

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2023/3419/P	John Miller CBE RIBA	25/09/2023 13:10:26	OBJ	Planning Application Number 2023/3419/P

1.0 Applicants Proposal

Number 2 Waterhouse Square is situated at the North end of the Prudential Insurance Estate. Its long façade extends for nearly the whole side of Brookes Market.

It is currently a vacant commercial building.

The applicant's brief calls for the development of this North end of Brookes Market, Their report states that "The scheme aspires to re-use as much of the existing fabric as possible on or off site."

On studying the drawings this aspiration seems unlikely as the majority of the existing buildings façade are shown demolished.

The applicants also wish to increase the height of the new building by adding one extra storey.

2.0 Consultation

In the attachment to the application entitled 2 Waterhouse Square Statement of Community Involvement the applicants state that:

The objectives of the consultation were:

"To conduct a targeted consultation, engaging with the residents living closest to the site, including through various resident and community organisations, as well as local politicians and businesses."

2.1 The Reality

Apart from a pamphlet dropped in letter boxes on September 1st", ie. after the Planning Application had been made, none of the residents of the Beauchamp Building, Brooke's Court, Langley House, Cranley Buildings and St Mungos (The Lodge) had knowledge of the proposed demolition and redevelopment of 2 Waterhouse Square.

The residents of the Beauchamp Building learnt, subsequently, that there had been an exhibition of the proposed project. But no information as to when or where it was to be held.

3.0 Applicant's comment on presence of residential property

In the attachment to the Application, it states that "The surrounding area is predominantly commercial office and retail properties.

Application No: Consultees Name: Received:

Comment: Response:

3.1 This is incorrect. The buildings surrounding Brookes Market, are all residential properties (see names above). There are also residential properties adjacent to the square. Namely Gamages Housing project

3.2 Brooke's Market, has a record of residential use for centuries. The construction of the original development, 30 years ago, necessitated the loss of a stretch of back to back terraces. Some were part residential.

4.0 OBJECTIONS

Having studied the documentation, I have two strong objections to the proposed scheme.

The two objections are:

1/ the scope of proposed demolition with its attendant disruption.

2/ The proposed additional storey to provide more office space when there is already a surplus. What is required is housing, particularly social housing.

I set out below my principal reasons for these objections

4.1 OBJECTION 1, DEMOLITION

The original No 2 Waterhouse Square was built in 1993, only thirty years ago. It is proposed on the Planning Application that the facades on Brooke's Market, parts of Leather Lane and Brooke Street be demolished together with parts of the interior.

Comment

Is it necessary to demolish the facades of the existing building? The existing interior could be reconfigured to suit the brief and updated to meet current Building Regulations for green energy and sustainability. Retention would reduce the overall time to realise the project and ease the anticipated problems associated with demolition. See paras below.

4.1.1 Access for the works

It is proposed that access for demolition trucks will be from Beauchamp Street, at the northern end of Brookes Market square. This is opposite the Southern flank of the Beauchamp Building. Residents (some with children) live on this South side and will be burdened with the continuous noise of demolition and later, reconstruction. The proposed access point for collection of debris and delivery of materials is directly opposite this South side and close to these apartments.

4.1.2 Pollution

Apart from being a physical hazard to residents and members of the public, who use Brookes Market, for access to and from Leather Lane Market and Holborn, demolition access can only increase pollution with a potential toxic effect on health.

Application No: Consultees Name: Received:

Comment: Response:

NB Brookes Market square is a regular route for parents and children to and from St Albans Primary school.

4.1.3 Parking Bays

In order to enable trucks to pass, the proposed circuitous access route for arriving and departing trucks will require the removal of, or a substantial reduction to, the number of parking places that surround the centre of the square.

There may well be a queue of trucks waiting to take debris away. Access to the Beauchamp Building garages may also be affected.

4.2 OBJECTION 2, EXTRA STOREY

It is proposed to add an additional sloping attic storey to a building, which is already as bulky as its predecessor.

It will provide more office space when what is required is additional housing.

It will overwhelm the scale of Brookes Market Square and crucially will cause further loss of winter sunlight and daylight.

5.0 CONCLUSION

I have no comment on the aesthetics of the proposal, except to say that Waterhouse's masterwork, the original Prudential Insurance Building facing Holborn, is essentially faced with only two materials, terracotta brick with pink/grey granite, whereas the proposed new work shows no less than twelve varying surface finishes.

I urge the Council to reject this application. It is an unnecessary demolition of a building only 30 years old, causing disruption to the lives of residents, whilst adding to the carbon footprint.

