

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2016/6356/P	Anarkali Musgrave	Flat 13 Derby Lodge Britannia Street WC1X 9BP WC1X 9BP	19/12/2016 21:07:36	COMNOT	<p>I strongly object to this planning application for the following reasons:</p> <p>I. Size Of Development</p> <p>This development hugely expands the current building in a way which is aggressive, crude and inappropriate. It will also affect the provision of natural light available to the residents and weaken the local community living around the courtyard.</p> <p>The development is not in keeping with the area. The size of the development is hugely out of scale and a large modern development within the context of what is essentially a small residential courtyard and comes up just metres away from residents' bedrooms, bathrooms and kitchens. It is very imposing. The current warehouse does not do this.</p> <p>It will impose a large, ugly and modern building within a Victorian courtyard which was designed to provide a quiet, calm space to residents away from the main road.</p> <p>Privacy</p> <p>It means that I will have a flat which has not only the front but also now the back exposed to noise from the public. The rooms located at the back of my, and all the flats, are the most intimate and personal eg the bathrooms and bedrooms. There will be no safe haven away from members of the public. This is not acceptable or proportionate.</p> <p>Even those parts of the proposal which do not have windows are massy, intrusive and imposing. There will simply be no getting away from it.</p> <p>I am very concerned about the terraces for members of the public to smoke. This means that they can look right into our flats – because of the flat windows above, below and next to the terraces.</p> <p>In order to maintain my privacy I will have to put blinds up, which I am very reluctant to do as it will impede the natural light. I think that this unacceptable.</p> <p>I think that you need to be aware that I have NEVER EVER seen any resident in the courtyard for as long as I've been living here. It remains locked from most residents. The only person I have seen is someone from Balcap Re walking around on top of the warehouse. The idea of members of the public using this space to work absolutely changes the nature of the space at the moment. This is aggravated by the idea of terraces where office workers can come out to smoke, chat etc. I just think that this will be unacceptable because any noise is amplified so many times over within the courtyard. We will be able to hear everything they say. I am on the 4th floor and I can hear the bubbles in the bong of the students who sit outside on summer evenings to smoke weed. I can hear literally every single word they say, as if they were saying it in the room next to me. I can also hear the rustle of their rizzlas. This noise comes straight into my bedroom and often means that I have to ask them to pipe down.</p>

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

**Comment:**    **Response:**

Cross Road. It will have massive implications for the light which reaches us from the sunrise which climbs from the direction of the SOAS building in the east. The light will reach us hours later because of the angle of the building, and in winter it will make the daylight very much shorter. The suggestion in the light report that just one window is going to be affected is so ludicrous that it is hard to know how to make sense of it. I note that they have missed off a whole row of windows, lightwells etc. it is just plain common sense that if there is building right next to our windows that many families and residents are going to be affected detrimentally.

I dread to think how the backs of the flats along winklow street are going to be affected by this. They do not have much light coming into the backs of their flats as it is. The flats along the lower floor will be particularly affected I should think.

Light pollution

It just doesn't make any sense for there to be an additional floor to minimise the light pollution. This of course obstructs our own access to natural light when it is available but also means that even in the evening our living conditions are going to be adversely affected. I just don't think it is ok for us to have both day and night affected in this very very aggressive and intrusive way. These are our homes – we have literally nowhere to escape to or go to for respite to get away from the glare.

Further, the light is coming into OUR BEDROOMS. It is just so aggressive. It is bound to affect the residents' sleep.

The basement is not in keeping with the area - which currently does not have any underground areas within the courtyard or within the homes. I have not seen a Basement Impact Assessment which should have been part of the application. The reason I am quite worried is that these walls are old and high; and the constant stress and pounding from the drilling is bound to affect them. I am very worried that they will become weakened.

