

---

**From:** Fowler, David  
**Sent:** 16 April 2015 13:39  
**To:** Planning  
**Subject:** FW: Town Hall Annexe

Please upload.

D

David Fowler  
Principal Planning Officer

Telephone: 0207 974 2123

---

**From:** Alice Eggeling [mailto: ]  
**Sent:** 15 April 2015 11:33  
**To:** Johnson, Heather (Councillor); Freeman, Roger (Councillor); Apak, Meric (Councillor); Beales, Danny (Councillor); Harrison, Adam (Councillor); Headlam-Wells, Jenny (Councillor); Jones, Phil (Councillor); Leyland, Claire-Louise (Councillor); Olszewski, Richard (Councillor); Pietragnoli, Lazzaro (Councillor); Rea, Flick (Councillor); Rosenberg, Phil (Councillor); Shah, Nadia (Councillor); Stark, Stephen (Councillor); Vincent, Sue (Councillor); Wood, Abi (Councillor); Fowler, David  
**Subject:** Town Hall Annexe

Application 2014/7874/P - The Town Hall Annexe

Dear Councillor

It is with utmost horror and fear that I have been made aware of a planning application going to the Development Control Committee tomorrow night. I live in Cromer House, Cromer Street, part of the Edwardian flats that make up the Hillview Estate in your ward.

We're a mixed community of races, faiths, social and market rents living harmoniously, sharing a courtyard (with Whidborne House) and making a home together. In short, we're a Camden success story, representing what makes a mixed community strong. My six year old daughter goes to Argyle School between our flats and the former Camden Town Hall Annexe. The school is another community success story. We may not be the most advantaged nor wealthy community but we value our homes and our school and what we can do together.

Many of my neighbours are of Bangladeshi origin and some of them do not feel confident in dealing with paperwork and the Council, which is why a neighbour stopped me in some distress to ask me about the Council Building extension, which I didn't know about.

I am in favour of reuse of this building and a hotel seems a sensible option, provided it doesn't impact the school and generate noise complaints from the tiny playground which is directly adjacent (they have nowhere else to play).

However, it is with absolute horror that I note that the Town Hall Annexe is to have two additional stories added, blotting out our connection with St Pancras Clock and our only sky gap, darkening

our shared courtyard (our only amenity space, we don't have balconies) and looming over the school.

We may not have a right to a view, but the St Pancras Clock is more than an historic landmark, it's a symbol of our community, it connects us to our location and it's a friendly and valued landmark for those of us that live beneath it. The new floors will block off this long-standing connection to the Edwardian flats. My neighbour mentioned this in front of our daughters, both of whom became very distressed at the loss of the glimpse of sky from their bedrooms. Worse, this is our only 'sky gap' our only visible connection to the sky above us from our home in a built up but relatively human scale environment as we look North, towards across the school to the town hall annexe.

This blocking out of the sky gap will have terrible implications for the courtyard at the centre of our flats, shared by around 100 homes; an issue that has not been considered at all in the Officer's Report. Certainly no one has been into our courtyard or my building to evaluate the impact. This is a material consideration which has been grievously omitted.

The Town Hall Annexe is a brutalism building of its time. I do not object to its appearance; it may stick out like a sore thumb in a sea of red brick buildings that originally formed connected with St.Pancras but it represents post-war Britain and the aspirations of the time. It's an important part of the story and those that approved it can be forgiven as we understand their motivations for social improvement. However, we've evolved since then. We understand setting and context, we understand impact and visual setting. We understand the importance of maintaining a sense of place and identity for communities. Councillors will not be considered in such a forgiving light in the future if the proposal is approved. This is not about symbolising social change, it's maximising development at the cost of community benefit. It's unnecessary, unneighbourly and impacts a strong, if humble community living directly beneath it.

The additional floors are not necessary. They're very ugly and cut off a community from its sense of place. They cut off our light and will overwhelm us in a dominating, unneighbourly way. They will loom over our shared courtyard, block off light to most of the bedrooms in Cromer House (mostly North facing), certainly both of the bedrooms in my North facing flat.

I'm not ashamed to admit that I'm very anxious, very distressed. I'm just a single voice with my upset neighbours, many of whom I suspect, don't know about it. It will very much impact my quality of life and that of my daughter at home and at school. She won't be able to escape the shadow of it, literally.

I am not objecting to conversion and some subsequent changes of appearance but this is too much and I implore you to represent us and be brave as Councillors to reject this iteration and ask the developer's to come back with a less obtrusive design.

Camden need to be bold and not cowed by the threat of appeal. It's a scheme I'd be more than happy to make representations against the scheme to an Inspector. Given its appearance from our home, I think we'd have a strong case.

In any event I'm especially worried that the impact to our community has not been considered, it's a material consideration that has not been given weight.

I'm also concerned at the very vague treatment of the undercroft link between Tonbridge Street and Euston Road, a vital link for many parents dropping children off at Argyle School and our nearest link to bus services on Euston Road for many residents, most of us not having access to private vehicles. As private land, a future developer could close this off or restrict it whatever assurances are given at planning stage. The S106 references are quite vague and I think the

planners can do better, it leaves too much wiggle room for the developers who are bound, like all reasonable companies, to reduce costs. It's an easy one to reduce.

Whilst I appreciate that the Council may want to see the building to the developer quickly and gain maximum value, please do not sell this off at the expense of good design and at the cost of the local residents who live in the shadow of the building. The project can be done, but the additional floors will blight our lives.

Please assist me and my fellow residents, many of whom do not have English as a first language and are unable or underconfident to engage with formal processes, to refuse this application and request a second, better design.

Local Resident,

**Alice Eggeling**  
**9 Cromer House, Cromer Street, WC1H 8DB**