

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2024/1364/P	Vincent Pinaud	13/05/2024 12:07:27	OBJ	<p>My partner and I are writing to object to planning permission 2024/1364/P for the proposed development adjacent to the Ziggurat building. As current residents of the Ziggurat building and pending owners of a flat within the building, we are deeply concerned about the detrimental effects this development would have on our quality of life.</p> <p>While we acknowledge the potential benefits of redevelopment, the proposed increase in building height and addition of outside terraces facing our residence pose significant threats to our well-being that would result in a substantial loss of daylight/ sunlight, in an equally harmful loss of privacy, and also in a raise of noise pollution.</p> <p>The below extract from your pre-application letter dated 21 March 2024 shows that Camden Council gives particular attention to loss of light and privacy concerns of the residents in the area:          “There is a concern due to the increase in height and massing, certainly on the upper floors that there will be a significant impact on outlook, overlooking, loss of sunlight and daylight and an increased sense of enclosure for the neighbouring buildings. There are residential buildings along St Cross Street and Saffron Street within close proximity and this aspect needs to be tested and built into the design”.          “A larger commercial office building with multiple floors and employees next to the windows and even on balconies has the potential to significantly increase the loss of privacy for surrounding residents and increase overlooking. There are concerns that this would affect residents, especially on Saffron Street”.          And you have concluded:          “Finally, there is still concern over impact on amenity including daylight/sunlight, privacy and loss of outlook for the surrounding buildings”.          The planning application documents are evidently not showing that these concerns have been considered or addressed into the design. The Daylight, Sunlight and Overshadowing report issued in April 2024 demonstrates notably a clear reduction of “vertical sky component” for a very large number of the windows tested for the Ziggurat building, indicating a severe impact on our living conditions.          We therefore object on the grounds of reduced daylight/sunlight in the flats of the Ziggurat building resulting from the increased height of the new building compared with the current height of the car park.</p> <p>It is imperative to note that Camden Council has previously shown consideration for the privacy and light concerns of Ziggurat residents in similar planning applications. This is notably the case for the below precedents:</p> <p>i) The planning application PSX0205254 for the adjoining building 77-79 Farringdon Road, where the initial proposals were amended following objections from residents of the Ziggurat building and discussions with Camden council. A 7th floor addition was omitted in this regard, which would have impacted the light and the privacy for the flats in the Ziggurat building. A proposal for an external glass lift or lightwell was also omitted, which would similarly have caused loss of privacy for the Ziggurat residents.</p> <p>ii) On Saffron Hill an appeal against planning permission refusal for an additional floor at 67-74 was rejected, including on the grounds of loss of open outlook to residents of flats in the Ziggurat building. An earlier application was rejected on the grounds of loss of amenity due to an outlook of office windows, but the additional story was still rejected when these were replaced with a blank wall. The refusal also includes reference to building in restrictions so that a proposed green roof could not be used as an outside space by office workers.</p> <p>Whilst we object to any increase in height in any event, we also object to outside terraces on the north</p>

**Application No:**    **Consultees Name:**    **Received:**

**Comment:**    **Response:**

elevation facing the Ziggurat building due to the evident impact of noise and loss of privacy.

In light of the abovementioned precedents and the evident negative impact of the proposed development on our living conditions, we urge the council to reject planning permission 2024/1364/P.

Allowing this development to proceed unchecked would set a dangerous precedent for future developments in the area, potentially exacerbating the loss of amenity for countless residents.

If restricted to the current height of the car park we expect the building would still include an element of loss of privacy to flats which face directly on to the building, and we would be grateful if the Council would bear this in mind in considering the design of glazing in the proposed new building facing onto residential flats, and would reject the development of outside terraces on the elevation facing the Ziggurat building.