Overlooking

This new building is going to be surrounded by and overlook residential dwellings. It overlooks the rest of the courtyard and the residential buildings surrounding that part of the courtyard. There are proposals for a balcony and outdoor space for smokers/ drinks parties, which will have the effect of encouraging office workers to peer into the back of the homes of ordinary residents in the area. It is enormously invasive and intrusive, and totally changes the environment of the area. The flats at Derby lodge are "sensitive lets", which means that more vulnerable members of the community are housed here. This will have the effect of intruding upon their privacy in an aggressive and unpleasant way.

Privacy

As the proposal is taking place at the back of the residents' homes, this will have the effect of looking

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

There is a lady who lives on Kings Cross road, about 100 metres away from my bedroom, who sometimes keeps her kitchen door open during warm months. The nature of the acoustics mean that I can hear when she is washing up, when she is putting items onto the drainer. I do not have particularly sensitive hearing. I can hear when she's chatting on the phone, and most of the time exactly what she is saying.

Once the drilling starts, the noise is simply going to be unbearable. I don't believe that it will be within acceptable limits given the acoustics of the place which I have described to you. Balcap re have stated that it will be but they know very little of the place – they haven't been into any of the residents' flats as far as I'm aware and they haven't lived in the place and don't know it like we do. They do not understand the acoustics of the courtyard and how it reverberates and becomes increasingly unbearable as the higher you go.

I am very worried about the noise from the air conditioning which will be on during the day and in the evening too. It will only get magnified in the acoustic basin of the courtyard.

Derby Lodge has what is known as Sensitive lets which means that more vulnerable members of the community live here. I just don't see how this is compatible with the sort of noise which is being proposed. When I asked the lady at the 'presentation' about how long the drilling would be, she told me that it would be at least 9 months. I can't see how it won't be much much longer, given the tiny entrance they have and the fact that the drilling area is extensive and deep. When I asked her about it, she looked blank and referred me to someone else, who didn't answer my question.

#### Changing the nature of the building

I was under the impression that there would be heritage concerns about building something like this in the middle of a Victorian courtyard. I just don't understand how this complies with preserving the nature of historic buildings which Camden and the Kings Cross Area still has. As far as I am aware, there are no other Victorian courtyards of this nature in the Kings Cross area. A modern office block will absolutely destroy the very private nature of these flats and the quiet sanctuary of the flats at the back.

I also simply don't understand why it is acceptable for a large office block to be superimposed into a residential circle. I can understand why it would be next to a block of flats etc, but it simply doesn't make any sense for it to be nestling right in the very heart of the residential area. I find it crazy.

#### Light

I am very concerned about the implications for the loss of natural light arising from the proposal. The building itself is dark and comes just metres away from the derby lodge flats 1,4,7 and 10. It is also right next to the windows of the houses and flats along the beginning of Britannia street and Kings

Application No:    Consultees Name:    Consultees Addr:    Received:

Comment:    Response:

into the most intimate and private parts of their dwellings, such as the bathrooms, bedrooms and kitchens. All the flats are designed so that the less intimate parts of the flat face out onto the street, away from the noise and the general public. At the moment, the space between the residents in the courtyard means that there is a large degree of privacy within the courtyard because the distance around the courtyard makes it difficult to actually see much through the windows. It will be very easy for office users to see into the most private part of the residents' houses, especially if the office workers are smoking or drinking on the terrace. It is unacceptable and will affect the way in which the residents use their homes. This is particularly concerning for families with children.

As mentioned above, the flats are designed so that dwellers can have the privacy of the courtyard facing onto the more private areas of their flats. The surrounding streets are extremely noisy, marked particularly by shouting and traffic. The courtyard as it currently stands is locked even from residents. It is extremely unusual to see a single person using it.

It is difficult to see how the 1.8m recommendations for privacy screens will be an acceptable solution to the privacy issues surrounding the terrace. On the contrary, such screens will almost certainly affect those affected residents' outlooks and access to daylight.

I do not see why we have to breathe in the smoke of those office users who do smoke. The smoke is bound to come into our flats, especially in summer. Watching people smoke like this sets a poor example to our children. There is a big difference between what children see when they leave their homes, and what they see in their home. When they can see people smoking from their bedroom windows it normalises what is a deadly, repulsive and disgusting habit. This in itself is unacceptable.