John Miller CBE RIBA

10 The Beauchamp Building
Brooke's Market
EC1N 7SX

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2023/3419/P	Tom Carter	25/09/2023 11:45:11	OBJ	<p>I am writing to object in the strongest terms to the above Planning Application. The reasons are as follows.</p> <p>The Applicant states that the surrounding area is predominantly commercial office and retail properties. This is completely incorrect. All the buildings in the square, which is enclosed by the top of Brooke Street, Dorrington Street, Brooke's Market and Beauchamp Street are residential properties.</p> <p>As a resident of Leather Lane. On the adjoining side of Dorrington Street. The proposed application would directly impact natural light into my property. Natural light which is already compromised in the area.</p> <p>The ability to work from home as many of the residents in all adjoining buildings do would be greatly compromised if not made impossible by the large scale demolition and construction proposed. Not to mention the environmental impact of such large scale construction with dust and debris directly entering all nearby air spaces and homes.</p> <p>As a resident I strongly request you reject this application on behalf of all current residents.</p>

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2023/3419/P	su rogers	25/09/2023 16:34:28	OBJ	Planning Application Number 2023/3419/P

I am writing to object in the strongest terms to the above Planning Application.

1.0 Observations on the Application

1.1 Consultation

In the attachment to the Application entitled 2 Waterhouse Square Statement of Community Involvement the applicants state that

The objectives of the consultation were:

1. "To conduct a targeted consultation, engaging with the residents living closest to the site, including through various resident and community organisations, as well as local politicians and businesses." The Beauchamp Building is a building comprising ten residential units together with two shop units and a restaurant. Together with Cranley Buildings. it is the closest residential building to the proposed building site. Prior to the Application being made to Camden Council, none of the residents in Cranley Buildings had been consulted, none of residents in the Beauchamp Building had been consulted, none of the Residents in Langley House had been consulted and none of the Residents in "The Lodge" had been consulted.

In the same attachment to the Application 2 Waterhouse Square Statement of Community involvement, the Applicant states that "The surrounding area is predominantly commercial office and retail properties. This is completely incorrect. All the buildings in the square, which is enclosed by the top of Brooke Street, Dorrington Street, Brooke's Market and Beauchamp Street are residential properties.

In the Construction/Demolition Management Plan, para 11 Consultation states that "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". We have not had any consultation about these matters and are extremely concerned about the difficulties of losing the residents parking and the loading and unloading of large lorries in Beauchamp Street and Brooke's Market.

We were not made aware of any public consultation nor did we receive any flyer or newsletter until that received on Friday the 1st of September, which were posted in our letter boxes.

2.0 Objections to the on The Brief and Proposal

Number 2 Waterhouse Square is the building at the North end of the Prudential Insurance Estate. It is currently a vacant commercial building. The North elevation over looks Brooke's Market which is a quiet square with four to five storey residential properties on the other three sides.

Application No: Consultees Name: Received:

Comment: Response:

2.1 Demolition

The brief is to develop the North end of The Prudential Insurance Estate. The report states that "The scheme has aspirations to re-use as much of the building's existing fabric as possible on or off site." On studying the drawings this ambition has not been achieved. All the external walls and much of the interior of the existing building is shown as being demolished.

The original building, which is the subject of this planning application, was built in 1993, only thirty years ago.

We question the need to demolish the building. The external walls could be kept and the interior could be reconfigured to suit the brief. The services could be updated to meet the current requirements for green energy and sustainability. The Applicants intend adding another top floor to provide more office space. This is excessive. There are many new office buildings in this part of London, which are not occupied or only partly occupied. The possibility of an empty replacement office building would be damaging to the environment.

Demolition work is one of the most immediate and damaging activities for the environment with a very high carbon footprint. It also creates noise, vibration and dust, which would be detrimental to the health of the residential community, especially people with breathing difficulties. Many residents in the Beauchamp Building work from home, and the noise will be a great disturbance. Removing the waste materials from the site during the demolition period will mean a continuous stream of heavy lorries carrying skips, circulating around Brooke's Market throughout the day. This is an intolerable imposition on a quiet and calm neighbourhood.

I note from the drawings that the applicants are assuming that they will service the demolition and construction from Beauchamp Street, following the existing one way system. This will have the following impact:

- Heavy lorries will be circulating around the square. This is an important route for parents and children to and from St Albans Primary School. The circulation of lorries will be damaging to their health as well as posing a threat of accidents.
- Some lorries will be very wide and it will often not be possible for other vehicles to pass, given all the streets around the square are quite narrow. Examples would be emergency vehicles, residents own cars, vehicles making deliveries to the residents around the square
- It will mean lorries queuing up around the square waiting to take away demolition material and later deliver all the new materials required to construct the new building. We know from the recent experience in Brooke Street that one often had to wait whilst the lorries were juggling for space or unloading. It is typical for lorries to leave their engines running whilst waiting/unloading and this will add to the toxic air quality generated by this building project. The access to the garages in the Beauchamp Building will undoubtedly be compromised at some points in the day.
- There will certainly mean the loss of all the Residents' Parking Bays on Beauchamp Street but maybe also on Dorrington Street. There are never enough Residents' Parking Bays and we cannot afford to lose any.

There will also need to be a crane somewhere on site and I would like to be told where this will be. Presumably one of the streets surrounding the site will need to be closed for a weekend to unload the crane.