---

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2024/1364/P	Thomas Roberts	14/05/2024 12:16:38	OBJ	<p>I am a resident and leaseholder in Allen House, 55-59 Saffron Hill. I wish to object to the current application 2024/1364/P.</p> <p>Allen House comprises 20 private flats and further social housing with the main frontage being on Saffron Hill and a flank along Saffron Street. The rest of the building is literally abounded by other buildings: the main one being the current NCP site. Whilst Allen House is near to a busy highway (Farringdon Road) for the most part, Saffron Hill is a quiet area during the week. As such this aspect is much valued by me given Saffron Hill is currently a relative peace and tranquil environment in an otherwise busy area of central London.</p> <p>Whilst, in principal, a well planned and proportionate redevelopment of the NCP site would be welcomed, the current application is not the appropriate scheme. It fails the Council's Local Plan including Policy A1 which "seeks to protect the quality of life of occupiers and neighbours."</p> <p>As the planning officer, Ewan Campbell has highlighted in his pre App advice dated 8/9/23 as a relevant factor which the applicant had to take account of in any plans for the NCP site:</p> <p>" the character of the area is a tight urban grain with small distances between buildings, some of which are residential".</p> <p>As a result, my objections concern (highlighting the relevant aspects of the Local Plan Policy A1 are:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. VISUAL PRIVACY AND ARTIFICIAL LIGHTING LEVELS. The massing of the proposed development around Allen House is far too great. Currently the impact of the NCP in terms of height and scale on Allen House is minor. In contrast, literally metres from Allen House, the application , if built, would create a "bear hug" of a disproportionately larger mass around Allen House. Further, from the few applicant's plans which have regards to Allen House, it would seem there are proposals including windows facing west which will overlook residential balconies in Allen House. This affects both privacy of the legitimate use of the balconies as well as increase artificial light pollution emanating from an over bearing development as outlined in the application.</li> <li>2. NOISE AND PRIVACY A number of the upper floors of the proposed development on the Saffron Hill elevation appear to have what the developer calls "outdoor amenity space" for the offices they are creating. Such spaces are also commonly described in the real estate industry (usually away from planning authorities) as "party decks". These party decks can be considerable in size and capacity. Whilst the applicant has suggested that this will be policed in lease terms, the fact is there is little or no adherence to such restrictions in the leases of many London offices and further enforcement is non existent. As such, there are no proper mitigations which can overcome the fact that such party decks need to be scaled back and away from Saffron Hill side given the proximity to residents of Allen House. I can find no numbers given or any other limitations proposed by the developer so it must be assumed there is the potential for substantial social events to occur very close to a residential environment (with all the attendant noise and nuisance factors). As such little or no regard has been given in the current plans to the office events occurring within a few metres to a residential block. Further, the privacy of residents will be affected three times over potentially by this massing: (1) of office occupants "overseeing " Allen House residents on balconies; (2) as well as those occupants outside on the party decks; and (3) further, maintenance and cleaning staff (presumably operating out of hours for the offices they serve ) needed to operate the proposed building, if approved. These will affect residents of Allen</li> </ol>

Application No:    Consultees Name:    Received:

Comment:    Response:

House's amenity in relation to use of their balconies.

3.NOISE It became apparent during the Teams call between the applicant and some of the Allen House residents that there would also be substantial A/C units placed on these upper floors again in very close proximity to Allen House. Apparently, Camden Council was cited as 'requiring this'. No reassurance was given as to (a) what other citing options there maybe to avoid pollutions from A/C (such as noise, vibration, smells) to Allen House residents; (b) any commitment if there was no other more dissent location, that all such units would be built away from Allen House so as to not affect Allen House (c) operational factors such as commitment on max db levels; limited hours of operation and the maintenance regime not causing further pollution (whether noise, noxious smells etc) . As it seems unlikely that in the current application locating A/C units in an exposed environment near Allen House then the application needs to be amended so such A/C units and ducking are neither seen or heard from Allen House.

4. NOISE and VIBRATION, ODOUR , FUMES AND DUST. It is apparent at the call with some Allen House Residents that the applicant has only particularly sketchy plans to mitigate the nuisance of demolishing and building on the NCP site (in the event of the application proceeding). A suggestion that they would anticipate work activity to include on Saturdays seems to me to be inappropriate given its adjacency to a residential block. There was some suggestion about reusing existing pilings in the foundations as part of building the new scheme- thus reducing the amount of pile driving needed to create new foundations. This was welcomed. However, there was a worrying lack of knowledge on potential damage due to vibration, and mitigations. In other words, the applicants thoughts were, on their own admission, vague. Again unless the applicant can show new pilings work can be materially eliminated are reduced such it does not create a pollution risk to nearby residents I suggest the application is not fit to be passed.

