

[REDACTED]

From: A&S [REDACTED]
Sent: 11 August 2013 18:56
To: Planning; McEillstrum, Richard
Subject: Fwd: Comments on application ref. 2013/1598/P
Importance: High
Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: [REDACTED]

Sir,

We are referring to your recommendation for the planning committee meeting on 15 August 2013.

We were extremely surprised to read that you thought that the application should be granted as it stands. There would be extensive building works to replace buildings that are only a few decades old. There would be extensive building works to replace one of the largest block of buildings by an even larger block of buildings, quite possibly the largest in the neighbourhood. There would be extensive building works to increase the numbers of students that could be accommodated by a very small proportion compared to the increase in the building size, which doesn't make sense. There would be extensive building works that would cause terrible annoyance to local residents in terms of noise, congestion and dust. There would be extensive building works that would result in a new building that causes tremendous concern to local residents as its design seems to sacrifice the whole neighbourhood to a spurious concept of autarkic community. There would be a terribly larger building designed in a way that would cause a terrible loss of quality of life to residents of Sandwich street, both through the impact it would have on their flats, overshadowed by buildings larger than anything around, and through the traffic, noise and insecurity caused in this street by the use of the new buildings.

We understand that all of the above points have been documented, explained, detailed, complained about and presented to Camden council and yet your analysis of the project is that it is perfect as you don't recommend the slightest change to it. We really look forward to understanding how none of the objections made by Camden residents have resulted in your questioning, amending or blocking any part of the project. In the meantime, we hope you will revise your overly optimistic and candid view of this project.

Best regards,
Agnes Mazurek
Stephane Peroz
[REDACTED]

Begin forwarded message:

From: A&S [REDACTED]
Subject: Comments on application ref. 2013/1598/P
Date: 3 May 2013 10:43:21 BST
To: planning@camden.gov.uk

Att.: Richard McEllistrum

Dear Sirs,

Thank you for your letter regarding this proposed building. We object to this application for the reasons below:

1. the rationale for the new building is not clear at all. Although the university may have a waiting list for student accommodation, the buildings on Cartwright Gardens are only 25 years old or so and in good condition ; student accommodation is already being built "next door", on Bidborough Street ; other student accommodation projects have been useful in regenerating other buildings and areas, as SOAS did on Penton Rise, but as is not the case here.

This project seems to be the easiest one: over-developing an already dense area, instead of investing in new projects and/or areas in need of modernisation, thereby having a detrimental effect here instead of a positive one in an other but just as good location. Developers should not be allowed to take such a lazy route, but steered to make a more positive contribution.

2. the consequences on the lives of some of residents would be dramatic. Should the project be approved, the "gap" between buildings, where a car park currently sits at the bottom of Hugues Parry tower, would be covered by five-floor houses ; behind them would be a nine-floor building. In other words, residents of the flats just opposite in Sandwich House would lose the very biggest part of their view of the sky. They would lose the sun shining through their windows in the afternoon. The amount of light provided by this sunny exposure is very precious, its loss would have a detrimental health effect on people, and a negative financial impact on the value of the flats. These flats are not currently overlooked, so there would also be a loss of privacy.

Please take into account that the proposed development would have a very clear and very negative impact on a minority of people, who would bear an absolutely disproportionate share of the inconvenience caused. Because this is a small number of people, our numbers are not going to reflect the trouble caused, so it is vital that you understand and convey the dreadful impact - both personal and financial - of losing the sun exposure that we currently enjoy, and that would be near impossible to replace in a crowded neighbourhood like this one.

We find it absolutely appalling that the developers should make the point that their project would "only" sacrifice the well-being of a minority, and that it would "only" bring their condition of life (if only the lighting levels, but also the trouble, noise etc) to a point "no worse" than in most inner cities. Why not build over all neighbourhood squares since they are only enjoyed by a few? Or build over the Green Belt since it would only bring it in line with the rest of London?

In conclusion this project would have an absolutely dreadful effect on current residents (who

would then be neighbours to a building twice as high as theirs) and an incommensurable loss to many residents whose interests need to be understood and relayed by their Council. This is all the more important that the developers have not taken the residents' comments on board nor changed their project in any visible way, over the consultation period.

The development needs of UoL should be an opportunity to renovate and regenerate another area - as SOAS have done with their Vernon Square campus, or as the Wellcome Trust have done behind the British Library - all in the same borough of Camden and within walking distance. Instead this is commercial venture (backed by a pension fund and a foreign State investment fund) and therefore a for-profit development, with a clear negative impact on the current residents of the neighbourhood, but only speculative benefits.

Best regards,

Agnes MAZUREK
Stephane PEROZ

