

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2024/1364/P	Elena Arkhangelskaya & Jegor Jermakov	26/05/2024 09:56:38	OBJ	<p>Hi, we are leaseholders of Flat 17, 55-59 Saffron Hill. Our flat overlooks Saffron Hill and Saffron Street.</p> <p>We would like to voice our objection to the planning application in its current shape and form. Our main concerns are:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none">1. The noise from the terraces overlooking Saffron Hill and how they will affect the mental health of our family. Our bedroom faces Saffron Street and is next to the wall where the new building will be constructed. This means that the terraces overlooking Saffron Street will be in line with the bedroom, and all voices/music will be reflected from the Ziggurat building into our bedroom, which will affect the quiet enjoyment of our property and may affect sleep and mental health, especially when extended into the evening hours. I am not sure the planning permission can enforce the hours of terraces being used, so can the building plan be changed so that there are no terraces and openable windows on the Saffron Street side?2. Particles and air quality during demolition. We are currently raising an 8-month-old baby, and we have concerns that the demolition process will produce a lot of dust which will enter our property and have a negative effect on the health and development of our son. What covenants and enforcement processes could be put in place to prevent this from happening?

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2024/1364/P	k. bakhtiar	25/05/2024 15:37:49	OBJNOT	<p>Dear Sir or Madam, at Camden Planning Department: I'm writing to you to object to the application 2024/1364/P I am of the opinion that this proposed development is a phase of transition from a highly utilized and viable carpark to temporary offices before being converted to apartments. This would significantly increase the value of the building.</p> <p>I have resided in the Ziggurat Building since its redevelopment in 1996. My apartment (2.4) is situated on the second floor of the Ziggurat Building and previously benefited from south-facing light and even the sun during the summer. However, this enjoyment has been diminished over the years as a result of the addition of additional floors to the building at the intersection of Saffron Street and Farringdon. Currently, the development at the intersection of Saffron Street and Saffron Hill, which is only a few metres from my principal windows facing Saffron Street.</p> <p>Proposed Massing The present proposals involve the addition of three additional floors and a plant room at the roof level to the existing car park and upper-level offices. The architects misled the public during their initial consultations by asserting that they were reducing the 12-story building to nine floors. However, they were actually counting half-floors that are connected by ramps. The building is actually six stories, and the four additional stories are disproportional to the current structure and out of context with the immediate neighbors. It is actually massive and overbearing due to the extremely narrow Saffron Street, which is barely broad enough for one car.</p> <p>In fact, the comparison of the existing and proposed sections from the planning application clearly demonstrates that a stump would be created, an eye sore between two comparatively high-standard designs, particularly the building on the corner of Saffron Street and Farringdon Road (77-79 Farringdon Road). The developer of our building, who also developed the building at the intersection of Saffron Street and Saffron Hill (59 Saffron Hill), ensured that the elevations along Saffron Hill were consistent. The section previously mentioned plainly demonstrates that the development site is nearly the same height as the two adjacent buildings, and a maximum of one additional floor and four as proposed should be permitted. This would enable the three buildings that face the Ziggurat across Saffron Street to be of equal height.</p> <p>Additionally, the extant buildings in the adjacent context appear to have a communality height, as evidenced by Davinci House at 42.42m, Alan House at 44 meters, and Ziggurat Building at a similar height prior to the recent addition of flat 8.1. Consequently, the vacating NCP carpark should be limited to a maximum of one additional floor, as it is 41 meters in height.</p> <p>Proposed Elevation to Saffron Street Additionally, I have examined all of the previous and current application sets and have been unable to locate any illustrations that illustrate the 25-degree test/rule, which is implemented when the window is located opposite the development. It would be evident that the fenestration in the current proposals does not confirm in the event that these are provided. Local authorities should have implemented these assessments when reviewing planning applications. The following tests are covered: Daylight to Windows • Daylight Provision Sunlight to Windows • Exposure to Sunlight</p>

Application No: Consultees Name: Received:

Comment: Response:

Overshadowing

- Overshadowing to Gardens and Open Spaces

The experiments detailed in this fact sheet are derived from the Building Research Establishment (BRE) document "Site Layout Planning for Daylight and Sunlight: A guide to good practice" and are highly pertinent to the planning of daylight and sunlight. Consequently, the windows in the proposed development that are currently facing precisely north (at our building) should be recessed and oriented towards the east or west. The Westminster planners ensured that the existing car park was replaced with a seven-story stepped extension clad in glazed terracotta with a cross-laminated timber (CLT) frame and planted terraces on every level when examining another project by the architects Allford Hall Monaghan Morris (AHMM) for Metropolis at Dorset Square. The stepping commences immediately following the ground floor retail units. It is logical that the same process should take place in Saffron Street, where the adjacent buildings are situated at an even shorter distance from the development proposals. Additionally, there was a green wall on the lower floor and additional landscaping as one progressed up the stepped elevation.