There was some suggestion by the applicant to Allen House residents of a 'working committee". Nothing more was suggested. Indeed the applicant chose not to follow up on a number of issues the residents left them with before the planning application was made to the council.

Overall I do not believe the applicant has had anything like sufficient regard to the impact of the proposal on neighbours and their consultation to date has been in my view superficial with little evidence that the welfare of neighbours (whether during the construction phase or in the context of development itself) has been properly considered.

It is quite striking that, for the applicants, they have had not much regard to date concerning the impact of what they propose on Allen Hill (which is literally bounded by the proposed development site) or its residents. As such the applicants have in my view failed to satisfy in any meaningful way their obligation to meaningfully engage with their neighbours or satisfy their responsibility to have a meaningful engagement locally. Indeed it is striking that only in one or two cases is Allen House itself named as a building on the developers' many plans accompanying the application. At a meeting organised with the applicant at the initiative of a number of the Allen House residents, the literature issued by the applicant (on its own admission) failed to show the impact of the massing of the proposed development over Allen House.

As such I feel the application is so defective that a series of conditions would be inadequate and meaningless unless and until the excessive over massing is designed out of the proposals and thus should in my view be resubmitted.

<b>Application No:</b>	<b>Consultees Name:</b>	<b>Received:</b>	<b>Comment:</b>	<b>Response:</b>
2024/1364/P	Rebecca Cotterill	13/05/2024 17:33:11	OBJ	NCP submission

I live on the 4th floor of Allan House, 55-59 Saffron Hill. My flat adjoins the NCP car park. I have several concerns and object to the proposed scheme for the following reasons:

#### Design

The proposed building is very big and particularly high for the area. I am concerned it will dwarf surrounding buildings which are relatively low and will make Saffron Hill/St Cross St and Saffron Street feel hemmed in and dark. These are dense, attractive and historical streets that maintain a certain medieval topography and this big tall design would stand out and diminish this. I am also concerned the balconies will bring noise to our quiet and peaceful block. Why can't the plant room be in the basement? I worry about noise and this adding increased height and bulkiness.

#### Saffron Street

I am not a car owner but I disagree with Saffron Street being closed to cars and open only to cyclists and pedestrians. It provides an extremely useful cut through for traffic to get to Farringdon Road quickly without having to queue at two sets of traffic lights at the Saffron Hill/Clerkenwell Road junction and then again at Clerkenwell Road/Farringdon Road junction. It creates too much congestion at these (slow) lights and these cut-throughs are important for their convenience. Saffron Street is still a quiet street and there is plenty of room for cyclists, pedestrians and cars.

#### Party wall / Potential loss of amenity through noise/ Disruption and environmental and health impacts

My flat has a party wall with the NCP car park and I would like to know how the proposed building will be attached and what is the risk of damage during the work. How will the developer avoid this and how will any damage be remedied? Ours is a quiet block with good sound insulation and it is very important that this continues. I would like to be assured that there won't be any noise from the other side of the wall once complete. I am also concerned about noise that the office balconies would bring and I think that will be hard to police.

I am extremely concerned about the environmental and health impact of the demolition and building works on such a large site and proposal. Particularly noise and vibration and the impact of dust from demolition for those of us living right within the block. How will all this be mitigated? Can the NCP building not be repurposed rather than demolished and rebuilt?

#### A final point: lack of consultation

The company, Kanda Consultancy, did little to engage with our block. I saw the flyer posted into our block and rang the number given to discuss the proposal but my call wasn't returned. When they held a meeting with Allan House at our request, their presentation included only one view of how the building would sit next to ours and that was at street level from St Cross Street. It was very odd. They promised to send us the relevant imagery, but they didn't. In fact we never heard from them again.

<b>Application No:</b>	<b>Consultees Name:</b>	<b>Received:</b>	<b>Comment:</b>	<b>Response:</b>
2024/1364/P	Rakesh Patel	13/05/2024 16:58:54	OBJ	RE: Objection to planning permission 2024/1364/P

Dear Planning Officers,

I reside on the raised ground floor of the Ziggurat Building and am writing to formally object to the referenced planning application. While we are not opposed to the principle of redeveloping the car park, my objection centres on the substantial adverse effects that this specific proposed development will have on our dwelling, which will in turn severely impact the living conditions of all residents within it.

