

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2014/7874/P	Jean Dollimore	23 Torriano Cottages NW5 2TA NW5 2TA	10/02/2015 09:23:44	INT	<p>This response to the planning application for Town Hall Extension Argyle Street London WC1H 8NN is from Camden Cycling Campaign (CCC), the local borough group of London Cycling Campaign (LCC). We have over 600 members and represent the interests of cyclists living or working in the borough of Camden.</p> <p>We have consulted our members by email on this issue and this response reflects the views of the membership.</p> <p>There is one very important cycling issue:</p> <p>In order to avoid cycling on the very congested and polluted Euston Road, cyclists need to have an informal way of travelling parallel to the Euston Road on the south side. It is already possible to cycle through Flaxman Terrace and Bidborough Street.</p> <p>There is a potential link from Bidborough Street to Argyle Street through the garden area of the current Town Hall Extension. This would enable the cycle route to continue on to St Chad's Street. We understand this used to be a public thoroughfare before the building of the Town Hall Extension.</p> <p>We therefore request that space should be allocated for a shared use (walking and cycling) path between Argyle Street and Bidborough Street.</p> <p>This should be made available as soon as the council vacates the site, rather than waiting for the development.</p> <p>In addition, we request that you ensure that an appropriate increase in cycle parking to go hand-in-hand with any increase in height.</p> <p>Please would you acknowledge receipt of this response; if you prefer a written submission please let me know. We would be very happy to discuss any aspect of our response.</p> <p>?J ean Dollimore</p> <p>CCC committee</p>

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2014/7874/P	Nicholas Reynolds	Flat 1 45 Balfe Street London N19EF	05/02/2015 10:00:35	OBJ	<p>Dear Sir/Madam</p> <p>I recently noticed that plans have been submitted to change the Camden Council town hall extension on Argyle Street. I was initially very excited at this prospect as the building is extremely unattractive and every time I walk past it, I look at it and think how ugly it is! However, I am very concerned that the new proposals appear to keep the ugly part of the building and simply extend the top which will surely draw more attention to it.</p> <p>I feel that the current planning proposal does not take into account the site's immediate surroundings. St Pancras Chambers directly opposite is simply stunning and is, as far as I know, Grade 1 listed, along with the station and Kings Cross Station. These have all undergone restorations relatively recently and have had considerable money spent on them to restore them to their original beauty. I was so happy when that terrible green extension to Kings Cross station was removed as it ruined what was a beautiful building behind as it is today. Therefore, I do not understand why this opportunity is not being used to completely demolish the town hall extension and replace it with something much more in-keeping with the new and highly desirable Kings Cross. The building next to the extension, Camden Town Hall, is Grade 2 listed and I would like to see something more in keeping with this building replacing the extension on Argyle Street. The current building dominates the southern side of Euston Road and this is not how it should be when you take into account how beautiful the original town hall is. I also think that any extension to the current roofline will take away some visibility of the iconic St Pancras Station spire and clock tower from some vantage points.</p> <p>Roof lines should be very important in any proposed modification in an area of such focus for regeneration as Kings Cross is today. The proposals would draw more attention to what is already an eye sore and detract from the beautiful buildings aforementioned.</p> <p>As a resident of Kings Cross, I certainly have no objections to the redevelopment of the site but I do feel that the current proposals are entirely inappropriate and are a missed opportunity to make a change which will add to the character and charm of this area. The current proposals are, in my opinion, a big mistake and will draw attention away from the other beautiful buildings and landmarks which have had millions spent on them to restore.</p> <p>Nick Reynolds Kings Cross Resident</p>

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2014/7874/P	Ewa Wolkowicz	Ewa Wolkowicz Flat 64 Westerham Bayham Street Camden London NW1 0JU	05/02/2015 11:19:10	OBJ	<p>Dear Camden Council</p> <p>I am writing to add comment to the proposed modifications to use and structure of the Camden council town hall annexe/extension. I have been a resident of Camden for a couple of years now and I am increasingly spending more time in Kings Cross as it continues to develop.</p> <p>I tend to walk past the site in question multiple times on most days and I really dislike the current building. When I read that Camden Council had vacated the building I suspected that something would be done to improve the building...ideally demolition. However, I am concerned to read that the building will actually be kept near enough in its current form with a multiple floor extension on top, I was very worried how this would look. Now that I have had time to look at the 'artist impression' of the proposed changes, I cannot believe that the proposals have even got this far in the process. The modern extension on top of a building which is already an eye sore simply draws more attention to the ugly façade below.</p> <p>The current proposals hare not in keeping with the other recently restored buildings in the area, such as Grade 1 listed St Pancras Station, Grade 1 listed St Pancras Chambers and Grade 1 listed Kings Cross Station. Millions of pounds have been spent to restore these buildings to their original beauty, including removing the ugly green metal building that was once in front of Kings Cross Station and is now Kings Cross Square. Surely a building which is more in keeping with the 'new' Kings Cross would be much more appropriate? The Camden Town Hall directly next to the site is also a lovely, attractive building and the current annexe building already detracts from the beauty of this because it is too high and overshadows it. Anything higher would have an even worse effect. The new building would be a 'landmark' in the area for all the wrong reasons, in my opinion, and take the focus away from the beautiful buildings I mentioned before.</p> <p>I would say that one of the main buildings affected will be the Renaissance Hotel and the residential apartments at the St Pancras Chambers directly opposite. There doesn't appear to be any visualisations from this vantage point by Tavernor AVR London which I feel is a considerable oversight or deliberate omission. The Local Development Document which I have seen states that any building must be "appreciably sensitive" and "respectful in scale and form to its relationship with the important landmark of St Pancras Chambers." Therefore why has there been no visualisation from this point? I believe this is because any visualisation from this point would show how damaging this proposal would be to this icon.</p> <p>I hope that this has not come across that I am against a redevelopment of the site. For clarification, I am certainly in support of this site as a target for development; however, the current proposals are not appropriate and will draw more attention to this eye sore. This application therefore seems to be a lost opportunity to improve Kings Cross and the setting of the original listed buildings. This proposal is very insensitive to some of London's most famous listed buildings. I stand by my opinion that the site should be demolished and something much more in keeping be built at a similar roof level to the original town hall.</p>