I am perplexed as to why they select examples for a mixed development, primary school, retail/office building, and three additional office buildings in their DAS, rather than a building that directly impacts the current proposals, specifically a conversion from a car park to offices. This illustrates the process of planting a green wall and stepping in order to meet the 25-degree test/rule.

Currently, the elevation of the car park stair is devoid of windows, as evidenced by the extant and proposed DAS views.

This verticality serves as a mediator between the elevations of the forecourt, the Ziggurat, and 77-79 Farringdon Road. Additionally, this is a blank wall, which necessitates no overhang. The developers intend to substitute this with horizontal under-window panels and expansive glazing.

The proposals and their adjacent aspects are incompatible, as evidenced by the aforementioned. There is no notion of continuity with conventional rectangular windows, as there is with the structures on either side. The proposed horizontal glazed band, which is disrupted by the configuration of smaller and larger windows, is a disorganized jumble. It is neither rectangular nor a strip, but rather an uncomfortable mismatch. The use of irregular horizontal louvres, which are arranged in a combination of horizontal and vertical framed shading measures, further complicates the situation.

Additionally, the developers' website abruptly attracts attention due to the unappealing colour scheme and the addition of four stories. Currently, the carpark is well-integrated with the adjacent structures due to the use of lighter colors and the fact that over half of the area is unglazed. However, the proposed design is atrocious. Additionally, the southern portion of the Ziggurat building will be dominated by a disproportionately large, obnoxious brown structure that dominates its surroundings. The proposals are completely out of proportion in this context, and the exceedingly large windows would provide a view of all of our apartments. As a result, I am opposed to the north elevation of the building due to the enormous windows that would directly overlook our apartments and would be prohibited by the 25-degree test/rule. Additionally, the proposed dirty brown coloration is entirely discordant with the neighborhood. It would be recommended to reduce the number of windows to only face east or west, rather than north, and to change the color to white, which would accentuate

Application No: Consultees Name: Received:

Comment: Response:

the gloomy passageway. Despite the architects' assertion that "lightweight and low-carbon finishes are considered, and bronze tones are considered to be sympathetic to the red brick palette of the area." Despite the fact that red brick is not utilized in any location along Saffron Street. Consequently, I would recommend that a distinct approach be implemented in Saffron Street, which has a face-to-face dimension of less than 5 meters on either side of the street. The architects also remark that the facade design is focused on optimizing passive solar control. However, as previously mentioned, the north elevation of the Teriya along Saffron Street is north-facing. Consequently, an alternative approach may be implemented. The car park site's disparately different street frontages are surely not accommodated by a single size.

The developer is encroaching on our Right to Light with their current proposed design, which will result in the extinguishment of the limited sunlight we receive and a significant reduction in the amount of light. The proposed over-scaled building would obstruct light in general, but sunlight in particular.

The proposed design features full-scale windows on the north elevation of the development for five stores, proceeding with the same windows. The window strips exceed the height of the car park aperture without windows. The controlled current ratio of opaque façade to open aperture (glazing subject to planning) should be maintained. Particularly in Saffron Street, the façade should be maintained in a light and uncomplicated manner. The profundity of the facade is modulated by the absence of a secondary facade frame, as it is north-facing and does not require solar control.

In 1994, the Ziggurat building underwent a transformation from a printer's facility to a residential block during its renovation. Thirty years later, the NCP carpark is attempting to replicate the Ziggurat Building, a structure that has never been used for human habitation and lacks windows (with the exception of a tiny portion at roof level). On page 66 of DAS, it is stated that "Step 3: Mirror the massing of the Ziggurat and maintain floors that are staggered or lowered by approximately half a storey to reduce overlooking." However, this solution resulted in the most repulsive instance of overlooking, as evidenced by the view from Allford Hall Monaghan Morris' building across Saffron Street (which shares the same design as the proposed new building).