Our apartment is likely to be one of the most severely affected by the proposed development due to its proximity to the planned noise sources and traffic pathways. Given these significant concerns—encompassing persistent noise pollution, heightened traffic, and a serious risk of injury from vehicular accidents—I respectfully request that our objections be given substantial consideration in the review of this development proposal.

The following provides an elaboration of these concerns in detail:

#### Loss of Daylight:

The proposed increase in height and closer proximity of the new building will cast significant shadows over my apartment, drastically reducing the natural light that is currently ample due to the open car park. This loss of light is contrary to the standards set out in the Building Research Establishment (BRE) guidelines, which recommend that developments should not adversely affect the light levels enjoyed by neighbouring properties. The reduction in daylight will not only darken my living environment but also affect my mental and physical well-being, as natural light is critical to my health conditions.

#### Loss of Privacy:

The current configuration with the car park ensures that my apartment enjoys a high degree of privacy. For the lower floors, the current NCP car park does not avail onlookers towards the Ziggurat building. The proposed development plans to replace this car park with a multi-story office building, which will introduce several floors of office space directly facing my all apartments along Saffron Street, including mine. The proposed office block would typically have people present all day, every day, including weekends, leading to constant potential for overlooking into the apartments, significantly reducing privacy at all times. This will lead to a substantial loss of privacy as office occupants will be able to look directly into homes. Given my living situation on the ground floor, this oversight becomes even more invasive and distressing, directly impacting my sense of security and privacy.

#### Noise and Loading Bay/Traffic Concerns:

##### Noise Concerns:

- Bike Shed and loading bay: The proposed placement of the bike shed and loading bay directly opposite my balcony raises significant concerns about noise pollution. Given its accessibility, it could potentially be used 24/7, including weekends and nights, times during which there is currently minimal activity. This would mark a drastic change from the existing quiet environment, particularly disruptive during hours typically reserved for

Application No:    Consultees Name:    Received:

Comment:    Response:

rest and relaxation.

- **General Noise Pollution:** The introduction of non-traditional hours of operation, especially early mornings, late evenings, and weekends could severely disrupt the tranquillity currently enjoyed by residents. Implementing restrictions such as limiting operational hours to socially acceptable times and possibly mandating the use of electric vehicles could mitigate some noise concerns. However, even electric vehicles contribute to noise pollution through reversing alarms, which are a significant source of disturbance.

Traffic and Injury Risk Concerns:

- **Increased Traffic from Loading Bay:** The plan to situate the loading bay opposite my residence is likely to lead to an increase in traffic, involving frequent deliveries that were not previously a factor with the car park. This increase in heavy vehicle traffic not only raises concerns about noise but also about the safety and structural integrity of our building.

- **Safety Hazards from Goods Vehicles:** Historical incidents where heavy goods vehicles have collided with the building pose a severe safety risk. Such collisions have already resulted in physical damage to the building's façade and my balcony's balustrades. The proposed increase in vehicle movements could exacerbate these dangers, potentially leading to more frequent accidents and heightened risk of serious injury to residents both inside the building and in surrounding areas. Goods vehicles routinely travel perilously close, mere centimetres from our balcony. This proximity introduces a grave risk where even minor extensions, such as a hand, or the accidental snagging of clothing on the balcony rail, could result in catastrophic consequences, potentially leading to fatal incidents by pulling an individual into a perilous interaction with the moving vehicles.

Consideration of Precedents in Neighbouring Developments:

- Camden Council has historically demonstrated a commitment to preserving the privacy and light for residents of the Ziggurat Building in its considerations of past planning applications. For instance, in previous cases such as the development at 77-79 Farringdon Road (application PSX0205254), the council responded to residents' objections by removing plans for a seventh-floor addition and an external glass lift. These amendments were made specifically to mitigate the impact on light and privacy for the Ziggurat residents.
- Similarly, an appeal against a planning refusal for an additional floor at 67-74 Saffron Hill was upheld, reinforcing the council's stance on protecting residential outlooks and preventing enclosures that would significantly impact residents' amenity space. The decision to reject the additional storey, even after alterations to replace office windows with a blank wall, underscores the importance placed on maintaining adequate light and visual space for the existing residents.
- The consistent application of these principles in past planning decisions creates a clear precedent that should inform the assessment of the current application. The proposed development, by introducing a taller structure with less setback, directly contravenes these established community standards. It threatens to encroach significantly on both the privacy and the access to natural light for residents of the Ziggurat, akin to situations previously remedied by the council's planning decisions.