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
					Thank you for letting me have my say. Ewa Wolkowicz
2014/7874/P	Phoebe Watkins	Flat 34 Pioneer House 46 Britannia Street London WC1X 9JH	11/02/2015 21:13:16	OBJCOMP AP	I dont object to the change of use particularly but would want some thought put into the location of the entrance to the hotel as there is a huge amount of people traffic going across Argyle Street crossing where there is a bike lane and traffic lights. With a hotel, the footfall will increase and there is not enough space for the existing people to cross roads safely as it is, and the bike lane on Argyle Street that leads across Euston Road is very dangerous for bike users anyway. With a new large hotel here, this will add to the numbers in this street - particularly as even more will have bags on wheels. My main objection is to the roof extension that will increase the height of the building by at least 2 floors. The impact on the skyline of the area will be negative and take away from the views of St Pancras clock tower - one of the most photographed buildings in this area. The views from behind this building will be obscured and it will inevitably encourage other planning applications from other buildings to build upwards changing the nature and skyline of this area. Too much is changing and altering completely the nature of the area. I have read the documents and seen the argument that as it is set back from the edge, it will have minimal impact light affect on neighbouring buildings, but it will definitely stand out, and at the moment it looks like a very odd eyesore. It overlooks a local school and will impact on Argyle Square. IT also will have glare problems and will dominate an area that should be dominated by a lovely clock tower and old buildings around Argyle Square, Argyle Street and the local area making it more and more into an international hub for visitors. Loads of people live in this area, and the more corporate and high end buildings are having a negative impact on a residential area that are not ever going to use these sorts of places.

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2014/7874/P	Stephen Jones	St Pancras Chambers Euston Road London NW1 2AR	12/02/2015 12:35:36	OBJNOT	<p>I have the following comments on the proposed development as a resident of St Pancras Chambers, in the former Midland Grand Hotel building directly opposite the proposed site. I speak not as one whose views will be directly affected, since my apartment is at the rear of the building, but as someone who has lived in that building for five years, and loves the area and the general improvements which have been and are being made in the surrounding area. In particular, St Pancras Chambers itself, now housing the St Pancras Renaissance Hotel as well as the Chambers apartments, is a significant landmark building, and one of the most distinctive and well known buildings in that part of London. It is Grade 1 listed, as are other buildings in the area which include King's Cross Station, also Grade 1, and the former Camden Town Hall building adjacent to the proposed site, which is of lesser architectural significance perhaps but still a grand building of its type, and listed Grade 2. Further away the more recent British Library building, not liked by all, is designed sympathetically to harmonise with its neighbour at St Pancras. There are also other listed buildings in the vicinity and the area has been subject to continuous improvement in the last few years.</p> <p>The Town Hall Annexe building which is the subject of the current proposal is considered by some to be out of keeping and out of place in the area. I understand that Sir Nikolaus Pevsner referred to it as a "coarse extension". Others may feel that it has merit as an example of an architectural style of a former era, having been built in the 1970s when concrete was still fashionable. Even as it stands now its height is disproportionate in relation to the neighbouring buildings, dominating that side of Euston Road, and much higher than anything in the immediate vicinity save for the clock tower at St Pancras itself. There may nevertheless be room for a building like this which is "of its time", and can be refurbished to make it conform internally to modern requirements without substantially altering the external fabric, as has been done with the former Unison building further down Euston Road. Some may wish to see it demolished, and that may be a discussion for another time, but that would be subject to proper consideration of a suitable replacement, not the creation of a bizarre chimera as here envisaged.</p> <p>The current proposals pay respect neither to the uniqueness of the surrounding area nor to the integrity of the Annexe building itself. They would result in an architectural anachronism with an upper addition which would further increase the height of an already massive and imposing building, raising the roof line further to challenge the height of the elegant and slender clock tower opposite. I have read some supposed justification from the architects for the proposed addition referring to "a characterful lightweight extension" and to the proposed addition helping to "reduce the building's perceived bulk", which is an extraordinary statement in the circumstances. Reference to "a new crown" which would "improve the squat proportions of the existing building" shows both the extent of the architects' delusion and their manifest disrespect for the building they are purporting to "improve". The final result would satisfy neither those who value the structure for its own merits nor those who object to its style and scale as already being out of place in its context.</p> <p>Buildings form the landscape of our cities and architects paying sympathetic attention to their surroundings can contribute positively to that landscape. This may include radical departures from the existing norms, as originally with Gilbert Scott's St Pancras, more recently the British Library and now the new Francis Crick building behind it. There is equally the opportunity for architects to cause irreparable harm for generations to come if they are allowed to indulge in ill conceived fantasies which they do not have to live with when they move on elsewhere. The proposal to create such a hybrid colossus in an area which is now emerging from decades of blight would be a mistake of which the Council would in due course have reason to be deeply ashamed. The proposal should in the exercise of</p>

Application No: **Consultees Name:** **Consultees Addr:** **Received:** **Comment:** **Response:**

good judgment and plain common sense be firmly rejected.

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2014/7874/P	Thomas Reynolds	5.32 St Pancras Chambers Euston Road London NW1 2AR	05/02/2015 09:26:23	OBJ	<p>Dear Sirs</p> <p>I am writing to express deep concern over the proposed modifications to the Camden Council Town Hall Annexe. As a resident of St Pancras Chambers, directly opposite the annexe, I believe this would have a detrimental effect on our beautiful building and, more importantly, the wider area of Kings Cross.</p> <p>I have never been a fan of the building as I feel it is an eye sore in comparison to the beautiful St Pancras Chambers building, both stations and the original Town Hall. When I heard news that the property was to be redeveloped, I had expected that it would be demolished and something more in keeping with the area would be erected. At the time of the original build of the annexe, I believe it was not decided what would happen with St Pancras Chambers itself...perhaps even demolition of our now beautiful Grade I listed building. This is not to mention the considerable number of other Grade I or Grade II listed buildings located adjacent to the site of the annexe – St Pancras Station, Kings Cross Station, and, of course, Camden Town hall directly next to the site in question.</p> <p>However, as you will be aware, millions of pounds were spent redeveloping St Pancras Station into the landmark it is today. There has been considerable attention to detail paid to restore it to its original beauty so I do not know why the vacation of the annexe is not being used as an opportunity to demolish and ‘start again’ with something much more in keeping with the area.</p> <p>Whilst I am not against the idea of the redevelopment of the annexe, I feel the current proposals are inappropriate. Adding floors to an already ugly building will simply, in my opinion, draw more attention to the eye sore. The proposed extensions look entirely out of place and do not ‘fit’ with the charisma of the area at all. I believe that the height of the building should be lowered so it is more in keeping with the original Town Hall roof line – currently your eyes are drawn to the annexe rather than the original listed Town Hall. Why not use this as an opportunity to change this?</p> <p>My apartment has relatively small windows as it is on the top two floors of the St Pancras Chambers building. It already suffers with a lack of natural light and it is of great concern to me that any extension will block more light out and have a detrimental effect on the habitability my property. This is not to mention that it will block the views I have of key London landmarks which will no doubt have some impact on my property’s value.</p> <p>In summary, I am strongly against the current proposal to extend the original Town Hall Annexe. I would very much support the redevelopment of the site but the current proposals would have a very negative effect on the charm of the area. The current building is not in keeping with its beautiful surroundings...the present proposal exacerbates this and would draw more attention to an already ugly building.</p> <p>Yours faithfully</p> <p>THOMAS W REYNOLDS</p>