#### Outlook

As above, the outlook of the courtyard will be transformed detrimentally by the building. At the moment, residents currently enjoy views across the courtyard and beyond. This will be entirely occluded by the proposed development because of its height. Not only will this obscure the view to the other sides of the courtyard, but it will mean that views across to the Kings Cross Road and the buildings abutting Pentonville Road will be lost.

#### Congestion

Access to the site is by way of a single, small entrance on Britannia street. This will make the matter of congestion, noise and disturbance particularly acute. I simply do not want hundreds of people traipsing outside my flat 3 times a day. The flats on the first floor are going to be particularly affected – and there are children living in that flat. The houses on Britannia street by the exit are also going to be hugely affected for the worse.

I am concerned that the proposals for bikes stands are going to make the place even more congested. The road already has quite a lot of bike stands, all of which are in use by the residents. If there are office workers it is my view that most of the residents are going to lose their bike spaces because office

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

**Comment:**    **Response:**

workers are likely to take them. I make this point taking into account the plans to build more bike racks.

I am concerned that when the proposal is being built the parking spaces on Britannia Street are going to be restricted even further and the road closed off wholly or in part. When the Gagosian Gallery was granted permission to close the road for 3 weeks earlier this year the drug dealers very quickly set up shop outside our flats. They were dealing openly on the streets, congregated in menacing groups and simply would not leave even if they were threatened with police action. Needless to say, the police were absolutely useless about doing anything about it but it was a huge issue for residents, especially as used needles were left strewn around. I am very anxious if this is to happen again. It is dreadful for children to see. It is very uncomfortable for women too. When the Gagosian closed the road my neighbour said he had to escort his girlfriend up and down the road because it was not safe. I myself felt very fearful.

I am worried about how the rubbish is going to be collected and removed from such a large site. At the moment, the hostel up the road simply leaves sacks of rubbish on the pavement for collection. Personally, I cannot understand why pedestrians ought to have to put up with it. It frequently gets opened up and strewn across the street by homeless people and the junkies. The proposal to put it in rows on the pavement in front of residents houses is deeply misconceived and misunderstands the nature of the people who dwell in this area. In the evening, most of the commuters are junkies or dealers, and the presence of bins will only attract them more and increase the trade outside those areas because the presence of large objects like bins creates shadows in which they can lurk and trade. These houses are family homes.

Further, the presence of large bins is unacceptable as it blocks up the pavement, which will already be congested because of the footfall traffic. It will lead to people walking on the road, creating accidents and blocking things up. In summer it absolutely stinks to high heaven. The office blocks are going to be dumping their enormous amounts of rubbish outside our homes for collection. Furthermore, there will be more vehicles up and down the street to deliver and collect things which will make it even noisier and more congested. It is not safe for the children and will attract rats.

Balcap Re have behaved like absolute swine over the whole process. Their exhibitions were really unclear and many occupants missed them because they were obviously not aware that this was a consultation. It means that there are many residents who may have failed to realise the importance and significance of these events. In any event, there is absolutely no reason not to take Balcap Re at their own words and concur that this was an exhibition, not a consultation. I was certainly unaware at the time that this was a consultation, with all the significance that this word implies in this process. It was indeed my view that there was no consultation process going on as they were supremely unconcerned about our views, and refused to respond to questions (changing the subject) and subsequently failing to provide information when asked for it. I am not sure how high the buildings are likely to be in metres, or what the current warehouse size really is. They have failed to attend any of our meetings or answer questions and tried to deflect queries to their (shoddy) communications company. Half the exhibition was about other properties they've 'renovated'. They only offered us the pictures they used when a