Adherence to Policy A1 of the Local Plan:

- **Objective of Policy A1:** This policy is fundamentally designed to protect the quality of life for occupants and

Application No:    Consultees Name:    Received:

Comment:    Response:

neighbours by addressing several critical environmental and privacy factors. These include visual privacy, outlook, sunlight, daylight, overshadowing, artificial lighting levels, noise and vibration, as well as odour, fumes, dust, and the impacts associated with the construction phase. Importantly, this also involves ensuring that construction management plans are in place to mitigate these effects during the development phase.

- Concerns Arising from Design Changes:
  - Glazing and Stepped Elevations: The revised design includes glazing on all elevations and the incorporation of stepped elevations with balconies. While these design elements are aesthetically appealing and modern, they significantly alter the interaction between the new building and its environment, particularly in a densely built area characterized by its "tight urban grain" and proximity between residential and commercial buildings.
  - Impact on Privacy and Light: The increase in glazing and open balconies exacerbates potential privacy issues. The reflective surfaces and visibility from elevated positions may lead to increased overlooking into neighbouring apartments, thereby reducing the residents' sense of privacy. Moreover, the extensive use of glass can also contribute to increased light pollution and significant changes in daylight dynamics for adjacent buildings.
  - Height and Massing Concerns:
    - Potential Overlooking and Loss of Daylight: The proposed increase in the building's height and its massing, presents a substantial risk of affecting the outlook and increasing the sense of enclosure for nearby residential properties. This change not only impacts the direct views residents currently enjoy but also reduces the penetration of natural sunlight, essential for wellbeing and comfort. The current configuration, with the NCP car park, means there are typically no people present to look into the apartments, ensuring privacy for residents throughout the week and especially on evenings and weekends. In contrast, the proposed office block would have people present all day, every day, including weekends, leading to constant potential for overlooking into the apartments, significantly reducing privacy at all times.
- Requirement for In-depth Testing:
  - Privacy and Overlooking Tests: Given the potential impacts outlined, there is a necessity for comprehensive testing to ensure that any increase in overlooking or loss of privacy is thoroughly assessed and adequately mitigated. This includes detailed visual impact assessments from multiple vantage points around the development to understand the full extent of the impact on surrounding residences.
  - Mitigation Measures: The development design should incorporate specific measures to mitigate these impacts, such as strategic placement of opaque materials or the use of screening techniques on balconies and windows that face directly onto nearby homes.
  - Visual Demonstrations of Impact:
    - Necessity for Transparent Communication: To ensure that the stakeholders, especially the residents affected by the development, have a clear understanding of the impact, it is imperative that the developer provides visual representations from various floors of the proposed building. This transparency will help in evaluating the actual impact on the residents' quality of life and in fostering a trustful relationship between the developer and the community.

Inconvenience to Road Users and Access Issues



Application No:    Consultees Name:    Received:

Comment:    Response:

Historically, there was a proposal to close Saffron Street to all traffic except cycles and pedestrians. If implemented, this would eliminate vehicular access to our building from the west, restricting entry to the car park to only Farringdon Road. This would necessitate a lengthy detour for anyone approaching from the south or west via Holborn and Clerkenwell Road. Such changes not only inconvenience residents and visitors but also contradict environmental goals by increasing travel distances and associated emissions.

