

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2023/3419/P	Eleanor Ferguson	19/11/2023 13:36:04	OBJ	<p>I lodged an objection to this application on 16 September . Since then there have been two meetings with the developers ; belated attempts to 'consult ' with residents that had been totally omitted previously . At both of these meetings the issue of antisocial behavior in the area was raised and that the presence of space has in the past acted as a magnet for this . In addition there is already a great deal of noise to the detriment of residents late at night . The developers assured us that they were taking on board the comments made in this regard ( and as I understood it committed to 'toning down' ideas of 'community space ' having no benches etc noting that those previously in the square had to be removed ) .</p> <p>It was therefore with some consternation that out of the blue ( no mention having been made of it at any meetings - or any word at all despite the developers having contact details for all of those attending the meetings ) I now find ( via signs in the street ) the plans have been amended to allow for a bar .</p> <p>I strongly object to this being so close to residential properties ; it would only aggravate the situation that already exists for excessive late night noise / antisocial behaviour with 2 Bars already within about 100yards - the Argyle and the Sir Christopher Hatton . I cannot see any need for additional bars given the existence of those already in such close proximity . Such an application seems totally misconceived .</p> <p>I would also like to add to my earlier objection in respect of the proposed access to the works which would see access for demolition trucks from Beauchamp Street, at the northern end of Brookes Market square. This is opposite the Southern side of the Beauchamp Building. The Residents on this side of which I am one will have to put up with ongoing noise of demolition / and building works in very very close proximity . Also the access point for collection of debris and delivery of materials is directly opposite this South side and extremely close to my building - this is unacceptable</p> <p>Also it would seem that this building that is being demolished ( in everything but name ) is only some 30 years old and I cannot see that sufficient thought has been given to the possibility of refurbishment</p>

<b>Application No:</b>	<b>Consultees Name:</b>	<b>Received:</b>	<b>Comment:</b>	<b>Response:</b>
2023/3419/P	malcolm cox	20/11/2023 16:17:49	OBJ	From Malcolm Cox: Beauchamp Building resident

I write to raise objections to the proposed Waterhouse Square developments.

I have lived in the Beauchamp Building for over twenty-five years. As someone who has lived and worked in Camden for many years and continues to do business in the area, I am fully supportive of having modern office space that supports local economic prosperity. However, not at any cost. I believe all new developments should support Camden's aims for the environment and contribute to the wider needs of the community.

The overriding concern is the lack of trust and transparency between the developers and the community. Communication is at best poor and seemingly disingenuous.

In September the residential community became very concerned as they slowly became aware of the developers' intentions, particularly about claims made by the developers that they had engaged with the residential community in April. In fact, they had held a meeting with Councillor Olad around that time who provided them with a list of residential blocks to engage with. As they ignored his suggestion, yet claimed that they had, actioned it, concerns began to develop in the community.

Two meetings between residents and the developers in late September and October did begin to alleviate some concerns. However, at the meeting the developers explicitly stated that there were no plans to include a bar – licenced premises – in their development. And now we discover that plans have been revised to include exactly that.

The developers also failed to communicate with residents plans to "infill existing atria providing additional office space". The first the community heard of such plans was notification that the council had approved them

In short, these developers can't be trusted to do what they say.

Overall, we believe that the developers underestimate the characteristics of the area, they deem it primarily non-residential. And subsequently, disregard the concerns of the residential community

In fact, many hundreds of people live in the vicinity of Waterhouse Square and will be impacted by the proposals.

It's a very diverse mix. Ranging from the Lodge, run by St Mungo's, housing very vulnerable people who are being transitioned from being homeless to rehabilitation into the wider community, through to relative luxury of apartments in the Beauchamp Building and new Brooke Street developments.

Many residents live in blocks run by the council, for example Cranley and Brookes Court or housing association, Langdale.