Application No: **Consultees Name:** **Consultees Addr:** **Received:** **Comment:** **Response:**

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2014/7874/P	John Dowson	flat 205 St Pancras Chambers Euston Road London	12/02/2015 17:15:40	COMNOT	<p>Comments on Proposal for former Camden Council annexe building Euston Road, London Ref 2014/7874/P</p> <p>a) Camden Council has failed in its duty to ensure orderly and sound planning by:</p> <p>(i) allowing the former annexe to be sold without conditions on its sale to prevent unsympathetic proposals for any redevelopment that would damage the heritage precinct it sits in.</p> <p>(ii) not contacting affected property owners of the proposal. As a Camden ratepayer I received a notice recently seeking public comment concerning a very minor proposal to place tables and chairs of a footway, yet for a large development like this one, which is directly across the road from where I live, there has been no such request for public comment.</p> <p>b) The subject development site, the former Camden Council 1974 Brutalist style building, is unsightly and a blot on an area which contains some very fine buildings, none more so than the grade one listed building directly across Euston Road, St Pancras. The immediately adjacent King's Cross Station is also grade one listed, and the unsightly brutal concrete former council annexe is surrounded by the grade two Town Hall immediately adjacent and the grade two buildings to the side and rear at Argyle Street.</p> <p>Council's own document (Site Allocation Plan p20 under the heading Site Context), which should be closely followed by staff and councillors, highlights the importance of this area:</p> <p>"The setting of these listed buildings is an extremely important consideration in determining the acceptability of potential demolition and design of redevelopment proposals if they come forward.</p> <p>Even though it is linked, the extension is not visually subservient to the town hall. The design, massing and appearance of the building in relation to its "senior partner" are considered unsympathetic. The King's Cross Conservation Area Statement identifies the town hall extension as having a negative contribution to the conservation area. The Council has decided to sell the site and new council offices are being constructed at Kings Cross Central.</p> <p>Refurbishment for alternative uses is therefore an option. Redevelopment of the site is also an option and could present an opportunity to enhance the townscape of this section of Euston Road and enhance the setting of the town hall."</p> <p>The proposal submitted certainly does not enhance the streetscape or the setting of the town hall.</p> <p>c) In planning terms, the sale by Camden Council of their former annexe provides a once in a lifetime opportunity to improve the streetscape and integrity of the area by reducing the negative impact that the current building has by DECONSTRUCTING the annexe. Retention of the overly plain Brutalist</p>

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

Comment: **Response:**

building should only occur if it competes less with the landmark St Pancras building across the road. It is already 8 storeys compared with the landmark St Pancras at 5 and the Brutalist annexe diminishes the good buildings around it, including the original town hall immediately adjacent.

d) The proposed additional storeys on top are the single most objectionable issue with this proposal. While there are efforts evident to improve the access, permeability and aesthetics of the 1974 building, the extra storeys compete with and diminish the significance of the level one building across the road and the town hall adjacent.

e) The current height of the Camden annexe already has a serious negative impact in terms of light for St Pancras. In winter especially, the current profile of the annexe blocks direct morning light until around 11am. Adding extra storeys to the annexe will significantly reduce the right to light of residents and hotel guests in St Pancras.

f) The significance of St Pancras was recognised when the British Library was build across the road from it. The new building there was significantly set back so as not to compete with St Pancras. Even though the British Library sits to the side of St Pancras and not directly in front of it like the annexe, architects took great pains to show respect to the landmark status of St Pancras in terms of both bulk and set backs. The new proposal for the former council building does not pay that respect.

g) St Pancras Station is of international significance and the building is described by many as the finest in London. It faces Euston Road as a curved building directly looking at the former council building. Anywhere else on Euston Road and the proposed extra height of the proposed redevelopment might work, but it does not work immediately opposite St Pancras Station. The additional storeys look like wall to wall phone towers.

h) Further to the extra height proposed for the annexe site diminishing the landmark status of St Pancras Station, the way it is designed with glass and lighting will make the whole top of the annexe into a giant lighthouse at night, with distracting bright lights reducing the impact of St Pancras Station in the streetscape.

i) Reuse of the subject building as a hotel is an idea that has merit because it taps into the historically interesting area for visitors and easily accesses the transport hubs immediately adjacent.

As a former planning committee member for 8 years on a local council, and former chairman of various heritage committees, and author of 5 books on heritage, I have a deep concern for the preservation and improvement of significant heritage buildings and areas. I feel that we should not have arrived at such a situation where something so unsympathetic has been designed and submitted, especially given that the public consultation that was done showed overwhelming opposition to the extra height proposed.

It would appear that site context has not been seriously taken into a ccount and that the application is contrary to council's own policies such as Camden Core Strategy Policy CS14 (Promoting High Quality Places), DP24 (Securing High Quality Design), DP25 (Conserving Camden's Heritage), and

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
					Camden Site Allocations Document Site 2) and I ask that the current proposal be refused. John Dowson Flat 205 St Pancras Chambers, London
2014/7874/P	Phillip Cornwall	Apartment 5-26 St Pancras Chambers	11/02/2015 22:38:58	OBJ	<p>I have lived at St Pancras Chambers for two years. I am obviously a great fan of St Pancras itself, and also of the many historical buildings in the area that have been so beautifully restored. I live on the fifth floor of St Pancras and therefore a significant part of my view includes the Town Hall Annex, even at its current height.</p> <p>I fully support the development of the Town Hall Annex as part of the overall regeneration of the area, and to prevent it sitting empty. I should also add that I actually like the current building, which is just as well as I see it so often. However I feel strongly that the proposed roof extension is both out of character with the existing building and detrimental to the views of the historic buildings around it, particularly St Pancras.</p> <p>If the development of the Town Hall Annex is to proceed, then it should be on the basis that: no further height is added to the existing building in order to preserve the views; and that any changes made to the exterior of the building are sympathetic to its original design. I therefore object to Planning Application 2014/7874/P.</p>

