

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2015/6955/P	mr william j reid	56 holsworthy square elm street	30/01/2016 10:33:10	COMMNT	I am William j reid,I live next door to panther house. I want to know,just now I have a noise coming into my flat 6 years and 1 month. I would object to any air conditioning units on any of those developments. they are noisy.also that it would be higher than holsworthy square and take away any light.I am the top flat on the corner.

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2015/6955/P	David Moore	55A Gray's Inn Road WC1X 8PP London	29/01/2016 10:37:00	OBJNOT	<p>OBJECTION TO APPLICATION 2015/6955/P 156-164 Gray's Inn Road/Panther House</p> <p>I wish to lodge an additional objection letter detailing where this application fails to meet key planning policies. I object to this development for the following reasons:</p> <p>Height, Bulk, Material and Massing:</p> <p>The bulk, height and mass of the proposed new buildings will create an overbearing development which, at 7 storeys, will be taller than any other building in this part of Gray's Inn Road. The relief and sunlight provided by the current two to three storey buildings that are proposed for demolition are essential to the vibrant and open nature of the street and account for the success of the area, which hosts a surprising number and variety of small businesses. The breathing space provided by the lower height of these buildings are the essence of this part of Gray's Inn Road and also provide the benefit of sunlight and daylight to properties on the opposite side of the road.</p> <p>The proposed scheme is too large for the plot and too tall in context with its neighbouring buildings. If a development is to take place it should be constrained to the height of the existing buildings. This would solve many, though not all, of the problems associated with the development, and would also save the historic Gillette sign, the loss of which would harm the character and history of the area.</p> <p>The additions to Brain Yard and Panther House are too bulky and add too much mass to the rear on Mount Pleasant, with a significant reduction in outdoor space and a general over-intensification of the site.</p> <p>The proposal to use concrete in this historic red brick street is astonishingly insensitive and entirely inappropriate and out of keeping with the character of the Conservation Area. The predominant and appropriate material is brick, particularly red brick including London Stock. A concrete residential development would be cold, deadening, imposing and unattractive. The glass and steel proposal for the offices at the rear are equally uninteresting.</p> <p>Impact on Sunlight and Daylight to Surrounding Properties:</p> <p>The sunlight & daylight report prepared by the applicant outlines the negative impact to many windows surrounding the development. The report admits there will be numerous transgressions from BRE as a result of the development. 165 or 21% of the windows surrounding the scheme suffer a BRE loss under Vertical Sky Component tests and 14% of the windows under the No Sky Line tests. Given the widespread negative impact of the scheme the loss of sunlight and daylight to the current community should be considered so great as to outweigh any benefit from the scheme.</p> <p>Perhaps the most severe loss of light is suffered by my property at 55 Gray's Inn Road, in which all windows are negatively impacted and none will meet BRE guidelines. As all the rooms affected are either living rooms or bedrooms the quality of living in my property will be substantially worsened and I will lose all morning sunlight into my house. At 7 stories the proposal will overshadow my property,</p>

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

Comment: **Response:**

darkening it throughout the day and causing the complete loss of the morning sunlight that has historically been enjoyed by all the street-facing rooms in this listed building. In addition the proposed new residences opposite will cause me to suffer a loss of privacy.

It is not only my dwelling that will lose light on the western side of Gray's Inn Road. Certainly all my neighbours – numbers 57, 51-53, 49, 47 and 45 Gray's Inn Road – will suffer significant loss of daylight and sunlight. All these buildings comprise multiple flats and so the total number of people affected is large. In addition, the blocks of flats on the other side of the scheme, along Mount Pleasant and Elm Street, which must house several hundred people, will also suffer severe loss of daylight and sunlight, in their case they will lose the afternoon sunlight that they have historically enjoyed. This scheme is simply too overbearing and its impact on daylight to surrounding properties is against the public good and is unacceptable.

I consider this to be a failing with regard to Camden's Core Strategy Policy CS5 (d): Protecting and enhancing our environment and heritage and the amenity and quality of life of local communities and CS5 (e): The Council will protect the amenity of Camden's residents and those working in and visiting the borough by: e) making sure that the impact of developments on their occupiers and neighbours is fully considered.