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2016/6356/P	Patrick Cantrill	Flat 25 Derby Lodge Britannia Street London WC1X 7BP	19/12/2016 16:27:21 INT		<p>counsellor got involved. I don't have any confidence that they will be considerate to the needs and concerns of the residents. In fact, what is alarming is that they have not even taken into account our needs and concerns.</p> <p>I object to the ugliness of the proposed building. It has no aesthetic merit. I am a fan of modernist, particularly brutalist, architecture; and all over London there are fantastic, exciting projects going up all the time. This proposal, however, is meagrely thought out, ugly and insensitive. It excels only in the lack of imagination used to dump a squat, monolithic construction into buildings which are extraordinarily representative of a particular style – that of the late Victorian.</p> <p>As far as I am aware Balcap Re have taken no steps to consult with vulnerable residents who are part of the sensitive lets. Although we shall all be affected, it is obvious that they will most affected in the most deleterious way. I am very concerned that they have been excluded from the process by the lack of proper consultation. It seems to me that there are potentially Equality Act issues arising from this failure to consult with those who are disabled etc.</p> <p>I am greatly concerned by this proposed development. At a time when open places in inner London should be celebrated especially one as here which is in a conservation area, I fail to see how this development can be deemed acceptable. The proposal will result in a building the footprint of which will take out much of the court yard behind Derby Lodge. It will also result in a block of considerable size with a height as high as the third storey at the residential block of Derby Lodge with the attendant loss of privacy and sunlight. Moreover, it would lie almost next door to this residential block, the occupants of which would have to bear 12/18 months of continuous dust and noise. No doubt, if the proposed office did open, those same neighbouring residents would be subject to people entering and leaving the office block around the clock day and night. The proposed development would greatly undermine the nature, amenity and atmosphere of the community that exists at Derby Lodge. In short, it is wholly the wrong proposal for this type of area and the Council should object to the application</p>

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2016/6356/P	Valerio Mannucci	Flat D 161 King's Cross Road	21/12/2016 19:11:36	COMMNT	<p>Dear Camden Council:</p> <p>I wish to make some objections to the proposal application number 2016/6356/P, namely, the demolition of the warehouse to the rear of 1-3 Britannia Street and the erection of a “3 storey plus basement building to provide office,” made by Balcap Re Ltd. As an immediate neighbour to the site, I believe that the proposed development will have a serious impact on the standard of living in my building (159-161 King’s Cross Road), and also that it is a contravention to several statements included in the Camden Council Development Policies.</p> <p>Specifically, I am concerned about the environmental wastefulness of the proposal, which entails a wholesale demolition of an old industrial building that is entirely in keeping with the character of the area. The proposal to redevelop the site from scratch, using all new materials, is a direct contravention to Policy Statement 24.9. In addition, the proposed design is ill-suited to the surrounding Victorian buildings, as well as entirely out of scale with their proportions and with the size of the available space on the site. If the industrial building must be redeveloped, I believe that this should be done in a way that instead makes use of the existing structure and materials and that also preserves the architectural character of the area.</p> <p>As regards the actual premises of 161 King’s Cross Road, I am concerned that the proposed office block would substantially cut off exposure to light in the communal areas of the building, since all of the stairwells and hallways in 161 King’s Cross Road give exclusively onto the courtyard where the proposed building is to be erected. In addition to the loss of light and increase in noise that the proposed building would bring about, what worries me is the safety risk of facilitating potential access to the interior of 161 King’s Cross Road, which would be a mere few feet away from the office building and separated from it only by a couple of panes of glass.</p> <p>Finally, I am greatly concerned about the noise and air pollution that would be wrought by such an extensive period of demolition and construction. Given that the courtyard where the proposed construction work would take place is faced almost exclusively by residential flats, and is a spatially very constricted area that effectively traps noise and dust within its confines, I believe this point should be of no small concern in deliberating the proposal.</p> <p>I very much hope that the Council will take my concerns into consideration before reaching its final decision about this proposal.</p> <p>Sincerely,</p> <p>Valerio Mannucci (leaseholder and tenant, Flat D, 161 King’s Cross Road)</p>