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2014/7874/P	Jo Baktis	Apt A 6 Regent Square London WC1H 8HZ	11/02/2015 23:06:33	OBJBOBXI	<p>I write as a local resident in respect of the captioned planning application, for the conversion of the Town Hall Extension into an hotel.</p> <p>The principle of having an hotel on the site is sensible, especially in view of the two major stations across the road and the rapid development of new business and educational communities in the adjacent Kings Cross site. Proposed improvements to the public space around this unlovely building are also to be welcomed.</p> <p>However I wish to object to the application in its current form, on the grounds of the proposed inappropriate increase in the height of the building and the equally inappropriate and rather ugly design of the addition to the top of the building.</p> <p>In its current form, the Town Hall Annexe building is already higher than its immediate neighbours, and looks a little out of place in the context of adjacent buildings on the Euston Road, and very much so in the context of the views of the terraced buildings in Argyle Street behind. The proposed additional floorspace on the top of the building would exacerbate this, and I would argue that the design is totally out of keeping with its surroundings.</p> <p>St Pancras Chambers and Kings Cross Station have both been restored recently at vast expense, and have proved to be a real improvement to the area. They deserve to be seen without the distraction of what looks like a modern pastiche on the roof of the building opposite - which is one of the first things seen by disembarking passengers at Kings Cross and to a less degree, international travellers on Eurostar.</p> <p>Camden's own Site Allocation policy stated that any development should be in "...the context of its surroundings including the scale and form; building, roof and sky lines; and appropriate architectural characteristics of surrounding buildings.."</p> <p>This application seems in no way to meet those criteria.</p>

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2014/7874/P	Andrew Xu	306 St Pancras Chambers Euston Rd London	05/02/2015 12:16:14	OBJ	<p>I am a resident of St. Pancras Chambers and I have been recently made aware of the plans to redevelop and extend the Camden Town Hall Annexe directly opposite my residence. Although I am very much looking forward to the redevelopment, especially the revival of the abandoned garden on the south side, I would like to raise a number of problems that current Planning Application by Crosstree and The Standard could cause to the Grade I listed St. Pancras Chambers, hotel and station as well as the area as a whole.</p> <p>I would like to note that effectively adding two extra floors would only increasingly disproportion the Annexe relative to its surroundings, particularly since the brutalist style of the Annexe already unhealthily contrasts with the mostly four-story tall buildings which surround it. The area is characterized by a number of listed buildings that mostly date from the 19th and early 20th centuries, including the Grade I St Pancras and Kings Cross, as well as the Grade II Town Hall currently adjoining the Annexe. The Camden Site Allocations document from 2013 states that the redeveloped Annexe should “successfully integrate itself with the surrounding townscape and respect the built form and historical context of the immediate area”. I fear that the addition of more stories would be, if anything, destructive to the historical context of the area, especially considering the currently proposed design.</p> <p>There are also a number of more direct problems associated with the Annexe’s expansion. The Annexe currently dominates most of the view from most of the flats and hotel rooms on the south side of St. Pancras Chambers. In the winter months from late November to December, the additional stories could potentially block out 4~5 hours of direct sunlight to the south side of the building. From my vantage point, the sun currently sits right above the Annexe during most of the day in winter, and two additional stories could potentially block out much of it. I could only imagine the potential problem to be worse for the residents and hotel guests on the lower floors of the Chambers.</p> <p>I note Crosstree and The Standard propose that the added two stories should become “hotel dining, lounge and observatory”. This could potentially be invasive to the privacy of residents and hotel guests on the south side of St. Pancras Chambers, since the additional two stories would make the Annexe much taller than the St. Pancras Chambers building, and this would allow patrons of the dining/lounge area to gaze down directly into most of the rooms on the south side of St. Pancras Chambers, especially since the two buildings are already very close. Likewise, I would potentially be able to see very clearly into what would be The Standard’s hotel rooms, since as aforementioned the Annexe dominates my view. This could only be made worse by the plan to install clear glass into the windows, and I could only imagine this to be worse at night when lights on both sides are turned on. The Site Allocations Document states that “a tall building is likely to be unacceptable in this location”, and I am afraid that at a potential 11 stories, the Annexe would inconvenience the entire neighborhood due to its height.</p> <p>I would prefer the Annexe to be demolished, although I understand that this may not be possible. I would like to point out that the proposed redevelopment of the Annexe runs against most of the points listed in the Site Allocations document. I believe that the site would be much more suited to low three-story buildings more respectfully designed to integrate with the area’s listed buildings.</p>

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2014/7874/P	Eileen Jenner	57 Jessel House Judd Street London WC1H 9NU	12/02/2015 10:12:43	COMMEM AIL	<p>I object to planning application 2014/7874/P on the following grounds:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The excessive height of the proposed extension towers over other buildings in the vicinity, particularly the grade 1 listed St. Pancreas Chambers and grade 1 listed Kings Cross station. It is essential that the new building be no higher than it currently is. 2. The proposed roof top extension is extremely ugly and out of character with both the original part of the annexe and other buildings in its immediate vicinity. <p>I strongly urge the Council to refuse this planning application</p>
2014/7874/P	Jane Dutton	4-20 St Pancras PO 23172	12/02/2015 10:34:15	APP	<p>Please do not do this. it would change the nature and character of historic buildings. And depreciate the value of our flats. I am vehemently against it. Please don't Jane Dutton</p>
2014/7874/P	Jane Dutton	4-20 St Pancras PO 23172	12/02/2015 10:34:37	COMMNT	

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2014/7874/P	Jean Dollimore	23 Torriano Cottages NW5 2TA NW5 2TA	10/02/2015 09:24:06	INT	<p>This response to the planning application for Town Hall Extension Argyle Street London WC1H 8NN is from Camden Cycling Campaign (CCC), the local borough group of London Cycling Campaign (LCC). We have over 600 members and represent the interests of cyclists living or working in the borough of Camden.</p> <p>We have consulted our members by email on this issue and this response reflects the views of the membership.</p> <p>There is one very important cycling issue:</p> <p>In order to avoid cycling on the very congested and polluted Euston Road, cyclists need to have an informal way of travelling parallel to the Euston Road on the south side. It is already possible to cycle through Flaxman Terrace and Bidborough Street.</p> <p>There is a potential link from Bidborough Street to Argyle Street through the garden area of the current Town Hall Extension. This would enable the cycle route to continue on to St Chad's Street. We understand this used to be a public thoroughfare before the building of the Town Hall Extension.</p> <p>We therefore request that space should be allocated for a shared use (walking and cycling) path between Argyle Street and Bidborough Street.</p> <p>This should be made available as soon as the council vacates the site, rather than waiting for the development.</p> <p>In addition, we request that you ensure that an appropriate increase in cycle parking to go hand-in-hand with any increase in height.</p> <p>Please would you acknowledge receipt of this response; if you prefer a written submission please let me know. We would be very happy to discuss any aspect of our response.</p> <p>?J ean Dollimore</p> <p>CCC committee</p>

