From: Marthe and Antoine Danzin [redacted]
Sent: 29 November 2023 20:44
To: Planning
Subject: Re: Comments on 2023/3420/L have been received by the council.

[redacted]

Good evening
Application number 2023/3420/L- adding comments to my objections form 17/09 2 Waterhouse Square, 140 Holborn, London EC1N 2ST

I was completely devastated when I learnt that the Waterhouse Square Project Team added a project to open a bar.
Initially, they falsely claimed that they had touched base with local residents. After having at last met with different local residents, they can no longer pretend this is not a residential area.
Yet they decided to ignore residents and their unified determination to keep ASB at bay in the area by applying for a bar in one of the future commercial units.
It really felt like being stabbed in the back.
Caring for children in the aftermath of lockdown is already a difficult challenge in itself. Having to face noise pollution outside of office hours when they are working hard to complete their homeworks and trying to sleep are not helping with their wellbeing nor their shattered mental health.
I also wonder what would happen when ASB will flare up as it always does when there are such premises. Too often our building and surroundings are used as public urinals (if not worse) by customers from the other surrounding bars. My children feel clearly insecure when confronted with these situations - which happen too often. Another bar with noise and ASB would bring them back to the lockdown period when they couldn't leave the security of their home. That is not acceptable.

There are enough bars, pubs and other places for entertainment in the close vicinity not to add another addition to the list. This is clearly not what is lacking in our neighbourhood.

Therefore I urge you to consider how this project planning has been made, in successive steps, not taking into consideration the local residents and the current situation to reject this planning permission for the safety and security of all people from this area, especially vulnerable children and teenagers.

Kind regards

Marthe Danzin

[redacted]

On Sun, 17 Sept 2023 at 17:29, <planning@camden.gov.uk> wrote:
> I am writing to object to the above Planning Application
> 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
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.
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.
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 townMoreover 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.
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)
In conclusion, I urge to reject this application

Comments made by Marthe Danzin of the beauchamp building flat 3, brookes market, bro, ec1n 7sx, ec1n 7sx
Phone [redacted]
EMail [redacted]
Preferred Method of Contact is Email

Comment Type is Objection

[redacted]