---

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2016/6356/P	Fiona Dealey	88 Derby Lodge Wicklow Street	19/12/2016 13:15:11	OBJ	<p>Application No: 2016/6356/P2016/6356/P</p> <p>I strongly object to this development for the following reasons laid out below</p> <p>This development ,in all correspondence and at exhibitions has been referred to as 159/163, King's Cross Road ,yet has been submitted under a different address, Rear of 1- 3, Britannia Street which is deliberately misleading and confusing.</p> <p>This proposed development is causing a great deal of unnecessary stress to all the surrounding neighbours . This is due to the behaviour of the applicant who has been aggressive and uncooperative. Failing to divulge information, failure to provide additional information when asked and having a high handed and dismissive attitude. Despite repeated requests the information that some of us were asking for were only provided by the intervention of Cllr Jonathan Simpson. All this made residents feel that something underhand was going on and that we are an inconvenience to be got round.</p> <p>Derby Lodge is Grade 11 listed and is a 'sensitive letting' according to Camden Council's letting policy. The sheer scale of this development is too domineering to sit within the curtilage of Derby Lodge.</p> <p>Any development on this site should be no higher than the current roof line and profile of the existing buildings, which has never been a problem to nearby residents.</p> <p>I object to the premises being changed from light industrial to office use.</p> <p>Due to globalisation most offices are 24 hour which will mean local residents will be greatly affected by increased noise disturbance of office workers outside on terraces talking, smoking in the courtyard, lights on in offices all night. We already suffer noise issues from air conditioning units from shops on King's Cross Road and the services for the proposed new office block will increase these noise problems greatly.</p> <p>We do not need a basement art gallery situated so close to our homes. During private views there will be people standing in the courtyard and outside the entrance on Britannia Street smoking and drinking. We already have problems with the openings at the Gagosian Gallery. Who often need shut Britannia Street down for up to three weeks at a time to install exhibitions. We don't need even more of the same disruption. Visitors to a proposed basement art gallery will cause noise nuisance. It's a constrained site with flats in close proximity.</p> <p>Security</p> <p>Derby Lodge courtyard has a lot of properties on the ground floor and there will be a direct problem with security and privacy if workers are allowed access to that area. Where exactly will the office workers go in the event of a fire ? They would need access to the courtyard as the site entrance is so narrow.</p>



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

**Comment:**    **Response:**

#### Privacy

The terraces and windows of office block will directly face onto the properties of 73-96, Derby Lodge, Wicklow Street and will overlook our bedrooms, living rooms and kitchens causing loss of privacy

#### Daylight/ Sunlight

There will be a dramatic loss of daylight and sunlight into the all the flats facing onto the property development, with 73-76 Derby Lodge, Wicklow Street and 1-3, Britannia Street being the most affected as all these properties have bedrooms and living rooms that face onto the courtyard.

#### Overall Design

The size and shape of the proposed development is just too tall and domineering against the proportion of Derby Lodge, which is Grade II listed and the other neighbouring buildings which are in extremely close proximity to this charmless proposal. This is a Conservation Area. This aggressive, imposing and monolithic dark finish of the building is not sympathetic with the general character of the area nor surrounding architecture, It should not be so tall, have a deep basement gallery and it should not have any roof terraces.

#### Noise

Derby Lodge, although being situated within the Conservation Area of King's Cross was surprisingly quiet when I moved here twenty-two years ago. However since several air conditioning units have been added to shops on the King's Cross Road and Derby Lodge's own heating unit having been incorrectly installed, there is an excessive amount of noise from these especially at night. The heating and air conditioning units that this office block development will need will only add to this constant and annoying hum. Having a four storey office block with open terraces for office staff to enjoy coffee breaks, smoking and general chatting will create an unnecessary amount of disturbance. Due to Derby Lodge being Grade II listed we were refused double glazed windows when DL had a Major Works redecoration a few years ago. So noise is an issue.

#### Conservation and Local Community

Derby Lodge lies within a small quiet pocket of Kings Cross Conservation Area and Wicklow Street is particularly charming with it's cobbled street, which is also listed. An office block of this scale is totally inappropriate in this small enclosed courtyard which is within the curtilage of Derby Lodge. It will have a negative impact on our local community.