2.2 Height of New Building

The applicants also wish to increase the height of the building by one extra storey. The result is a dominant

Application No: Consultees Name: Received:

Comment: Response:

new building occupying the whole length of Beauchamp Street and reducing the sun and light levels to the public square and adjacent residential properties. This is shown in the applicants three part report Daylight and Sunlight overshadowing.

In terms of the extra storey; there are many new commercial buildings in this part of London, which are currently unoccupied. It is not necessary to add more commercial space when there is already a surfeit in the area?

! would like to see a drawing superimposing the proposed elevation to Brooke's Market on to the existing elevation.

2.3 Residential Units

The Applicants state that they explored adding some residential units, to meet Camden Council's policy, but this idea was rejected. We consider that this decision was badly judged and some residential units should and could be easily added to the scheme design to the benefit of the square and its long history of residential use. Even if, as I recommend, the existing building was retained, it should be possible to add some residential units.

3.0 Summary

We urge you to reject this application. It is an unnecessary demolition of a building only 30 years old causing disruption to the adjacent residents, adding to the carbon footprint, and providing more office space when what is required is additional housing.

Su Rogers

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2023/3419/P	Charlotte Chambers	25/09/2023 11:18:08	OBJ	Dear Planning Officers,

While I will not have a construction site literally on my doorstep, like those living in Brooke's Market, I am concerned about the necessity of changing the building.
 If it's an aesthetic change - I would ask if that's a good enough reason to make these changes and impact people and the environment so extremely.
 One of the children who lives next to it wrote they would prefer it to be used as a playground - I concur!
 There are so many empty offices around us, and empty shops everywhere - can't one of those be used?
 We have had building work around us for years - and will do so forever, as we live centrally. We have been placed here by our landlords, Camden and other social housing landlords. It wasn't necessarily a choice. I would urge you to think about the pollution we live with, just because we live centrally, and ask whether it is really necessary to have yet another building site with all the extra noise and pollution and noise pollution that comes with workmen on a building site, scaffolding etc.

I personally have breathing issues and chronic sinusitis, which I fear would be exacerbated by the approval of this applicaiton.

However, I would add should you proceed with the application, can I turn your attention to the Section 106 agreement.

The child who called for a playground on the site was 100% right: we don't need another community hall, we need more open space that is a green as it can be.

Get rid of the paving stones, get creative!

Why not put a paddling pool there? Make it a peaceful garden / playground for all of us that have so little space. Currently there are about ten benches and five bins... and a lot of pigeons!

We need our ground to be more porous so rain can drain away, and children and grown ups need peaceful and green places to relax. Put grass there. Put sand there. Put a paddling pool there.

Make it work for the neighbours, many of whom live in hot and cramped conditions and need somewhere outside that has water and some sun and some shade...

Basically, whatever you would like in your garden - we would like in ours!

Please consider this an objection - but should it go ahead let's make the best of it and give the community something they really need, and make the developers pay good money for the privilege of putting us through two years of pain.

Thanks you for your time.

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2023/3419/P	Oliver jackson-cohen	25/09/2023 11:30:24	OBJ	<p>Hi there,</p> <p>I am writing to object to this planned work.</p> <p>I live on leather lane and it appears it will compromise access to daylight and sunlight into my building and create some quite serious noise and congestion during the build. Also the dust and debris that will be created from the demolition will create health concerns for all nearby residents.</p> <p>Additionally the loss of the majority of the parking on the square (and there are already very few spaces available as it is) will compromise parking availability, specifically for disabled members of my family, Furthermore, the original building on the square is a perfectly suitable residential building, as are many in this concentrated area. The build of an office block right in the center of this would not be welcome.</p> <p>Many thanks Oliver jackson-cohen</p>
2023/3419/P	Ben Rogers	25/09/2023 18:33:10	INT	<p>I have worked on or around Hatton Garden for many years. This is an unique part of London, rich in history and containing a remarkable mix of activity, including many small businesses, civic services, and homes of all tenures. I am concerned that the proposed development does not understand this mix or do enough to enhance it. I note that that the applicant describe this area a 'predominantly commercial', which is of course very far from the case. Brooke's Market is largely residential, including affordable housing on three sides and a shelter for vulnerable homeless men. It also contains an outstanding Church complex designed by William Butterfield and listed Grade 2*. Just to the north of the Church, and closely connected to it, there are other small housing developments, a Mosque, a primary school and a community hall. As far as I can see the proposed development adds nothing to this mix or provides anything for the local community. Indeed, by adding an extra floor to the existing commercial building, it will detract from it, denying valuable light to what is already a dark and rather forbidding square. This can not be allowed. It is worth adding that that the area has already seen one overly large new and dumb commercial building at 33 Waterhouse Square. Residents should not be asked to endure another outsized development, with all the disruption that will entail. If the development is to go ahead, it should be no higher than it is, it should be revised to add more to the local community and disruption should be kept to an absolute minimum, with the great majority of it borne not by residents to the North and East, but by the applicant themselves, who own the Waterhouse Square estate immediately to the South.</p>