
From: Antoine Danzin [REDACTED]
Sent: 30 November 2023 13:19
To: Planning
Subject: Planning Application - 2023/3419/P - 2 Waterhouse square
Attachments: image.png

[REDACTED]

Application number 2023/3419/P - Adding comments to my previous objection on same application, 2 Waterhouse Square, 140 Holborn, London EC1N 2ST

Dear Camden planning team,

Please find below further comments following the objection I filed on 17 September 2023:

My second submission follows the recent amendment filed by the 2 Waterhouse Sq project team asking for planning permission to use one of the future commercial units as a bar.

I am a resident of the Beauchamp Building just opposite the 2 Waterhouse Square building.

The entire application process for the proposed works is dishonest. After failing to inform the residents in the nearby buildings, the applicant failed again to inform us of the addition of the bar in the premises. We only discovered this "addition" to the initially proposed plans thanks to our neighbours. The mere fact the Council is entertaining this request to me is very concerning.

Our windows will be about 5m away from the entrance of the bar. This would lead to a significant loss of value of our property. We won't be able to rent the property and we won't be able to enjoy it as a family.

Every night we have several drunk patrons of nearby bars screaming and sometimes fighting as well as smoking cigarettes (in the best case) under the windows of our children. Having the entrance of a bar just a few meters away means alcohol, cigarette smoke, anti-social behaviour, noise will increase from already unacceptable levels to

In general we suffer a lot from the noise related to commercial premises. Delivery trucks have limited access to the area hence come at night and make a lot of noise and air pollution. There is no space for these trucks to stop near the proposed location of the bar. This will involve more traffic issues, more work and more noise every night.

The concentration of bars in the area is already problematic. With one bar at 33 meters and 12 bars at less than 385m (see attached list), without counting the numerous bars and clubs around Smithfield Market, the number of bars very nearby is more than sufficient for the area.

Please kindly consider the impact of such work on the community.

Kind regards,

Antoine Danzin
[REDACTED]

On Sun, Sep 17, 2023 at 11:50 PM Antoine Danzin [REDACTED] wrote:

>

- > Dear Camden planning's team
- >
- > The webpages for looking for applications on the Camden website seem to be all down at the moment hence I am sending you my comments below by email with regards to the application for the "refurbishment" of 2 Waterhouse square.
- >
- > I strongly object to the aforementioned application.
- >
- > 1. I question the legality of the application process:
- > The developers have not complied with the obligation to inform the community transparently. None of the resident buildings were informed of the plans before the application was made. The first communication was made on the 1st September and misled the public with the following wording:
- > - allegedly made consultations since march 2023 which is simply not
- > true
- > - "planning application validated" is understood as permit being given
- > (i.e. too late to comment or object
- > - "comprehensively refurbish and extend": the scale of the works
- > involves significant demolition and reconstruction. The word "refurbish" misled many residents in thinking it was just works on the existing facade It is obvious that the applicant was aware of the strong objections the project would receive and therefore processed their request illegally lying to the council and the community.
- >
- > 2. The works will be a disaster for the community:
- > The residents in the direct vicinity already suffer from microparticle emissions (barbecues) and noise pollution from the market. The dust and additional noise created by the works will affect physical and mental health of children, students, residents very significantly. It will also affect the quality of their studies or work.
- >
- > 3. the works would damage the image of Camden, civil service and politicians:
- > Camden politicians declare having a strong green agenda. The negative impact of demolition-reconstruction vs. retrofit is enormous while the advantages are very little. It is widely repeated in the press that the net impact of operation emission reduction minus construction emission is very often negative.
- >
- > 4. impact on vulnerable people of the Lodge and the community spirit:
- > The building is facing a square which is a gem of tranquillity in a very busy area. A place where many people leaving or working nearby go for a break. It is comforting to breathe in this green and peaceful environment. The residents of the Lodge often don't move away from the square. It is the place where the rest of the community meet with them which provides them with an important link to the outside world. Since the access to the square was restricted a few months back for other works organised by Camden, the residents of the Lodge have suffered an impact on their social interactions and ability to remain outside in a relaxing environment. Both have an effect on mental health. Years of works on the square could have further devastating effects on them.
- >
- > 5. there is nothing positive about the works:
- > I am surprised that the council did not condition the filing of this
- > request to real improvements to the community. I would have expected
- > residential units, parking spaces for cars and bicycles of nearby
- > residents, electric chargers, green spaces managed by the building's
- > security...
- >
- > 6. the financial impact on residents and property owners will be significant:
- > Costs of maintaining properties with the significant dust will increase (windows are already covered by the grease from smokes of the market to which dust will be added).
- > Flats will not be rentable or sellable during the period of works except at a significant discount. Were some to lose a job they would not have the ability to let or sell without taking a significant loss.
- >
- > 5. Traffic issues will increase:

> The loss of parking spaces will result in further traffic in the area as there are very little parking spaces in the near vicinity. We already drive sometimes over 15min in the area to find a resident parking space. The trucks will create additional disruption.

>

> Kind regards,

> Antoine Danzin

> 