In this regard the proposal wholly fails to meet policy DP 26: Managing the Impact of Development on Occupiers and Neighbours, which states that the Council will protect the quality of life of occupiers and neighbours by only granting permission for development that does not cause harm to amenity. The factors to consider include: a) visual privacy and overlooking; b) overshadowing and outlook; c) sunlight, daylight and artificial light levels. My objection clearly highlights the general overbearing nature of the scheme and the consequent wide-scale negative impact on neighbours in terms of overshadowing and sunlight and daylight.

The developers have sought to justify this massive loss of amenity to the local residents by introducing the notion that local residents who currently enjoy sunlight have more of it than is typical in a central London setting, and therefore this gives the developers the right to take it away and reduce the daylight to what they, the developers, think more appropriate. This is a spurious and deeply arrogant argument. It fails to acknowledge that the residents acquired or rented their properties with that amenity in place, and almost certainly compromised on some other amenity in order to obtain the amenity of the sunlight. This compromise might have been in price/rent, or perhaps the negative aspect of living above a very busy street, or some other thing. The argument also suggests that they, the developers, know what level of amenity should be enjoyed by central London residents and wherever a slightly higher level of a specific amenity is present they have the right to take it away and profit from it. The argument implies that this process will continue until all the positive aspects of living in central London have been removed by developers and every resident has been reduced to some uniform and minimal level of amenity.

Negative impact to Streetscape and Conservation Area and on the Setting of Grade II listed Building at 55 Gray's Inn Road:

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

The proposal is out of character with the Hatton Garden Conservation area. More detailed points are made very clearly by Historic England who highlight the quality of the existing architecture and who oppose the application.

The proposal will dominate and overbear the important Grade II listed building at 55 Gray's Inn Road, which dates from around 1714 and which comprises a shopfront for a restaurant and dwelling above. This building is the last survivor of the original row of terraced houses that were constructed here as the urban area began its northward expansion in the very early Georgian period. At present the context provides low rise buildings of appropriate scale and building material which sit well with the listed house at No 55 on the opposite side of the road.

The size, materials and design of the new proposal are inappropriate, overbearing and out of context, and will significantly damage the setting and heritage value of the listed dwelling.

The site itself currently has a range of different buildings which work together to create a unique and lively urban context and which host a range of different employment uses and also show off the historic Gillette advertisement. The proposal threatens the loss of all of this architecture and proposes a scheme which does not add value to nor sit well within the Conservation Area.

Number 160 Gray's Inn Road is a 1920s building with much character and interesting mouldings on the frontage. The compromise proposed by this developer, of casting the exterior in concrete and then building a modern, concrete development alongside, is a mockery which does nothing to preserve the interesting nature of the building. The overly large concrete building proposed above the façade of No 160 will visually crush the façade, destroy any remaining character, and have no relationship to the neighbouring and very handsome red brick mansion blocks on either side. This will be to the great detriment of the Conservation Area.

Number 156, proposed for complete demolition, is a very attractive arts and crafts style building dating from the early c20th which adds greatly to the architectural value and interest of the area. The loss of this delightful historic building would be an irreversible tragedy.

To the rear the attractive Victorian industrial brick Panther House, so quintessentially representative of the Hatton Garden Conservation Area, would be replaced by a large glass and steel office development, with a hugely negative impact on Mount Pleasant. It will utterly fail to add value to the Conservation Area.

The scheme proposes a pedestrian route under the new frontage through the redeveloped Brain Yard to Mount Pleasant but this route is of poor quality: it has little function; its entrance will give the appearance of being private; and it will not be accessible 24/7 so it will create a gated community where there is currently none and a potentially unsafe route when it is open. It will contribute nothing to the character of the Conservation Area where the existing buildings are back to back but create usable courtyards on each side. Furthermore it will not add value to the historic road layout as described in the

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

Comment: **Response:**

Hatton Garden Conservation Area Statement in section 5.4-5.10.

The scheme fails to respond to the requirements of high-quality design as sought by NPPF paragraph 58 which requires schemes to respond to local character and history, and reflect the identity of local surroundings and materials, while not preventing nor discouraging appropriate innovation. Instead here the attempt to fossilise a delightful building in concrete as an excuse to massively increase its volume is entirely inappropriate in this Conservation Area and opposite a listed building.