The current multi-story NCP carpark building located at 45-54 Saffron Hill and 3 Saffron Street is a highly valued and frequently utilized local asset. The loss of this facility will only serve to increase the demand for street parking and decrease the number of visitors to the area. This is particularly true given the London Museum's relocation from the Barbican to Smithfield's meat market, which will result in an increase in the demand for car parks, rather than a decrease. The area has already experienced a significant reduction in parking spaces due to the redevelopment of the NCP car park to a hotel and the loss of the NCP car park located further north of Farringdon Road. I am grateful for Policy T2 of the Camden Local Plan, which aims to create a car-free borough. However, we must acknowledge the reality of the situation. The London Museum and Smithfield redevelopment will result in an increased demand for car parking spaces in the area, as well as new tourists and visitors and adjacent stores. Consequently, I am opposed to the proposed modification of the use.

Public Realm Works

The Site's developers have made claims regarding "associated landscaping and public realm works." However, they have not received a response, despite being pursued, despite writing to them extensively. A straightforward method for them to demonstrate their conformance is to install a green wall along Saffron

Application No: Consultees Name: Received:

Comment: Response:

Street for the lower floors and subsequently lower the building significantly below the current proposal.

In their DAS, the project architects assert that "Allford Hall Monaghan Morris creates buildings that are effortless to comprehend, visually appealing, and enjoyable to function." The buildings we design are intended for a wide range of individuals to use in a variety of methods. We are committed to the creation of structures and locations that are both functional and enduring, as well as buildings that are intrinsic to their design. However, their design is a replica of a multi-story car park that was an eyesore in the mid-20th century. They have preserved the elevational articulation of the carpark in their design and, despite the fact that the locality is not a "We believe in making places as well as buildings" location, they have succeeded in creating a replica of an unappealing building that was never designed well to begin with and is a rather low-grade eyesore. They emphasize a specific group of buildings within Sub Area 5 that are recognized as beneficial to the conservation area in their DAS, As stated in the 'Hatton Garden Conservation Area Appraisal and Management Plan', the proposed site is directly adjacent to 77-79 Farringdon Road. However, the carpark replacement design does not demonstrate a high level of contextualism or design in relation to either the Ziggurat at 60-66 Saffron Hill, which is directly opposite, or the adjacent 77-79 Farringdon Road.

replaced with glazing, and the lower register from corrugated metal sheeting with a similar material. The carpark was a series of half floors with ventilation openings and low-cost metal mesh. It appears that the design (if we can refer to it as such) by Allford Hall Monaghan Morris has not significantly evolved from a carpark constructed half a century ago. The sensation of suffocation in a tight urban infill scheme is further exacerbated by the inclusion of a higher level open mesh at roof level.

The developers are presently using a wall along Saffron Street to provide access to offices and cycle storage areas. The doors are opening and closing at a high volume. The proposed new office is situated on a street that is highly hazardous due to its width of approximately 5 meters. The increased foot traffic would result in commotion and a hazard for cyclists and office workers entering or exiting the site. I have witnessed numerous accidents or near-accidents over the past twenty-five years and personally reside across the narrow street. I am of the opinion that these proposals are a recipe for calamity and significantly violate our rights and enjoyment of the area.

The environmental improvements on the ground in these initiatives appear to be limited to the planting of three new trees along Saint Cross Street and nothing along Saffron Street. There is a significant opportunity to create a small urban square and close off Saffron Street from Farringdon Road with Section 106, which would significantly benefit the area. Traffic could enter Onslow Street from Saffron Hill via Saffron Street and utilize it to serve the businesses and car park in Onslow Street, thereby establishing a small square adjacent to Farringdon Road that is characterized by tranquilly and vegetation. In accordance with the architects' assertion that "We believe in the creation of places in addition to buildings," this would be a warm occasion for them to contribute to the community through positive initiatives.

The Camden Council's pre app advice :-

It is evident that this statement serves as a foundation for a variety of future planning conditions regarding the development, including:

Application No: Consultees Name: Received:

Comment: Response:

visual privacy: I am of the opinion that the 25-degree test/rule has not been met, and if it were, it would not permit the intolerable overlooking of our residential properties from a building proposal located less than five metres away across Saffron Street.

Outlook: Similarly, our future appears grim in light of the current proposals. Our livelihoods and the future value of our flats will be significantly impacted by this proposed development, as we are severely constrained on all sites.

The case has been outlined in the developers' own consultants' DSO of daylight assessment, as well as in their architects' proposed internal perspective on the surrounding structures. I object on the grounds of reduced outlook to my flat in the Ziggurat Building resulting from the increased height of the new building compared with the current height of the car park.

Sunlight: In the same vein, the present proposals suggest that our future is bleak. This proposed development will have a substantial impact on the future value of our apartments and our livelihoods, as we are severely constrained on all sites.

