that alternative solutions be explored, holding the well-being and best interests of the residents in mind. Furthermore, I urge you to conduct a comprehensive environmental impact assessment, engaging independent experts, to evaluate the potential consequences of this project more accurately.</p> <p>Please understand that my objection is not intended to hinder progress or development within our city but to ensure it is carried out in a responsible and careful manner. I trust that you will uphold our collective interests and make decisions that reflect the values and needs of the community.</p> <p>Thank you for your attention to this matter. I kindly request that you keep the local community informed about any updates or progress made in relation to this proposed construction site.</p>

Maximilian Yu

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2023/3420/L	Agathe Danzin	18/09/2023 11:26:24	OBJ	Good morning

I beg you to reject this project.
Here are my reasons.

I am a 16 year old living in the building opposite. I have just started studying for my A-levels which means that during the next couple of years I will be managing an intense workload and will be studying a lot from home. I already struggle to study during weekdays due to the noise of the street market and rubbish trucks, and this construction will cause a huge amount of extra noise which will make it extremely difficult for me to work.

As I live in central London, I can't have a garden or a pet, so I grow plants on my windowsills for which I have won many gardening awards and which have allowed me to start conversations with neighbours from my community. The new building will greatly reduce the already scarce sunlight which reaches my windows and make it impossible for me to have even this small connection with nature which helps me care for my mental health.

Finally, as I am greatly concerned about pollution and global warming, I would be very upset if you allowed a building to be knocked down and completely rebuilt, using up many precious resources which could be used elsewhere.

Thank you for reading this; I hope you take all of this into consideration.

Agathe Danzin