These comments regarding design, impact on a listed building and impact on a conservation area & existing heritage demonstrate how completely the proposal fails to meet Camden's Core Strategy Policy CS14: Promoting high quality places and conserving our heritage by:

- a) requiring development of the highest standard of design that respects local context and character;
- b) preserving and enhancing Camden's rich and diverse heritage assets and their settings, including conservation areas, listed buildings, archaeological remains, scheduled ancient monuments and historic parks and gardens;
- c) promoting high quality landscaping and works to streets and public spaces;
- d) seeking the highest standards of access in all buildings and places and requiring schemes to be designed to be inclusive and accessible.

The design also fails to meet Policy DP 24: Securing high quality design, which states that the Council will require all developments, including alterations and extensions to existing buildings, to be of the highest standard of design and will expect developments to consider:

- a) character, setting, context and the form and scale of neighbouring buildings;
- b) the character and proportions of the existing building, where alterations and extensions are proposed;
- c) the quality of materials to be used;
- d) the provision of visually interesting frontages at street level.

Nor does it meet Policy DP25 which seeks to conserve Heritage including within Conservation Areas and to Listed Buildings.

Loss of Employment and Loss of Creative Community:

This scheme will lead to the loss of much affordable and varied employment space including small independent traders in Brain Yard, the units on Gray's Inn Road and around 100 SMEs and artists' studios in Panther House. The loss of employment will be among independent and small businesses and the new office space will not be targeted at these more vulnerable and smaller scale businesses. Instead of delivering the NPPF requirement to build a strong economy this scheme eliminates an existing strong and varied economic community and does not re-provide for it, thus going against NPPF paragraphs 21 and 23. Increasingly these small-scale creative and innovative enterprises are being forced out of central London, to the great detriment of the local and national economy.

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

Comment: **Response:**

I consider this to be a failing with regard to Camden's Core Strategy Policy CS5 (d): Protecting and enhancing our environment and heritage and the amenity and quality of life of local communities. It also fails to meet Policy CS 7 (g): Protecting and promoting small and independent shops, and resisting the loss of shops where this would cause harm to the character and function of a centre; and also policy CS 8 b): Support Camden's industries by: safeguarding existing employment sites and premises in the borough that meet the needs of modern industry and other employers; c) expect a mix of employment facilities and types, including the provision of facilities suitable for small and medium sized enterprises, such as managed, affordable workspace; and f) recognise the importance of other employment generating uses, including retail, markets, leisure, education, tourism and health.

It also fails to meet Development Policy DP 10: Helping and promoting small and independent shops, such as the shops, café, tailor and many others currently on the site who will lose their premises and be unable to secure new ones in the locality. It also fails policy DP13 which states that the Council will retain land and buildings that are suitable for continued business use and will resist a change to non-business unless: a) it can be demonstrated to the Council's satisfaction that a site or building is no longer suitable for its existing business use; and b) there is evidence that the possibility of retaining, reusing or redeveloping the site or building for similar or alternative business use has been fully explored over an appropriate period of time.

Poor Quality of Residential Dwellings Proposed:

This very large development offers 13 residential units (12 additional units), all of which will be market priced with no affordable housing contribution whatsoever. The supply of affordable housing is possibly London's most pressing need and to not contribute to this aspect in a major scheme is contrary to all current planning policy. In addition this market housing is being created through the loss of affordable and flexible workplaces. The scheme as a whole does nothing to support communities in need in London.

I consider this to be a failing with regard to Camden's Core Strategy Policy CS6 which states that the Council will aim to secure high quality affordable housing for Camden households that are unable to access market housing by g) seeking to negotiate a contribution from specific proposals on the basis of: – the maximum reasonable amount of affordable housing under the specific circumstances of the site, including the financial viability of the development, – an affordable housing target of 50% of the total addition to housing floor-space, and guidelines of 60% social rented housing and 40% intermediate affordable housing. It fails to meet the Development Plan Policy DP3 which seeks contributions to affordable housing. It fails to provide a mix and range of housing including affordable housing as required by NPPF paragraphs 47 and 50.

If an off-site contribution is negotiated in the s106 it will likely fail to support actual need as it will probably not be of a sufficiently high value to deliver new units in Camden.