Application No:    Consultees Name:    Consultees Addr:    Received:

Comment:    Response:

Need

There are already many offices in the King's Cross Area which are empty. So why build more ? There will be no control as to who rents these offices and what sort of work will be carried out there. When asked, the developer, Balcap Re , had no idea how many office workers would be squeezed into these offices. Also the developer is anxious that the office workers have access to sunlight, daylight and can relax on the terraces, whilst not considering the loss of privacy and daylight that will detrimentally affect the nearby residents.

Light Pollution

The lights from these offices will flood our homes with artificial light at night which will have a detrimental affect on our sleep.

Rubbish

We have a constant problem with rubbish and litter in this area which has increased since the student halls of residence, The Depot, was built. For example The Depot, which has 250 students living there leaves it's rubbish outside on Britannia Street. If this office block and art gallery are developed they will be leaving their rubbish outside in front of the private homes of 1- 3 Britannia Street.

Use

If this site has to be developed it should either stay as light industrial or changed to residential. I do not think this site is suitable for offices.

Demolition and construction of site

The proposed length of time for this development is 18 months. Since the gallery space will be in a basement , this will mean they will be digging 4.5 metres into the ground to create this space, I thought Camden Council's policy was only to dig to a depth of 3 metres so surely an extra 1.5 metres should not be allowed. It's not as if the basement area is already there. The devastation caused by digging and hauling the tons of earth through the small entrance of the site on Britannia Street will seriously affect all the neighbouring properties for the build length. The developer and architect have not shown any understanding or regard for the people who already actually live here. Apart from a lot of elderly people, residents who work from home, and there are also a number of families with small children whose day to day lives at home will be disrupted by the noise of drilling, digging etc for the entire eighteen months.

Britannia Street will undoubtedly be closed for most of the earth removal and construction. Leeke Street is closed until 2020 whilst the bridge over the railway track is being strengthened. There are also

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

**Comment:**    **Response:**

plans to build yet another cycle lane down King's Cross Road and all of this will probably coincide with the work intended on the Mount Pleasant site. This will cause total traffic gridlock in an already heavily congested area.

In September the Gagosian Gallery had a Richard Sienna exhibition installed which closed Britannia Street for three weeks. This then meant local residents had to drive a mile detour to gain access to Wicklow Street which is one way.

And if all the resident bays were full we'd have to drive the same detour to get back into Swinton Street. I need my car to work ....it was distressing enough to have to do this for three weeks, eighteen months will be too stressful.

The loss of permit bays in Britannia Street will create even more problems regarding parking.

Objecting to planning applications at Camden Council

Since the beginning of October Camden Council has changed it's policy of posting planning applications to all residents who will be affected by a new development. Unless you are registered on-line for Camden's Planning alerts you will be unaware of any applications. Camden's Planning department do put up limited signage and advertise in the Ham & High and Camden New Journal but as neither of these papers are stocked in our immediate newsagent how are residents who have no access to the internet supposed to know ?

Planning Application Notification on Wicklow and Britannia Street

According to these signs the site has now grown and Derby Lodge's heating unit is now included in the development.

Does this mean that Balcap Re intend to remove Derby Lodge's heating unit and that all residents will be without heating and hot water ?

Consultation with developers Balcap Re and Four Communications

Finally I need to say something about Four Communications, the PR company who organized the 'exhibition'. There was never any participation nor proper consultation with local residents. I have found Four Communications uncooperative. As they are a slick PR company who are being employed by Balcap Re they obviously have a financial interest in their client.

In the document that they have submitted with the planning application there are a number of issues I'd like to address.