#### Density, Design, and Impact on Historical and Community Context

- **Unacceptably High Density and Over-Development:** The proposed site plan indicates a significant increase in the density of the area, potentially involving the loss of open spaces which serve as communal or garden lands. This over-development compromises the open aspect of our neighbourhood, contributing to 'garden grabbing' and diminishing the community's living quality.
- **Visual Impact of the Development:** The architectural design and scale of the proposed building will drastically alter the visual landscape of our neighborhood. Its modern construction could starkly contrast with the surrounding buildings, particularly if it uses incongruent materials or aggressive design features.
- **Effect on the Character of the Neighbourhood:** The character of our neighbourhood is defined by a blend of historical significance and architectural harmony. The proposed development threatens to disrupt this balance, introducing elements that are out of scale and character with the existing environment.
- **Design Concerns (Bulk, Massing, Detailing, and Materials):** The bulk and massing of the proposed development are concerns, as they appear overbearing compared to the modest scale of neighbouring properties. The detailing and materials proposed could further exacerbate this disparity, potentially clashing with the aesthetic and historical elements prevalent in the area.
- **Over-Bearing, Out-of-Scale, or Out of Character Appearance:** Relative to the current architectural styles and scales in the vicinity, the proposed development is likely to be over-bearing and out-of-scale. Such a structure would disrupt the visual harmony and architectural unity that characterizes our neighbourhood.
- **Loss of Existing Views:** The new building's height and placement could obstruct existing views from neighbouring properties, significantly diminishing the residential amenity and property values of existing owners.
- **Impact on Conservation Area or Listed Building:** If the development is within a Conservation Area or near a Listed Building, its modern design and increased footprint could adversely affect the historical integrity and visual appeal of the area, undermining conservation efforts.
- **Adverse Effects on Highway Safety and Road User Convenience:** The proposed development might also negatively impact highway safety and the convenience of road users, particularly if it leads to increased traffic, reduced visibility at junctions, or complicates access due to its layout and density.

#### Safety and Health Concerns:

As a registered disabled individual with several serious medical conditions, including claustrophobia, the

**Application No:**    **Consultees Name:**    **Received:**

**Comment:**    **Response:**

development poses specific health risks to me. The increased building mass and resulting enclosure effect will intensify feelings of confinement and anxiety, made worse by the loss of open views and reduced light. Moreover, the potential for debris or accidents associated with the proximity of the loading bay and the history of vehicle collisions presents a continued risk to my personal safety and mental health.

Considering the aforementioned concerns, it is evident that the proposed development will significantly deteriorate our living conditions by breaching local planning policies designed to protect residential amenities in terms of daylight, privacy, noise levels and safety from injury. The development, as proposed, is not in keeping with the community's needs and fails to consider the existing residents' quality of life.

I urge the planning committee to reconsider the approval of this development, taking into account the profound impacts it would have on residents like myself. Adjustments must be made to reduce the building's height, reconsider the location of the loading bay and bike shed, and ensure adequate privacy and noise controls are in place to mitigate these impacts.

Thank you for considering my objections. I look forward to your response and am available for any further discussion or clarification needed regarding my concerns.

---

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2024/1364/P	Sam and Daniel Pioro Woods	14/05/2024 16:38:10	OBJ	<p>We are writing to object to planning permission 2024/1364/P.</p> <p>Introduction We own a flat in the Ziggurat building (4.5) which is directly opposite the proposed development. We are not opposed to the principle of development, and we welcome the development of the car park. There is an opportunity to create a positive architectural change. Unfortunately, we feel the scheme proposed is grossly disproportionate and is damaging to our home.</p> <p>We object to this scheme on the following bases:</p> <p>Grounds of objection</p> <p>Size The proposed building goes up 4 storeys higher than the existing building. It will be 2-3 storeys higher than both adjacent buildings on Saffron Hill. It towers over adjacent buildings and pushes towards our building at upper levels. As well as being disproportionately large as a matter of principle, the height of the building causes harm in relation to loss of direct sunlight in window, overshadowing, and enclosure.</p> <p>Overlooking, loss of privacy &amp; enclosure The development will see large windows directly opposite our apartment. In the proposed development, the curtilage of the building at upper levels has been pulled closer to our building, thus reducing the distance of overlooking from some 12.5m from the present windows to 10m at the level of our flat and, importantly, enabling access to outside spaces in those closer areas. It will see people outside on terraces on multiple levels opposite our outdoor terrace and with views into our apartment. The new proposal will mean that not only will we be overlooked, but we will be effected by noise on the terraces. We are also concerned about light pollution from the development.</p> <p>Loss of light and overshadowing Assessments that have been carried out by fellow residents in the Ziggurat (with our sincere thanks) confirms that our apartment is impacted well beyond BRE guidelines for VSC. Other flats in our building are also impacted, which is not surprising, given that our building is located immediately to the north of the proposed new development.</p> <p>The BRE assessment for sunlight on external amenity areas is only concerned with demonstrating that these spaces will continue to receive 2 hours of sun on March 21st in any year both pre and post development. But this is self-evidently a tiny snapshot in time. What the BRE assessment does not tell the Council is that the development will block out the sun for many months. When four storeys are added to the existing development, and the upper floors of the development are moved closer towards our building, this will directly block the sunpath in winter.</p> <p>The developer has not supplied a sunpath analysis, presumably because it recognises that the impact of its proposals are damaging. In order to illustrate the impact of the development on sunlight, ZFL has procured a sunpath analysis and the impact of the proposed development is startling with loss of direct sunlight in November, December &amp; January; and morning direct sunlight in September, October, February &amp; March.</p> <p>ZFL has also procured the relevant overshadowing analysis, which shows that the development will have an</p>