The design of the residential units proposed is poor as they fail to meet open space standards and do not provide quality outdoor space. Instead there is a cramped hard landscaping that falls below space

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

Comment: **Response:**

standards and is not private as it will be shared with the offices and public and will be in a dark overlooked central area. The proposed Juliette balconies that face onto the busy Gray's Inn Road are unusable in space terms and will face a noisy road and so never be opened, they thus fail to satisfy the requirement. This is in an area of existing open space deficiency as identified in map 7 Open Space of the Core Strategy.

The arrangements for waste collection and bins are not well-considered and the space available for dealing with them is not large and so this issue is unlikely to be resolved at detail stage, so that a poor environment around the scheme is the likely end result, with a consequent failure to meet Policy CS18 Dealing with Waste.

The scheme also fails to meet criteria set out in the later part of DP26, specifically that developments are to provide: h) an acceptable standard of accommodation in terms of internal arrangements, dwelling and room sizes and amenity space; i) facilities for the storage, recycling and disposal of waste; and k) outdoor space for private or communal amenity space, wherever practical.

As a final point, I note that there is extremely strong opposition from local residents and occupants to this scheme. By any standard at all it is an unattractive and jarring development that will eliminate an important local economic community, damage our heritage, bring irreparable harm to a much-loved Conservation Area and cause distress, loss of light and loss of general amenity to hundreds of local residents.

I support sensitive and appropriate development and I recognise that there is a housing crisis in London. However this development is neither sensitive nor appropriate and does nothing to address the housing crisis, providing only 13 high-end flats for the very market segment that is immune to the housing crisis. Apart from that it replaces affordable studio and office space with high-cost studio and office space. The benefits to the local population, the wider community and to the city and nation are zero, while the negative impact on all the above, but most especially the local residents, is very high.

At what point will we recognise that these developments, designed, we imagine, to allow our city to continue to prosper, are gradually turning London into a generic and characterless city that will crush the spirit of its residents and repel visitors? London appears to be undergoing a 'rush to develop' at present, to the great enrichment of developers, who pocket their profits and move on. But the destruction they wrought remains and is irreversible. Developments of this nature will be bitterly regretted in the decades to come. It seems inconceivable that a wise and forward-looking Council, and an elected body, could sanction this proposal.

I would like to attend and speak at the planning committee meeting. As I spend a lot of time working in Australia I may need to ask a representative to speak on my behalf or ask for a short statement to be read out on my behalf. Please let me know the relevant date and also whether or not either of the above options are allowable in the event of my absence.

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2015/6955/P	Valerie Woods	2 Grays Court 51-53 Grays Inn Road WC1X8PP WC1X8PP WC1X8PP	28/01/2016 15:52:39	OBJ	<p>There have been a number of plans for this site over the years but I was horrified to see this latest one. I attended the community consultation at the London Welsh Centre and was so disappointed and shocked to see the plans. I live directly opposite the proposed build at Grays Court on Grays Inn Road. I have enjoyed this fantastic location for 17 years. I strongly object to the proposed development. My main objections to the Panther house build are:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The height of the building – at the moment we enjoy great access to direct sun and daylight into our bedroom and living area, this would change dramatically with this extremely high and bulky build. 5 extra floors will mean it is higher than the existing neighbouring buildings. 2. The material of the building is dire. Concrete?! It is beyond belief that in a fantastic line of red brick mansion blocks anyone would think to insert an enormous lump of grey, bland concrete. I questioned this at the community consultation and was told it was the architect's modern take on a mansion block. It is completely out of keeping with the local area; it is not a 'sensitive refurbishment' as the plans state but an ugly and hard façade, a stark contrast to the soft and undulating redbrick mansions. 3. Loss of privacy and light pollution – we will have a number of apartments and terraces looking direct into our rooms; further the lighting from their building will shine directly into our apartment greatly and will change the nature and quality of our living space. 4. The lose of character of the road and area - I appreciate something of the old build is being kept in the new design but so much character will be lost including the lovely building at 156 Grays Inn Road; replacing 156 with a mock-concrete façade is not an appropriate replacement. We will also lose the great old Gillette advert on the side of the building. All these things add to the character of an area. This proposed build is in the Hatton Garden Conservation area, it is hard too understand how these charmless plans can be acceptable in a heritage area. 5. The area is going to become a lot busier with the walk way through to Panther Yard, more offices, shops etc. will mean more deliveries and noise for residents on Grays Inn Road. I cannot see the advantage of a walk way when Elm Street is just half a block away. 6. Obviously the effects of such a long construction will be terrible for all residents of the area – noise, dirt, dust, traffic, cranes. We are just recovering from the Co-op build which was a horrible experience.

