

Application N	Consultees Name	Recipient Address	Received	Comment	Response
2025/1684/P	Glenda Davies	111 Thanet House Thanet Street London	22/05/2025 15:39:47	OBJ	<p>As a local resident within close proximity to 105 Judd Street, I strongly object to the section 73 application - the proposed changes to the roofscape would result in further serious damage to the character of the conservation area beyond that inherent in the plans already approved. It is telling that no illustration is provided of the view local residents like me will have of the proposed new 3 meter flues rising from the roof - a further assault on our visual amenity.</p> <p>Additionally, and more importantly, the effective change in use from an office building with laboratory-enabled facilities to a biochemical laboratory raises serious concerns about the potential impact on the quality of life of local residents and indeed our safety. The potential discharge from the proposed tall flues of dangerous or toxic materials is very worrying.</p> <p>References in material from the developers to "containment measures" being "designed to protect both the laboratory personnel and the local community from any potential hazards associated with scientific work" underline this worry and raise a fundamental question: is it appropriate for a laboratory of the kind envisaged to be located in a high density residential area? The use of the designation "Knowledge Quarter" cannot change the fact that the building concerned is in a residential neighbourhood not a science park. The future establishment and monitoring of emission levels and limits referred to by the developers is not sufficient. Robust, independent monitoring provisions and restrictions must be applied to the planning application before it can be properly considered.</p> <p>I objected to the original planning application on the grounds that it threatened residents' fundamental rights to light, privacy, visual amenity and the quiet enjoyment of their homes. That application was granted but subject to numerous conditions underlining how problematic elements of it were for local residents. Had the original planning application been able to anticipate the apparent requirements of the tenant now identified and included the provisions in this Section 73 application, I believe the disbenefits to residents would have clearly outweighed benefits.</p>

---

Application N	Consultees Name	Recipient Address	Received	Comment	Response
2025/1684/P	B Bennett	156 Agar Grove	22/05/2025 18:10:36	OBJ	<p>Dear Sam Fitzpatrick</p> <p>I am writing to object to this proposal.</p> <p>Unfortunately I was not aware of the previous planning application to alter this iconic Bloomsbury early 20th century historic originally Salvation Army building within the conservation area. It was applied for in 2022 at a time of crisis when probably a large amount of people were not aware of the plan.</p> <p>The building has survived even the wars in very good condition, has lovely delicate windows on the upper floor which is in keeping with the surrounding Camden conservation area. The proposal adds enormous dark rounded overbearing bulk to the roof area which does not fit in with surrounding colours, scale and styles of local buildings. The proposed added height is a creeping upwards. Unfortunately a few large bulky new buildings/ additions have been added in other parts of London, but this has kept its original height, fitting in with the local scale.</p> <p>In this highly complicated application, it is not made clear and accessible exactly what "life-sciences" are planned in this building but in the description, what is briefly stated as "provide extract flues to the roof", appears to plan for serious emissions. What type of materials are planned to be emitted from such flues? From the extensive highly complex "Odour Impact Assessment (Fumes)" report, this an extremely important part of this proposed development. This is not an appropriate area for laboratory fume extracts as it is a highly concentrated residential area. A large laboratory also would put pressure on local services as presumably large amounts of waste, some even potentially toxic, would be produced, and deliveries/ removals would cause vehicle congestion.</p> <p>I am opposed to the proposal to infill existing windows, which would damage and alter the original style. As stated, this building has survived even the wars in very good condition and needs protection.</p> <p>Yours Sincerely</p>

---

Application N	Consultees Name	Recipient Address	Received	Comment	Response
2025/1684/P	B Bennett	156 Agar Grove London NW19TY	22/05/2025 18:37:24	OBJ	<p>Dear Sam Fitzpatrick</p> <p>I am writing to object to this proposal.</p> <p>Unfortunately I was not aware of the previous planning application to alter this iconic Bloomsbury early 20th century historic originally Salvation Army building within the conservation area. It was applied for in 2022 at a time of crisis when probably a large amount of people were not aware of the plan.</p> <p>The building has survived even the wars in very good condition, has lovely delicate windows on the upper floor which is in keeping with the surrounding Camden conservation area. The proposal adds enormous dark rounded overbearing bulk to the roof area which does not fit in with surrounding colours, scale and styles of local buildings. The proposed added height is a creeping upwards. Unfortunately a few large bulky new buildings/ additions have been added in other parts of London, but this has kept its original height, fitting in with the local scale.</p> <p>In this highly complicated application, it is not made clear and accessible exactly what "life-sciences" are planned in this building but in the description, what is briefly stated as "provide extract flues to the roof", appears to plan for serious emissions. What type of materials are planned to be emitted from such flues? From the extensive highly complex "Odour Impact Assessment (Fumes)" report, this an extremely important part of this proposed development. This is not an appropriate area for laboratory fume extracts as it is a highly concentrated residential area. A large laboratory also would put pressure on local services as presumably large amounts of waste, some even potentially toxic, would be produced, and deliveries/ removals would cause vehicle congestion.</p> <p>I am opposed to the proposal to infill existing windows, which would damage and alter the original style. As stated, this building has survived even the wars in very good condition and needs protection.</p> <p>Yours Sincerely</p>

---