Application No:    Consultees Name:    Received:

Comment:    Response:

overshadowing impact on the Ziggurat Building.

We are very lucky to have direct sunlight in our apartments. Depriving us of that amenity is irreparable and cannot be mitigated.

Noise

There will be noise from the proposed balconies facing our apartment. Placing internal controls on when balconies can be used is ineffective. It is dependent upon the tenants' goodwill and adherence to rules, and we will be able to hear every word said, particularly for the two terraces which are immediately opposite.

As to the other larger south facing terraces, whilst we do not accept that the upper floors as currently designed should be constructed at all, there should be restrictions on use before 8am and after 6pm on weekdays, and at any time on weekends or bank holidays, with a means for residents such as ourselves to enforce such matters. There should also be a prohibition on music or amplified speech/music.

The large plant store on the roof will be noisy, even with attenuation in the form of planting. There seems no reason why plant cannot be stored in the basement. That would also reduce the massing by a storey.

Finally the inclusion of a large bin store and cycle store on Saffron St has the potential to be extremely disturbing. The noise will echo up between the buildings on Saffron St and into our windows. Please could we ask that there be a condition that such amenities are subject to complete access restrictions before 8am and after 6pm on weekdays, and at any time on weekends or bank holidays.

Wellbeing

The prospect of being faced every morning with an office block sitting directly outside our living room and bedroom, whose sense of enclosure is foreboding, which blocks out all of the direct winter sunlight, and which will intrude on our privacy and disturb us, is depressing.

Private rights to light

It is material that the south facing windows of our apartment enjoy private rights to light at law, in respect of which the developer is not legally permitted to infringe. The developer has acknowledged that we have such rights.

By blocking out direct sunlight in winter, and by reducing daylight/sunlight in other measurable respects, such rights will clearly be infringed if the development were to be granted planning permission and built.

We, together with leaseholders of other south facing apartments and the freeholder, ZFL, will enforce those rights in the event that planning permission is granted. It seems pointless to entertain any such application where there is no practical way that the developer can proceed with construction of a structure of that size and massing in any event. It will find itself being injunctioned in the High Court.

In summary, we would implore planners to refuse permission for a scheme of this size.

We reiterate that we welcome sympathetic development on this site. If the developer reduces the height of the building, removes north facing terraces, and includes a staggered structure, then there may well be scope for an acceptable solution. We seek that as it stands the application should be refused.

