

[REDACTED]

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: 26 May 2025 14:02
To: Planning
Cc: 'Debbie Radcliffe'; Jonathan Simpson (Councillor); Lotis Bautista (Cllr); Liam Martin-Lane (Cllr)
Subject: Planning application 2025 1684 P 105 Judd Street attn Sam Fitzpatrick

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

Objection by Meta Zimmeck, 33 Queen Alexandra Mansions, Judd Street, London WC1H 9DQ

I note that this application was allocated one calendar month for consultation (including two Bank Holiday weekends). This is insufficient.

Yet again an existing planning permission, previously strongly opposed by local residents, is now the subject of a variation in order to obtain new conditions, which are even worse than the original application in terms of their impact on local residents and the character of the neighbourhood.

The developers' logic seems to be that they didn't get enough of what they wanted the first time around and so now – midway through a lengthy and disruptive scheme (which has already developed in ways not originally permitted – e.g. virtual gutting of the building) – they are going to go for more. The initial application was speculative and involved generic laboratory facilities. The proposed variation is based on acquiring a client who wishes to use it for specialist Level 2 Containment facilities. So the motive is more money for the developers and hence a more ambitious ask with the usual mantra of 'The project won't stack up unless we get these changes'. The convenience and profit margin of a speculative developer and any s.106 gain for LB Camden are not considerations that should have decisive weight.

I oppose this variation on the following grounds:

- The building is a handsome Edwardian four-storey red brick building in the Bloomsbury Conservation Area. The proposed changes will really uglify this building (especially from the back and sides) – too large for the site and looming over existing buildings (especially the exquisite terraces in Thanet Street), multiple terraces (not the usual accountrement for a workspace but seemingly essential for a Level 2 Containment so that staff can hang out in the open air, eat their lunches and gaze into people's bedrooms), and the ruination of the building's most pleasing features on the roofline.
- The loss of local amenity in the removal of the promised café available to members of the community (space is money!) as well as enhancement of the building's exterior at street level.

- The inclusion of a Level 2 Containment facility in a densely residential neighbourhood, complete with five chimneys which rise 3 metres above an already increased (and maybe even more increased roof level – see references to ‘seven stories’). Most importantly, the building will now be home to dangerous materials with no guarantee that these will not escape into the air. Promises are not enough to inspire confidence in our safety.

There has been a huge expansion of laboratory space in central London (see massive Liverpool Victoria building on Southampton Row/New Oxford Street) presumably because the bottom has fallen out of the market for office accommodation and because such fictions as the ‘Knowledge Quarter’ have been foisted onto local residents without consultation or permission to facilitate this sort of thing.

In summary, the changes proposed constitute a threat to local people’s quiet and safe enjoyment of their homes – in terms of aesthetics, overshadowing, loss of privacy and danger from the activities to take place there. This application should be rejected.

A Level 2 Containment laboratory belongs in a business park on a ring road not near homes, shops, pubs, restaurants and a primary school. The finance people and developers won’t be living here when the wind blows ill.