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2014/7874/P	hugh cullum	BCAAC c/o Hugh Cullum Hugh Cullum Architects 61B Judd Street London WC1H 9QT	12/02/2015 15:59:17	OBJ	<p>Response from BCAAC to Camden re: 2014/7874/P Town Hall Extension</p> <p>Statement of Objection</p> <p>Setting</p> <p>This site is in the King's Cross Conservation Area and on the immediate edge of the Bloomsbury Conservation Area. As it is very visible from the latter it comes within the remit of the Bloomsbury Conservation Area Advisory Committee.</p> <p>The existing town hall annexe building is a very prominent element in the context and setting of many Listed buildings, indeed is almost entirely surrounded by them: the Listed terraces to the south (12-36 and 7-19 Argyle Street), the Listed Camden Town Hall to the west, the Grade I listed St Pancras Chambers to the north and the Grade I Listed King's Cross Station to the north-east. This close proximity to the stations, including Eurostar, makes the site internationally significant. For many visitors this building will be their first impression of England.</p> <p>Existing building</p> <p>At one time considered to have a negative impact on the Conservation Area, the merits of this building are now recognised. But there is no doubt that it is a large, bulky building, already straining the site to its capacity, and overly dominating and harmful to views of all the Listed buildings referred to above.</p> <p>Roof extension</p> <p>The existing building earns its place on this important site by the quality of its design, but would lose that entitlement with this inappropriately large and unduly prominent extension on the roof. The proposed extension takes no account of the context and fails to enhance or preserve the settings of all the surrounding Listed buildings and that of the conservation area.</p> <p>The relatively minor improvements brought about by the removal of the stair-tower, in no way compensate for the considerable harm caused by the excessive roof extension. The removal of the stair-tower is an improvement to just one side of the Town Hall and brings little benefit to offer to any of the other Listed buildings. While the removal of the stair-tower provides a slightly better view through to Euston Road from Tonbridge Street it nonetheless removes a useful buffer protecting the backstreets from the noise, pollution and bustle of Euston Road. The stair-tower was designed as an integral element to the Annexe; its removal would leave scars on both the Annexe itself and on the Town Hall, which will need to be modified in some way but which will always show as "repairs". Although it will be a cost to the applicant, its removal would actually provide some additional usable floor space (being the lobby space on each floor giving access to those stairs) which could be used for hotel accommodation.</p> <p>Conclusion</p> <p>In summary The Advisory Committee considers that were this proposal developed it would do considerable harm to the two Conservation Areas and the settings of Listed buildings of outstanding importance. We strongly recommend that this proposal is not granted consent.</p>

Application No: **Consultees Name:** **Consultees Addr:** **Received:** **Comment:** **Response:**

Hugh Cullum
Chairman, Bloomsbury Conservation Area Advisory Committee
February 12th, 2015

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2014/7874/P	Samantha Giles Lane	Apartment 2-12 St Pancras Chambers Euston Road London NW1 2AR	11/02/2015 09:27:43	OBJ	<p>I am a tenant living at Apartment 2-12 of St Pancras Chambers and have been doing so for three years.</p> <p>FYI My landlord, Chris Brennan, who has owned the apartment since the refurbishment, has endorsed my comments.</p> <p>I have been noting the planning application for the Town Hall Extension with interest. I attended one public meeting and was pleased to hear about the plans for the unit not to be demolished, rather repurposed as a boutique hotel.</p> <p>I do have concerns over the traffic and parking issues that may arise, but my main objection is two-fold:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The additional height of the proposed design <p>AND</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 2. The actual proposed design. <p>I address these here:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The additional height of the proposed design is TOO HIGH. From what I can see it appears to represent four further levels and virtually a 50% increase in height! This will block vistas from most angles. This will block light onto St Pancras Chambers (Euston Road side). This will look disproportionate to other buildings along Euston Road. Although some recent planning has increased height along some existing buildings (eg the YHA), they have not blocked any beautiful, Grade 1 listed Victorian Gothic buildings, built to dominate the skyline for centuries. 2. The actual proposed design. Design is always subjective and will always have those who love it and those who hate it with a few neutrals in between. The original building is controversial enough but the addition of the glass and "gold"? arty "thing" at the top is simply outrageous and totally out of kilter with the surrounding area. <p>There have been some controversial (in my opinion wrong) decisions about external design eg the "paint job" on Karpo/Megaro, but at least that can be repainted. The proposed design for the additional floors is wrong, ugly and out of place. Even before you complain about the additional height.</p> <p>I would very strongly like the council to reconsider the planning application in its current form.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> > The building height should NOT be allowed to be increased to this level. Perhaps even it should retain it's original height (inclusive of the plant area). > The additional levels should NOT be stuck on like a design after thought and should be far more sympathetic to the existing structure.

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
					<p>Thank you for your consideration and please do not hesitate to contact me if you would like more information.</p> <p>Also I would like to be informed of the Committee date.</p> <p>Kind regards</p> <p>Sam</p>
2014/7874/P	Juzar Jeevanjee	5.16 St Pancras Chambers	12/02/2015 10:40:14	COMMNT	I think the proposed building design is too high and out of character of the very wonderful conservation area we have.
2014/7874/P	Juzar Jeevanjee	5.16 St Pancras Chambers	12/02/2015 10:40:22	COMMNT	
2014/7874/P	Juzar Jeevanjee	5.16 St Pancras Chambers	12/02/2015 10:41:06	OBJ	

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2014/7874/P	William Duncan Kennedy	Apt. 2.14 St Pancras Chambers Euston Road London UK NW1 2AR	12/02/2015 23:47:16	OBJLETTE R	<p>Dear Camden Council,</p> <p>I am writing with very strong objection to the proposed roof level addition to the Town Hall Extension (THE).</p> <p>My wife (Katherine Bash) and I are owners of two flats in the St Pancras Chambers (apts 2.14 and 2.02). I have been very pleased and impressed with all of the construction projects north of the St Pancras facilities and particularly impressed with the improvements and fresh "transformation" of the Kings Cross station. As an owner and part-time resident (my wife is a resident; I spend much of my time in Texas) of the St. Pancras Chambers, I am constantly amazed at the gravity, rich texture and astounding levels of beauty exhibited by the St. Pancras building. It is a miraculous achievement in architecture, masterful blend of building materials and great achievement of construction. The recent restoration (and continuing improvement) of this London treasure has established a precedent for the area which is proceeding with the very outstanding and attractive development to the north.</p> <p>The THE is a completely different form of building from a different era. Some may appreciate its look and function while others will declare that it is only worthy of destruction. However, the current proposal concerns a roof top "extension" of this building, and to this point I believe the negative attributes far outweigh the positive.</p> <p>PROPORTION: At present, the THE already dominates the adjacent Town Hall, significantly diminishing and overpowering its "sister" building. The THE seems out of place and "clunky" in proportion to the Town Hall and even more so in comparison to the elegant St Pancras. While the existing mass of the THE overpowers the Town Hall, it also seems to threaten the St Pancras. The proposed roof extension to the THE would shift the proportion and mass further away from the prominence of the St Pancras and squarely in favor of the THE. This would be a travesty of grand proportion. The addition of this mass of building block would forever alter the space and communication between the St Pancras and Town Hall Extension, allowing the THE to essentially override and squash the elegant presence of the St Pancras with a hulk of insensitive domination.</p> <p>STYLE: The proposed roof extension to the THE does not appear to clearly compliment or maintain consistency with the existing structure. Its contrast in materials, color and shape would draw even more attention to itself and further beg the question: why? Once again, with the proposed extension the THE would secure a prominence and "voice" in stark obnoxious contrast to the surrounding classic buildings and seem like a loud bully in a nice pleasant playground.</p> <p>VIEW: The existing eight story THE already dominates the southern view for much of the St Pancras Chambers residences. The proposed extension would further dominate (by an additional 50%!) the view and, in my view, strongly diminish our quality of life in this respect. In contrast, I'm sure the THE over-nighters would thoroughly their view of the St Pancras, Kings Cross, and the variety of excellent new buildings rising to the north.</p> <p>CONFLICT: I can not help but be highly concerned about the obvious conflict that appears to exist in</p>