Application No:    Consultees Name:    Received:

Comment:    Response:

While the area has a strong residential community, most people recognise, indeed value, that they live in a mixed-use environment. The leather lane market and surrounding office buildings, Hatton Garden jewellers, were around long before we lived here and no doubt long after we have gone. We also have a mosque sitting next to a protestant high church!

Community issues have tended to be relatively detailed. Concerns about market traders violating environmental health issues or outbreaks of anti-social behaviour in the Brookes Market square, finding a parking space, being typical day to day concerns. But the proposed developments of Waterhouse Square seem different. A bigger scale and potentially bigger impact on people's lives.

If the developers were listening to the community, rather than paying lip service, they would understand that a new licenced bar was at best insensitive and at worst likely to contribute to anti-social behaviour or have a detrimental impact on some vulnerable residents.

The lack of trust brings concerns about specific aspects of the developers' proposals.

Individual properties are concerned about the reduction of natural light They want to know if the survey submitted by the developer is robust? What if it isn't? They are keen to understand their rights and the developer's responsibilities to them. There is also some thought that there are other properties potential impacted by their plans that have not been surveyed

Traffic and neighbourhood management. Short term impact from pollution and general health and safety concerns re access. Some strategic questions around a conflict in the council's approach to net zero and some genuine concerns around personal health and emergency access. The developers are now saying this gets dealt with after the initial approval of plans is this the case.

Impact on public realm post development. Potential increase in ASB. The developers are saying this sits with Camden's plans for the Brookes Market square – currently fenced off to house Brookes Court builders' huts and tools and the no man's land area east of Greville Street/ Leather Lane which has hosted illegal raves in the past. What are the councils plans for this?

The approach to residential communications and engagement being generally poor an afterthought reacting to community pressure.

A lot of this angst could be alleviated by not building an additional floor on top of the building. Residents fail to understand why the developers won't refurbish and intend to knock down and rebuild. The developers appear to say that they need to rebuild the infrastructure in order to add the extra floor. And they need the extra floor to increase the marketability of the property. We would like to robustly challenge that view.

Post pandemic demand for central London office space has declined. But our area has bucked the trend. Driven partly by fashion – EC1 is the place for the media, advertising and technology communities and partly by access, as Lord Adonis has observed, the Elizabeth line has far exceeded its passenger targets with Farringdon footfall increasing significantly.

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2023/3419/P	GORAN DELIC	20/11/2023 00:11:12	COMMIT	<p>I do understand that the council is under financial pressure and revenue generated by office developments is useful to alleviate budget concerns elsewhere. However, this should not be done in a way which impacts other goals that impact the quality of residential life and broader physical and mental health.</p> <p>Surely, we should be encouraging the developers to refurbish what they have, reduce their overall budget and still show a good return on their investment. And then eliminate the issues around light, reduce the disruption on residential lives and not blow a hole in Camden's environment policies?</p> <hr/> <p>I am writing to object to the above Application for Full Planning Permission 2023/3419P.            As you are well aware, this area is predominately residential and building works on such a large scale would have detrimental effect on our health and well-being.            I believe it is completely unnecessary to demolish the existing external walls of the new building just because windows could not be replaced otherwise. I am sure technology is there and new windows could be replaced without demolishing the existing external walls. Furthermore, demolishing works would create noisy and polluted environment and negatively affect all residents and especially residents who do not have a choice but to work from home.            I also object to the proposal to add an extra storey to the building, this would cause loss of light to Cranley Buildings, The Beauchamp Building, Langdale House, St Ursula's Lodge and Brooke's Court. We are already surrounded with office buildings and our access to sunlight is limited.            A revised proposal has been submitted by applicants for the ground floor plan to include a Bar, this was never mentioned in our previous meetings.            I am very concerned that the bar in such a location will generate more noise and will result in an anti-social behavior.            Loss of residential parking bays is going to create additional problems for resident who are already limited with the number of available residential bays, especially for older and reduced mobility residents.            I urge the Planning Committee to refuse this application.</p>