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2015/6955/P	Katie Dawson	136 St Thomas's Rd N4 2QP	01/02/2016 13:25:25	OBJ	I wish to object in strongest possible terms to the proposals to demolish and redevelop these buildings. The buildings on Grays Inn Rd are a valuable part of the historic streetscape in this neighbourhood and contribute greatly to the street frontage and character of the area. Andrew's Café in particular is a popular and well-loved business, which has been part of the local community for many years. Unlike other cafes, it provides honest and affordable food and is a family business with deep roots in the local community. It should be protected and cherished for the service it provides, as well for its historic interest. Panther House is a building of great architectural interest - both historic and aesthetic. The small businesses that use these lovely buildings contribute significantly to the character and vibrancy of the surrounding area. Please do not destroy these buildings. This is a part of London that people love and is therefore vulnerable to overdevelopment - but destroying the history and character of the area will remove the very thing that makes it desirable to developers. Please do not destroy these buildings - they are irreplaceable.
2015/6955/P	Sean McDonagh	Flat 33 Mullen Tower Mount Pleasant London WC1X 0AG	01/02/2016 15:42:17	OBJ	<p>I strongly object to the proposal.If passed it will stand as a blatantly clear case of the profits of a developer being put above rights of the existing community.</p> <p>It is an excessive overdevelopment that doesn't fit the character of the existing area.Social and affordable housing are not part of this scheme and it will force out the existing trades people of Panther House.Other local businesses will also be lost. The work needed will last for a number of years and will cause considerable disruption to residents.</p> <p>The new 'through route' from Grays Inn to Mount Pleasant {open 24/7 at both ends} will present new opportunities for anti-social behaviour.Cutbacks to neighbourhood policing and the lack of a concierge will not help to keep this new throughfare safe. The "Public Realm Security Features & Design Elements" document is full of words like 'could' and 'expected'.This is not good enough when the issue is public safety. STRONG assurances are needed NOT weasel words!</p> <p>I understand that the developer "would not be opposed to licensed premises selling alcohol on the site".What consideration has gone into the impact on the locality of this 'possible' addition? Very little I suspect!</p> <p>The heightening of Panther House will result in the loss of light to the buildings facing it.This will be significant to the lower floors of Mullen Tower {the building I live in} The proposed terraces for Panther House will also face Mullen Tower.As far as I am aware no limits have been placed on their use and residents will be forced to endure the noise that will inevitably result</p>
2015/6955/P	Colin Marr	3 Methuen Park N10 2JR N10 2JR N10 2JR	29/01/2016 21:28:11	OBJ	I object to this proposal. I consider it to excessive in mass and height to the extent that it will be out of scale with the surrounding buildings. It would also destroy the attractive character of this part of Gray's Inn Road, with its shops and cafe, which enrich the life and heritage of this part of London.