Application No: **Consultees Name:** **Consultees Addr:** **Received:** **Comment:** **Response:**

this specific approval process. Am I correct in understanding that the Camden Council has sold the Town Hall Extension to Crosstree, and now Crosstree is seeking approval from Camden Council for this roof extension? If this is even vaguely correct then an obvious conflict of interest exists and Camden Council should clearly abstain from this process.

From all definition and description I have read on this proposal, it seems abundantly clear that the proposed roof extension to the Town Hall Extension would not be a positive compliment, in any obvious way, to the offset buildings and aesthetic of the area. The only "winner" in this proposal would be the owners of the THE. The proposed massive clunky cubical eyesore would plop down into a wonderful rising neighborhood of fine aesthetic. The view from their windows superb and refined while our view diminished and degraded.

I believe the proposed roof extension to the Town Hall Extension would be highly detrimental to the area and strongly oppose its approval. In addition, the parties involved in this proposal appear to have a clear conflict of interest which brings this entire process into question. This specific proposal and process should be subject to the highest scrutiny.

For your consideration with best regards,

W Duncan Kennedy
 Apt 2.14 St Pancras Chambers
 Euston Road
 London NW1 2AR

2014/7874/P	A N Young	61 Sandwich House Sandwich Street WC1H 9PP	12/02/2015 23:01:10	COMMNT	I have lived in the area off Judd Street for almost 40 years now and have appreciated the improvement in the local environment over this time. It is therefore a source of great regret to me that the quality of the renovation of the Town Hall extension is so poor. The site is a sensitive one, being adjacent to the listed St Pancras and King's Cross stations and Camden's main Town Hall. The addition of the top floors for the proposed new hotel is out of scale with the surrounding buildings, in addition to being out of character with the largely domestic feel of the area south of Euston Road. The view east along Euston Road with the stations on the left clearly shows what damage this building will do to the unique architectural ensemble of the two grand stations and the new forecourt to King's Cross rail station. If this building is allowed to go forward in its currently proposed state it will negate much of the improvements seen with the renovation of the stations and the surrounding public realm. It should be refused planning permission in its current state.
-------------	-----------	--	---------------------	--------	---

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2014/7874/P	Eileen Jenner	57 Jessel House Judd Street London WC1H 9NU	12/02/2015 10:12:21	COMMEM AIL	<p>I object to planning application 2014/7874/P on the following grounds:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none">1. The excessive height of the proposed extension towers over other buildings in the vicinity, particularly the grade 1 listed St. Pancreas Chambers and grade 1 listed Kings Cross station. It is essential that the new building be no higher than it currently is.2. The proposed roof top extension is extremely ugly and out of character with both the original part of the annexe and other buildings in its immediate vicinity. <p>I strongly urge the Council to refuse this planning application</p>

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2014/7874/P	Yazann Romahi	Apt 5-21 St Pancras Chambers Euston Road NW1 2AR	12/02/2015 01:14:52	OBJ	<p>To whom it may concern</p> <p>As a resident in St Pancras chambers, I have recently come across the development plans at the former Camden council site and would like to object most strongly to this eyesore.</p> <p>Of course, I am not against development of the Town Hall Annexe per-se; and would be more than happy to support appropriate proposals if they preserved the special character of the area. However, given the various heritage buildings in the area, I think it is very clear to anyone that this proposal is very damaging to the character of the area. Most importantly the added height makes the building especially imposing compared to its surrounding buildings and detracts from one of the most spectacular buildings in London - the Grade 1 listed St Pancras. The meticulousness with which the restoration of St Pancras stands in sharp contrast to the callous nature of this proposal. This proposal is particularly inappropriate given the high density of heritage buildings in the area: in addition to St Pancras Chambers and Station (Grade 1 listed), we have Kings Cross Station (Grade 1); Camden Town Hall (Grade 2 and adjoining the application site); listed buildings to the side and rear at Argyle Street etc. It is imperative that the setting of this important concentration of heritage buildings is not damaged and that the character and appearance of the area is enhanced and not eroded.</p> <p>It is a widely held view that the one local blot in the area has always been the Town Hall Annexe. It is out of context in terms of height, in terms of design, and detracts considerably from the special character of the surroundings.</p> <p>I would of course, strongly prefer for the building to be demolished entirely and be replaced with a building designed to relate appropriately to its context and sensitive heritage setting in terms of height, massing, design etc.</p> <p>This application is I believe, a significant lost opportunity to improve the townscape and setting of the area.</p> <p>If the building cannot be redeveloped, then it should certainly not be made larger. The extension would draw greater attention to an ugly building; and it would be even more overbearing on the adjacent listed Town Hall and St Pancras Chambers opposite (and other listed buildings).</p> <p>While extending the building is itself folly, extending it with a "golden crown" is simply incomprehensible in its lack of style.</p> <p>I would just like to summarise by saying that I am not averse to development but am keen that any development is appropriate to the heritage of the area. This proposal does not meet this requirement and the height addition is significantly harmful to the area.</p>

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2014/7874/P	Katherine E. Bash	Apartment 2-14 St. Pancras Chambers Euston Road London NW1 2AR	11/02/2015 13:39:27	PETITNOBJ E	Dear Readers and Deciders of this most impactful of planning applications, I have lived in London since 2006 and completed my PhD at the Bartlett School of Architecture, UCL in 2011. In that time, I have been a resident of Bloomsbury since 2006, resident at St. Pancras Chambers since 2011, and a leaseholder of Apt. 2-14 since 2012, and a leaseholder of Apt. 2-02 since December 2014 (just a few months), hence I have a strong relationship to and with this neighborhood and buildings.