1) The 'exhibition', was never referred to as a consultation, was organized by Four Communications to be held at a community centre in Argyle Street which is on the other side of the Gray's Inn Road which has four traffic lanes and is difficult for the frail, elderly and disabled to navigate. I had several telephone conversations with various Four Communications employees and it was only when I asked for the CEO's name and address that a Ralph Scott spoke to me and said ' it was not Four

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
					<p>Communications company policy to give out that information'. I wanted to know why the exhibition couldn't be held on the site, as is common with these type of developments. Ralph Scott finally admitted that it wasn't cost effective for them to pay a cleaner to clean the floor for a one day exhibition.</p> <p>2) The publicity they used was a very slick leaflet with little real information on it. Ralph Scott told me 1,500 leaflets had been distributed but didn't know exactly where and would have to get back to me about that.</p> <p>3) The first event was held at 51, Argyle Street, WC1H 8EF. Only seven residents attended due to that location not being part of our community. Derby Lodge post code is WC1X.</p> <p>4) The boards that they were exhibiting lacked any graphics showing the elevations of the proposed development that would be facing on to 73, 96, Derby Lodge , 1-5, Britannia Street and the rear of King's Cross Road This was an important piece of information that they had chosen not to exhibit. So I asked that we would need these elevations to be at the second exhibition. I also asked that pdf's of the boards that were at this first 'exhibition' could be emailed to me. Although promised Four Communications didn't send them to me.</p> <p>5) After several residents and the Derby Lodge TRA complained about the location of the first exhibition site Four Communications finally agreed to another 'drop in' event on Tuesday 18th October, which was held at our TR Hall which is situated in Derby Lodge Courtyard and a place which is known to local residents so more convenient to attend.</p> <p>6) Four Communications promised they would send the information about this second 'exhibition' to local residents via Royal Mail yet nothing arrived in the post. Why ?</p> <p>7) 21 residents attended this meeting.</p> <p>8) The one elevations that I requested were there. I asked that pdf's of these images be emailed to me . I asked Clemente Capello, the property developer from Balcap Re., Andrew one of the MWA architects and Laurie Sanderson from Four Communications to do this. And I took all their email addresses. The MWA email address proved to be wrong.</p> <p>9) Three of us took Clemente Capello, the property developer from Balcap Re, to the outside of our flats to show how this office block development would negatively impact on our homes. I asked if he and one of the architects could come and visit my home in daylight to see why I was objecting and both of them replied that they were too busy.</p> <p>10) I made it quite clear to Clemente Capello that I did not want an office block built in the courtyard and would prefer social housing. He was surprised and said 'you wouldn't want social housing here', as if social housing was a negative thing. And one of my neighbours replied ' we live in social housing'.</p>

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
					<p>11) None of the pdf's that were at the second 'exhibition' that I requested to be sent to me were emailed to me. And I was told by Clemente Capello that all correspondence had to be done via Four Communications. And all of them refused to send me the elevations that they had promised me.</p> <p>12) I then had to contact Cllr Jonathan Simpson who asked for them on my behalf. It took him a week before they sent what they had initially promised me. Despite being contacted by a Councillor, they again appeared reluctant and slow to provide the information.</p> <p>13) In Four Communications response to key issues they say, regarding a daylight, sunlight and overshadowing report by a, Malcolm Hollis ,that it demonstrates that the majority surrounding properties will meet the BRE guidelines used to access levels with the exception of ONE window in a property in Wicklow Street. Where is this one window ? The report is incorrect and wildly inaccurate to claim only a single window will be affected. And I can assure you that both my bedroom and living room windows will loose a considerable amount of daylight and sunlight and will be overshadowed along with a lot of my neighbours properties too.</p> <p>Neither Malcolm Hollis nor any of his colleagues has visited my flat, nor those of any of my neighbours. His report is entirely self-serving and I do not believe it to be accurate.”</p> <p>14) Concerned Residents of Derby Lodge organised a further meeting on 1st November at the TR Hall and Balcap Re, MWA, Four Communications and Planning Officers Neil MacDonald and Laura Hazelton were all invited to come. Balcap Re, MWA and Four Communications all declined to attend. So there has never been any any real participation or proper consultation with local residents which one would expect with such a contentious development .</p> <p>Fiona Dealey 88, Derby Lodge Wicklow Street London WC1X 9LF</p>

---

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2016/6356/P	Stephen Daldry	Britannia Street 5 WC1X 9JT WC1X 9JT	19/12/2016 14:35:16	OBJ	I am writing to object the development of Rear Of 1-3, Britannia Street, London, WC1X 9BN (ref: 2016/6356/P) in its current form. The development will cause considerable harm the use and enjoyment of my property 5 Britannia Street, with considerable regard to massive loss of light. The objections, and suggested solutions are listed below.