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2015/6955/P	ALEX ROBBINS (DR.)	FLAT 3 GRAY'S COURT 51-53 GRAY'S INN ROAD LONDON WC1X 8PP	01/02/2016 20:38:23	COMNOT	I am writing to voice opposition to this proposed build. As regards my own building and flat, we have concerns about loss of light resulting from the new development, and very serious concerns about noise and pollution during the very long building process. Our section of Gray's Inn Road has already been disturbed by the Co-op build recently, and now we are being asked to prepare for a three-year build directly opposite. This is not acceptable. The proposed design of the new building is also problematic, as it does not in any way fit with the architectural style of the buildings on either side. I and others do not wish to look out on an ugly glass box. In larger terms, this build will change the atmosphere and make-up of the neighbourhood, replacing small local shops and traders with corporate anonymity. The current shops and business are part of the fabric of our neighbourhood, as are those who work in them (many of whom have become friends and familiar faces, and they may be unable to return at the end of the build). It is my wish that the life and spirit of our community be preserved. I understand that this is not something tangible, not something that can be measured or quantified, but it is very important to a lot of people living here and to our general quality of life.
2015/6955/P	Sara A.	Pratt street	28/01/2016 17:26:06	COMMNT	<p>It's terrible news to hear about another unnecessary redevelopment, especially if we consider that independent businesses and artists studios will be replaced by a new set of "luxury flats" too many people couldn't afford to live in.</p> <p>As a Camden resident I'm gutted by the recent planning policies, which are generally pushed forward regardless the existing architecture, not to mention residents' and local business owners' opposing views.</p> <p>I think it's time to reconsider the plans and pay attention to what the actual needs of Camden are. Support to artists spaces, local, independent businesses and social housing, to mention a few. No more tacky buildings and overpriced coffee shops, thanks.</p>
2015/6955/P	David Moore	2 Gray's Court 51-53 Gray's Inn rd London	01/02/2016 11:08:58	OBJ	<p>I object to the height and bulk of this build on Gray's inn rd. The new higher roof line exceeding that of Dulverton Mansions.</p> <p>The proposed materials are not in-keeping with the surrounding buildings.</p> <p>The proposed build is ugly and of no architectural merit.</p>

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2015/6955/P	Anna Sabapathy	151 O'Donnell Court Brunswick Centre London WC1N 1NX	31/01/2016 12:03:56	OBJ	<p>Good morning,</p> <p>I am objecting to the development on Grays Inn Road which will see the closure of Andrew's cafe. I have been going there for over 20 years now. It is a part of the community and the local history. The area does not need another faceless corporate block with million pound homes which no one locally can afford, which are bought by overseas residents to be left unoccupied.</p> <p>I implore Camden to deny the planning permission of this redevelopment and preserve the essence of the local community.</p> <p>Anna Sabapathy</p>
2015/6955/P	Teresa White	236 Gray's Inn Road London WC1X 8HB	29/01/2016 13:37:24	OBJ	<p>I use all 3 of these independent businesses. They are important to the people who live and work at this end of the Gray's Inn Road. More luxury flats that your average Londoner can't afford aren't really what's needed here.</p>
2015/6955/P	Ben	93 Rowland Hill House	31/01/2016 13:09:58	OBJ	<p>Panther house is a vital home to the capital's smaller independent businesses. Camden borough and London needs these kind of artisan companies to remain a relevant supportive home for diverse independent companies.</p>

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2015/6955/P	Sean McDonagh	Flat 33 Mullen Tower Mount Pleasant London WC1X 0AG	29/01/2016 01:04:02	COMMNT	<p>I strongly object to the proposal.If passed it will stand as a blatantly clear case of the profits of a developer being put above rights of the existing community.</p> <p>It is an excessive overdevelopment that doesn't fit the character of the existing area.Social and affordable housing are not part of this scheme and it will force out the existing trades people of Panther House.Other local businesses will also be lost. The work needed will last for a number of years and will cause considerable disruption to residents.</p> <p>The new 'through route' from Grays Inn to Mount Pleasant {open 24/7 at both ends} will present new opportunities for anti-social behaviour.Cutbacks to neighbourhood policing and the lack of a concierge will not help to keep this new throughfare safe. The "Public Realm Security Features & Design Elements" document is full of words like 'could' and 'expected'.This is not good enough when the issue is public safety. STRONG assurances are needed NOT weasel words!</p> <p>I understand that the developer "would not be opposed to licensed premises selling alcohol on the site".What consideration has gone into the impact on the locality of this 'possible' addition? Very little I suspect!</p> <p>The heightening of Panther House will result in the loss of light to the buildings facing it.This will be significant to the lower floors of Mullen Tower {the building I live in} The proposed terraces for Panther House will also face Mullen Tower.As far as I am aware no limits have been placed on their use and residents will be forced to endure the noise that will inevitably result</p>
2015/6955/P	Carla Zoso	4 Holsworthy Square WC1X 0AU	29/01/2016 22:15:52	OBJ	<p>I live on the ground Floor at Holsworthy Square. The only light I get comes from the opening between Panther House and the next Building belonging to the Square. I already have to have the light on almost all day The proposed building will take away even the little daylight I get.. The noise, dust, will go on for years.</p>