When it was time to move from my wonderful accommodation on Mecklenburgh Square in 2011, we could find no other neighborhood that had such a special and unique feel; not Chelsea, not Fulham, not Kensington. The combination of a kind of gritty openness, Grade 1 and II listed buildings, transport networks and libraries, in addition to the small but multiple green spaces, these are some of the details that make this area special to me.

Though I had my reservations about the development north of the station, I am continually impressed with the care that has been taken to weave the new in with the existing, to bring the history of the buildings into the present, without making a blight of the whole area. Friends whose relatives were part of the planning process assured me of the integrity of the planning process.

As I mentioned, having lived at St. Pancras Chambers for three years, we decided to purchase 2-02 to function as my artist/writer studio and showroom. It is south facing and will be directly impacted by any re-development of the Town Hall Annexe.

For this, in addition to the other justifications for my position listed above, I have strong objections to the current proposal and hope to give you further insight as to my own views, in hopes that it will give you better appreciation some of the impacts of what is being currently put forth, not only on my own particular situation, but on the entire area of redevelopment.

So, I live in the Grade 1 Listed St. Pancras Chambers, that was painstakingly redeveloped by Manhattan Loft Corporation. Any further work that we do in our apartments are likewise extremely costly endeavors as there is such great importance of maintaining the integrity of the building and respecting its status. We spent great sums of money to "simply" draft proof the windows, without resorting to double glazing that would most certainly effect our views out of the window onto the Camden Town Hall. This is one small step to help retain the local heritage of the area, and one that as stewards of these two beautiful apartments, I am very proud of.

Looking left out of my windows in 2-02, I see the current Town Hall Annexe; it is rather sad and empty. It also sits at the very head of the whole area as it is the southern tip of the major areas of redevelopment. St. Pancras right now holds a very strong position and anchor, as its spires reach to the sky, but the current proposal will have the effect of shifting the visual emphasis to a building that not only is not listed, but is also already an example of the brutalist architecture that, in my view, should either be improved with care, or rebuilt completely.

For example, I walked by Westminster Kingsway and was sensorially abused by the building that was eventually torn down and replaced by the current building that fits in pleasingly. In addition, the

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

Comment: **Response:**

building that sits at the corner of Cartwright Gardens and Euston Road, similarly a sensory blight, was rather impressively re-developed in a way that is likewise fitting.

Now, to address the Town Hall Annexe: certainly it needs redevelopment, however, it is so important that the redevelopment weave into all of the existing efforts to make this both a local/global hub. At present, the materials, design, shape, and large presence are already very strong and leave the taste of dollops of meat found in a beautifully brewed tea. If the building is redeveloped without taking the building down, it certainly should not be made bigger: why put more chunks of stale meat into a beautiful tea, when we could simply strain them out and be left with just a funny aftertaste, but at least have the opportunity to drink the tea? Adding four more floors to this building is for me the equivalent of the said invasion of such meat into our tea.

As in the metaphor, the meat has nothing to do with tea, and if it is to be taken with tea, it should be housed in the appropriate container (bread, perhaps) and not be placed into the tea, but set along side, to be eaten when appropriate. In a sort of similar way, brutalist buildings farther afield from the direct area of development work in a way that while not making the area gorgeous, it is fine, taken in bites.

What is being proposed here, is to turn the Town Hall Annexe into the visual crown of the whole development. This is most certainly what 4 stories would do to the building that I can see looking to my left. In addition to blocking the sky on the left of my view, I would be looking at a box that does not relate to the area. Whilst the people inside that box get to benefit from the view of our building, and benefit from the enormous expense of re-developing and leaseholding, we will get to look at this grainy piece of meat floating in our tea.

On top of the Camden Town Hall there is a glass extension that has been delicately designed. As I am sure you know, curves are much more expensive than straight lines, and though I do not know the history of this greenhouse type space, I can see that care and expense were taken to mimic some of the flavour of the building just opposite it: the St. Pancras. So, while in my living room, I can look at the curves on the windows and see how it mimics the curves of this glass extension and marvel at the care that was taken to make sure it fit in.

In quite striking contrast, the block being proposed to top an already large and out of place building, will not echo the details that have been already restored and that make up the fabric of this neighborhood.

Further, when a visitor arrives on the Eurostar, for example, they do not see the facade of the St. Pancras, they will emerge to this building, the stringy piece of meat, perhaps obscuring attention that could be turned back and around.

Whilst the visitors to this hotel will get all of the benefit of viewing the whole development, we will get the punishment of this blight that would stand way above anything in its immediate vicinity. It seems incredulous that just because the building itself is not listed, that it could be redeveloped in such a way that would ignore in total the context of the neighborhood and its local fabric, for a development for

Application No: **Consultees Name:** **Consultees Addr:** **Received:** **Comment:** **Response:**

people who are transient: visitors to the hotel.

The re-development of the Town Hall Annexe is as important as the redevelopment of each of the surrounding buildings: the improvement to Kings Cross, St. Pancras, etc. This building, once a local Camden Centre and library, provides a wonderful re-development opportunity to bring to the area a setting that is consistent with the heritage, or at least not an insult, to bring further residences, etc. There is so much more than can be done that is being proposed at present.

Please please do not support this application that is most certain to drop stringy pieces of stale meat into the beautifully brewed tea, in which so many people and so much money has already played a part.

Who could really say that tea is better with meat in it. Let's leave it in some sandwiches on the side where it belongs, and let's take in this marvelous place and beautiful context.

Thank you very much for your kind attention and understanding and for taking the appropriate measures for positive future impacts.

With kind regards,
Katherine E. Bash.

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2014/7874/P	Peter Tompkins	5-01 St Pancras Chambers Euston Road NW1 2AR NW1 2AR	11/02/2015 23:23:49	OBJ	<p>Height of the Building</p> <p>My main focus is and always has been on the height and bulk of the converted building. This was a subject considered in depth as part of the Planning Inspectorate's review of the Site Allocations Document which was adopted in September 2013.</p> <p>The guidance is specific in relation to this Site 2 of the Site Allocations Local Development Document .</p> <p>“Development will be expected to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Where demolition is proposed be an architecturally excellent building which contributes positively to its sensitive location • Fully appreciate and respect the setting of the Grade I listed St Pancras and King's Cross stations and Grade II listed Town Hall and nearby listed terraced housing • Facilitate the planned reprovision of Council offices, facilities and library accommodation • Provide appropriately designed active frontages and positively enhance the townscape of Euston Road • Maintain and enhance the pedestrian route through to Tonbridge Street • Contribute towards an improved public realm and streetscape which responds to the other streetscape and public space improvements around King's Cross • Provide infrastructure for supporting local energy generation” <p>And the Site Allocations Document confirms that</p> <p>“New development is likely to be acceptable where it (amongst other design considerations):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - successfully integrates itself with the surrounding townscape and respects the built form and historic context of the immediate area - respects and appreciably improves the setting of, and relationship with, the adjacent Town Hall - is appreciably sensitive and respectful in scale and form to its relationship with the important landmark of St Pancras Chambers, and its wider setting - positively contributes to improving pedestrian permeability and accessibility - positively responds to, and respects the context of ,its surroundings including public spaces , residential amenity, and the adjacent school - positively responds to and respects the context of its surroundings including the scale and form; building ,roof and sky lines; and appropriate architectural characteristics of surrounding buildings; - redresses the design, scale and massing shortcomings of the existing building and appreciably improves on the streetscape, particularly at street level - respects and enhances existing important views ,or assists in revealing new views, of the important landmark of St Pancras Chambers and its towers and spire <p>In view of these constraints and considerations a tall building is likely to be unacceptable in this location. “</p>