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2024/1364/P	Jane Dodd	14/05/2024 02:23:34	COMMNT	<p>1. I am extremely worried about the impact of this development on the lives of residents in the area. Already the neighbourhood suffers from daytime offices and ensuing loss of local community. Residential properties are increasingly surrounded by offices and transient daytime populations.</p> <p>2. Further developing the office population likely also increases the litter problem and the already difficult outdoor extremely noisy pub gatherings. Moreover the addition of large outdoor balconies overlooking and adjacent to 60-66 Saffron Hill will likely encourage gatherings that further increase noise and decrease privacy. Any rules about such we know to be ineffective: we already experience horrendous noise issues on the other side of our building where the landlord pays no attention to council rules or threatened sanctions permitting extreme noise at unsociable hours (very early morning and late night).</p> <p>3. There is a need for more housing and it is arguable that would be a much better use of this space.</p> <p>4. Moreover, there are many empty offices in the neighbourhood, suggesting this is not a required usage.</p> <p>5. Even if the development of yet more office space is approved there exist several major issues as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. the new building is much more extensive than the previous structure and as such is much closer to and encroaches on 60-66 Saffron Hill to an extent that drastically reduces light access for several apartments, affecting quality of living for many residents.</li> <li>b. same issue also drastically affects the outlook of several apartments</li> <li>c. Same issue but the overlook from the large windows of the offices into our living spaces. Currently as a car park with no real windows or lingering people and greater distance this has not been a major issue.</li> <li>c. access to and from the garage of 60-66 Saffron Hill will be hugely compromised during building (when it seems the proposal is to close Saffron Street) and possibly afterwards</li> <li>d. The new building will be 3 storeys higher than adjacent buildings on Saffron Hill. This overbearing structure in a place of such historical value seems completely wrong headed in addition to altering the already crowded nature of the streets</li> </ul> <p>Finally, there has been very little effective consultation. I am not alone I believe in finding out about this proposal only in January. Would not Camden be a better place if it considered its residents and businesses together and their collaborative ideas for neighbourhood cohesion? Moreover, only when our building representatives moved to have a meeting was one arranged and at that the developer listened to our concerns and professed to incorporate them into the design. However, the developer then refused to share scheme design with residents and did not take our concerns into the design ahead of submitting the application. This does not engender confidence that the developer will be conscientious.</p>

<b>Application No:</b>	<b>Consultees Name:</b>	<b>Received:</b>	<b>Comment:</b>	<b>Response:</b>
2024/1364/P	Justin Kowbel	14/05/2024 08:48:46	OBJ	Good afternoon,

I am responding to the proposed redevelopment of the NCP car park on Saffron Hill. I am a resident in the Ziggurat on the second floor and the majority of my windows are along the south wall and some look directly onto the car park.

First off, I'd like to say I think the redevelopment of the St Cross Street car park is a great addition to the neighbourhood. Aside from the dirty and outdated structure, the car park has been underused and mismanaged in many ways for the nearly 20 years I've lived in the Ziggurat. The alarm often goes off between 6 and 7 am and can be on for over an hour between 6 and 7am. This has been improved but it still happens. In summary, I welcome the redevelopment.

However, it is deeply disappointing that the proposed development would have an alarmingly negative impact on all south-facing Ziggurat residents. The building height and upper floors' surface area proposed are significantly larger than the current structure. The significant increase in redevelopment space towers over the Ziggurat. This blocks out the natural daylight and significantly reduces the direct sunlight into the south-facing Ziggurat flats. This would be most exaggerated during the winter months when any sun is so needed for mental health and has a profoundly negative impact on all of the south-facing Ziggurat residents' quality of life.

What surprises me is the St Cross Street car park owner's remarks that they want to be long-term, friendly/collaborative neighbours. This is the opposite of what has been demonstrated in their application. They seem to disregard the Council's comments that the redevelopment should not negatively impact the Ziggurat residents. They have also disregarded and ignored the clearly laid out issues/concerns with the proposed structure on the Ziggurat residents by the Ziggurat residents at a meeting shortly before the St Cross Street car park owner filed. I'm particularly nervous about NCP shareholders' future actions given the history in the area of developers ignoring clearly laid out requirements/approval by the Council (such as by 67-74 Saffron Hill's owner).

I'm also concerned about the increase in noise from the increased traffic on Saffron Street, the bike storage entrance on Saffron Street and people using the new development balcony spaces on each of the floors.

I hope this is an oversight by the St Cross Street car park owner and a rushed decision to simply get the process going. I truly hope they take on board the serious concerns and objections of the Council and residents and redesign the proposed development to be as interesting and innovative as the current design but fully respect the quality of life of the long-term residents. I suggest the following solution: the new structure be limited to the current overall building surface and dimensions, including the dimensions of each floor (and no more). This will prevent a taller building and one with larger/ wider on upper floors that would dramatically reduce the light for Ziggurat residents to maintain the existing flow of traffic entering all from the much wider St Cross Street or access from Saffron Hill, as there is a much larger combined frontage on those two streets. This would keep the current traffic and noise to the current levels.

Thank you for your consideration.

<b>Application No:</b>	<b>Consultees Name:</b>	<b>Received:</b>	<b>Comment:</b>	<b>Response:</b>
				Kind regards,  Justin

---