The case has been delineated in the developers' own consultants' DSO of daylight assessment, as well as in their architects' proposed internal perspective on the surrounding structures. I object on the grounds of reduced sunlight to my flat in the Ziggurat Building resulting from the increased height of the new building compared with the current height of the car park.

Daylight: The current car park building will be reduced by nearly two-thirds with the proposed four new floors. The right to light is a legal easement that safeguards the access of property owners to natural light. It guarantees that the light penetrating a property's windows is not substantially obstructed by neighboring developments. The right to light is essential for the preservation of property values, the protection of occupants' well-being, and the maintenance of a comfortable living environment. The primary windows in my living room and sitting room overlook the car park site directly. If the development is granted planning permission, the reduction in illumination would be more than 40%, as well as the vast windows that overlook me from less than 5 meters away. This is completely unacceptable.

The developers' own consultants' DSO of daylight assessment has established the case. I object on the grounds of reduced daylight to my flat in the Ziggurat Building resulting from the increased height of the new building compared with the current height of the car park.

Overshadowing: This development will render the overshadowing process entirely complete, as we are usually in the shadow.

The developers' own consultants' DSO of daylight assessment has established the case. I object on the grounds of reduced overshadowing to my flat in the Ziggurat Building resulting from the increased height of the new building compared with the current height of the car park.

Acoustic quilting as a noise barrier, Noise and vibration: Approximately ten years ago, the carpark installed metal open mesh over the openings, resulting in a devastating drilling noise that included vibrations, reverberations, and a deafening noise. This persisted for six months. We are currently considering a construction programmed that will extend beyond two years. I am of the opinion that sound limits should be established by planners as a condition, and the contractor should be required to demonstrate how construction noise will be minimized. This can be achieved by reducing noise-related works to either the morning or the afternoon, as well as the use of noise control enclosures (e.g., acoustic curtains, cutting stations, noise barrier fences, machinery enclosures, generator enclosures).

Tight urban grain with small distances between buildings some of which are residential: Regrettably, the developer has disregarded this matter and pursued an extensive space acquisition. In a similar tight urban fabric situation, we have been required to step the building from the first floor on a residential building in

Application No: Consultees Name: Received:

Comment:

Response:

Southwark. I am presently working on this project. Therefore, I am astounded that the Southwark planners, as evidenced by the earlier Allford Hall Monaghan Morris (AHMM) project for Metropolis at Dorset Square, and the Westminster planners, have implemented a design that necessitates the developers to step the buildings in order to maintain sufficient lighting for neighboring properties, rather than merely raising the walls at the site perimeter boundary walls.

Finally I would like to add:

Overbearing impact: refers to the adverse impact that a proposed development may have on the properties in the vicinity, including their size, scope, and proximity. It has the potential to influence the visual appeal, amenity, and privacy of the region. The quality of life for neighboring properties can be significantly impacted by overbearing developments, which can produce a sense of being overlooked or overshadowed. I am of the opinion that Camden Council should request that the developers withdraw their application due to the numerous objections from the neighbours on all sides (North, South, and West). This request would be upheld on the basis of excessive. I object on the grounds of overbearing impact on my flat in the Ziggurat Building resulting from the increased height of the new building compared with the current height of the car park.

In conclusion, the developers have adhered to a conventional consultation method, which included a meeting and the submission of architectural plans. This process resulted in a considerable amount of work on our part, which was subsequently overlooked by them. This disregard for our efforts partially unveils their underlying objective to maximize their spatial acquisition. Given these circumstances, I am inclined to dismiss their proposals and urge the Camden Council to reject their application. The primary reason for this rejection is the overbearing impact of their development, especially on the residents to the north, due to the narrow span of less than five meters across Saffron Street. Our current living conditions are already in close quarters, and these proposals threaten to intensify an already strained situation, pushing us towards an unsustainable future.

I would like to emphasize the profound influence of the adjacent proposals. Their impact is not just substantial, but indeed, it dominates the overall planning landscape tight urban grain with small distances between buildings and most of which are residential. This dominance necessitates careful consideration and strategic response to ensure balanced and sustainable development.

Finally, Planning Permission should not be granted for a development which would reduce outlook, sunlight, daylight, and increase overshadowing in this tight urban grain with small distances between buildings some of which are residential building and only less than five meters away.