Application No: **Consultees Name:** **Consultees Addr:** **Received:****Comment:** **Response:**

I draw attention to the highly misleading and inaccurate Townscape and Visual Impact Assessment from Tavernor AVRLondon which purports to address the Camden Site Allocations Local Development Document (LDD) at paragraphs 3.26 to 3.30. Correctly, Tavernor AVRLondon recognise that the LDD forms part of the Local Development Framework. At paragraph 3.27 and 3.28 they repeat the extracts which I have included above – but notably omitting the crucial final sentence which Camden inserted following the Inspector’s opinion that the unacceptability of a tall building should be recorded. I had made representations to the Inspector at the January 2013 hearings on the draft document.

Tavernor AVRLondon report at paragraph 3.30 the Council’s views expressed to the Inspector which are that “The Council, who own the site, believe that the policy should be flexible enough to allow for creative design solutions. They say that a building higher than the existing could be acceptable, for example, on an area of the site if it is part of a high quality design solution that reduces the overall bulk and visual impact of the existing building. I can see some merit in this approach.”

The key comment of the inspector here was that there could be merit in a building higher than the existing if it is part of a solution that “reduces the overall bulk and visual impact of the existing building.” This Planning Application does nothing of the kind; indeed, it expands the visual impact of the existing building hugely. The key responsibility of planning in relation to listed buildings is to follow the requirement of Section 66 of the Listed Building and Conservation Areas Act 1990. To be approved the application should preserve or enhance the setting of listed buildings by reference to the setting of those listed buildings following the principle set out in the Barnwell Manor case.

I note that the visualisations made by Tavernor AVRLondon include a large variety of locations both in front of and behind the Annexe and further along Euston Road. They do not include any visualisation from St Pancras Chambers where I live. This is in complete contradiction to the requirement of the LDD which specifies that the building must be “appreciably sensitive and respectful in scale and form to its relationship with the important landmark of St Pancras Chambers.” It is clear to me that a visualisation from St Pancras Chambers would demonstrate the overbearing nature of the proposed increase in height and its disrespect to St Pancras Chambers.

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2014/7874/P	Pino & Carolyn De Rosa	Apartment 5.11 St Pancras Chambers Euston Road NW1 2AR	11/02/2015 22:26:51	OBJEMPER	<p>Dear Sir</p> <p>Ref : Planning Application - 2014/7874/P</p> <p>I am writing to you to raise my concerns about the impact that this planning application will have on myself and my family who own apartment 5.11 on the 5th Floor of St Pancras Chambers overlooking the Euston Road towards the Town Hall annexe.</p> <p>My family and I bought our apartment off plan on the 27th of April 2005 and have been resident in St Pancras Chambers since 2009. We chose this property because I am a railway civil engineer who is passionate about both maintaining and restoring railway heritage as well as looking to leave legacy buildings for the future. We were attracted to the vision that was articulated for what was at the time a dilapidated building, and the sympathetic way that St Pancras Chambers has been restored on the exterior in keeping with its railway heritage, whilst providing a modern interior design suitable for family living. The apartment was also selected because it was above the noise at street level, for its spectacular view across London's skyline and the quality of light at the 5th floor level which would be lost if this development goes ahead at the proposed scale.</p> <p>We have been delighted by the way Network Rail have both sympathetically restored and modernised the re-development of Kings Cross station which we believe has been a great addition to the general area. While we are not against the re-development of the Town Hall Annexe building per se, we are concerned that these proposals are not sympathetic to the area due to their scale and unsympathetic design in conjunction with adjacent buildings and mixed use of materials. In our view, demolition of the existing building and a brand new development designed in keeping with both the existing heritage and listed buildings together with the modern approach taken for Kings Cross station would be adding to the architectural legacy of the area rather than dominating it!</p> <p>Although visual impact diagrams have been provided for a number aspects of this proposed new building, the visual impact of this design on St Pancras Chambers and on its residents has not been properly considered and we strongly believe this proposal will both detract from the visual impact of St Pancras Chambers and have a detrimental effect on the light and view from any apartments facing on to the Euston Road.</p> <p>In summary, we object to the proposal in its current form and would ask that planning office seek alternative proposals that may include demolition and a design of new construction that stands no taller than the original town hall or at least to reduce the vertical height of the proposed extension to align with neighboring properties to reduce impact on the skyline.</p> <p>Pino & Carolyn De Rosa</p>

2014/7874/P	Pino & Carolyn De Rosa	Apartment 5.11 St Pancras Chambers Euston Road NW1 2AR	11/02/2015 22:19:42	OBJEMPER
-------------	---------------------------	--	---------------------	----------

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2014/7874/P	alan hines	24 Jessel House Judd Street WC1H 9NX	11/02/2015 20:12:06	COMMEMP ER	I wish to object to the application to re-develop the Town Hall Extension. My objection is to the proposed increase in height of the building, made worse by the unfortunate style of the proposed upward extension, which is out of keeping with the rest of the building and with the rest of the vista along the main road. It is detrimental to the surrounding listed buildings. On Sunday I stood outside the western end of the St Pancras Hotel, looking east. The sweep of the redbrick facade of the hotel is truly stunning - one of the sights of London. Unfortunately the proposed development will raise the annexe to significantly higher than the redbrick facade of the hotel. It will dominate the view and be detrimental to it. I believe it is essential that the development is no higher than it currently is, and ask that the Council reject the application.
2014/7874/P	Leah Dixon	28 Pioneer House 46 Britannia street London WC1X 9JH	11/02/2015 19:13:19	OBJ	I do not want this building to be extended on the roof. It needs to remain the same height in keeping with the rest of the area. If it is built up it will set a precedent and the rest of Euston road will become sky scrapers. There is a primary school right behind this building and it is a conservation area. Kings Cross residents need to be respected over profit for this hotel.