Dr K Bakhtiar
2.4 the Ziggurat Building
60-66 Saffron Hill
London EC1N 8QX

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2024/1364/P	Peter Yeoh	26/05/2024 22:38:51	OBJ	<p>I live next door to the proposed new development and I'm against the plan for the existing car park to be transformed into a massive 8-storey office building. If built, it would adversely alter the environment and quality of light of its surroundings, and the flats in my building. First, the proposed building will be too tall and overwhelmingly large for a narrow street like Saffron Hill. It also plans to add two-three more floors, much taller than other buildings there. This will have a long-term negative effect and raise the height of a street that's not equipped to support such structural scale. Second, the addition of windows facing directly to us means we will lose significant privacy and light quality, and will certainly affect the mental health of residents in my building. The lack of light has proven to trigger depression. Finally, it's shocking that the developer tried to push this project through without consulting us or its neighbours, and when confronted, refused to send us the scheme. This should raise a big red flag to the council and prove that the developer cannot be trusted to build a building in a community like Saffron Hill. I hope the council will consider my comment seriously.</p>
2024/1364/P	Miss Rachel Ashton	26/05/2024 21:41:05	OBJ	<p>I have lived in Da Vinci House for 20 years and have given birth to all of my three children in our flat. They love our home and our neighbourhood and they are anxious about having strangers looking in and the noise they will create</p> <p>A redevelopment of the car park, which is somewhat of an eyesore at street level, is a good idea but it seems unnecessary to have it developed so tall to completely change the character of our neighbourhood and home.</p> <p>The size of the overall development is far from the character of the area where there are few tall buildings, and it looks too top heavy for the area. The height of this new proposed building will hem us in.</p> <p>The windows facing our building should have frosted glass to counter the loss of privacy that we and our neighbours will endure.</p> <p>Thank you.</p> <p>Sincerely yours,</p> <p>Rachel Ashton</p>

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2024/1364/P	Reem Waines	24/05/2024 20:57:13	COMMNT	<p>I am a resident of Da Vinci House, living in one of the two flats on the top two floors of the building. I have lived at this address since 2003, except for an 18 month gap when our flat (and our neighbour's flat 22) received planning permission to add a new floor to our flat with the express intention of unifying the the outside look of the building on the 5th floor and receding the 6th floor far back from the external wall so that the building doesn't look top heavy. We modified our plans to accommodate the recommendations from the council. Our one floor extension has not detracted from the views nor the sunlight of neighbouring residents.</p> <p>I am writing to object to the current plans put forward to transform the car park (NCP) building on St Cross Street, EC1N. While I am in full support of the car park being refurbished and updated to reflect the up and coming nature of the area with its enviable public transportation hub, I am alarmed at the size and mass of the proposal.</p> <p>I attended the meeting that was held between the neighbours and the developers in January. The developers planned this meeting very last minute, not giving residents enough notice to attend. After their presentation, the comments and concerns of all the neighbours who were present, were not reflected in the plans they submitted as they look exactly the same. It seems the meeting was called just to tick a box.</p> <p>At the meeting I objected to the need to have such a large mass in the middle of a block. It doesn't complement the look of the area and its height is frightening and will affect our views and light. It will completely block our view of the Ziggurat which is a Clerkenwell icon I enjoy seeing every morning. I met my neighbours during the Thursday NHS applause because we could see each other and wave in support.</p> <p>The height of the current car park reaches the second floor of our flat, so we see the Ziggurat building from the north. There is enough space between us that it feels neighbourly and spacious. The Car Park development is going to have many terraces for working people to access, meaning there is going to be a lot more noise especially in the summer months. People who work somewhere are less concerned about making noise in their place of work and can be disruptive to people who live in the area. Some of these people will be looking over into one of our bedrooms and our whole balcony.</p> <p>What is puzzling is that this is considered a Conservation Area but the proposal doesn't reflect that. The demolition of the original building is not a sustainable option and the dense mass they plan to create is unnecessary.</p> <p>I was hoping that the area would develop more buildings into residences rather than more offices and there are plenty of modern office blocks in the area that are empty.</p> <p>St Cross street is a very busy street especially during working hours and we have trucks of all sizes and lengths that turn into Saffron Hill from it. Saffron Hill is a very narrow road and the plan for a cafe with outdoor seating on the edge of that, seems hazardous. St Cross street is going to become even more busy especially because of one-way system further up that street, leaving little option but to use it. And with the rental bicycle and scooter bay on the street, it beggars belief how this development is will be developed without seriously negatively affecting. We're already enduring huge levels of noice from the 20-24 Kirby Street redevelopment, making working at and from home near impossible.</p> <p>Yours sincerely,</p>

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
				Reem Waines Flat 23 Da Vinci House