Please note that while this objection share many paragraphs with that of 3 Britannia Street my direct neighbour, as we worked together on common issues affecting us both and how to solve them, this is a separate comment/objection with many separate issues particularly in reference to the massive and significant loss of light my property will suffer.

#### 1) Loss of Light and Negligent Inaccuracies of Daylight and Sunlight Report:

- My primary objection to the proposed developed is the massive loss of light my property will suffer both to inside (through windows) and to outside amenities. Given the massive detrimental effect this will have on my use of the property I find it highly disappointing and troubling with respect to the lack of diligence undertaken in the planning that the light report does include my property's large window (roughly 12ft by 6ft), which is also the window closest to the development and stands suffer the greatest reduction in light.

#### Inaccuracies within the Daylight and Sunlight Report

- The skylight window of my kitchen is the primary source of light for the kitchen and only source of direct sunlight for the room. The Daylight and Sun report completely omits this very large (12ft by 6ft) and easily observable window, even though it is easily observable and will be the most affected window. There is no conceivable way that the author of the Daylight and Sunlight Report could have accidentally missed this window, indeed it is discounted from the amenity area, suggesting they knew about its existence but left it out the report.
- These among of numerous errors in the report, suggesting that the report lacks the necessary diligence and detail required for submission and questions validity and bias of the report.
- The report also omits or skylight windows on properties for 159 to 163 (p30 of lighting report) are also missing, and these windows are likely the only source of daylight for the below rooms.
- The amenity area for my property, 5 Britannia Street, will suffer massive light loss , if the development proceeds then only 9% of it will 2 hours of daylight. It is not unreasonable to assume that my kitchen window (that is not in the lighting report) would suffer a similar reduction in light, serve damaging light in an important family room and falling well below BRE guidelines.
- The report also incorrectly suggests that "It is conceivable that most amenity spaces are mainly used during the summer months." This entirely incorrect as the amenity is in constant use but in particularly heavy use in Spring and Summer. The frankly absurd assertion that we do not use our outdoor space during spring one more leads me to question the validity and independence of the report.

#### Loss of Light:

- Loss of light will be among the primary detrimental effects I will suffer should this development go ahead.
- According to Daylight and Sunlight Report the it will reduce the proportion of my outdoor amenity that receives 2 hours on sunlight in spring (March 21st) to 9%, a reduction of 31%! Effectively it will render my outdoor space without sunlight for most of spring, making it cold and uninviting, destroying

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
					<p>its utility as an outdoor space of enjoyment.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>I expect daylight to my kitchen to be restricted in the same way, though it has been left off the report. This will severely restrict sunlight which upon which the most used room in my house relies.</li> <li>The development, due to its excessive height, will impinge and harm the use of our only outdoor space through serve curtailing of the sunlight it currently enjoys. This would be detrimental to all residents within the property though affect my property perhaps the curtail the ability to use and enjoy affected amenities and kitchen.</li> <li>In the DAS the developers state that:  “Collaboration with Malcolm Hollis from the early stages of design ensured that there will be no discernible loss. Furthermore working closely with the neighbouring residents through a series of public consultation have also ensured that there will be no adverse impact with regards to the daylight and sunlight enjoyed by the residents. Refer to Daylight/Sunlight report by Malcolm Hollis”  The above is clearly untrue, not only is there significant loss of light, the Daylight/Sunlight report by Malcolm Hollis illustrates that they fail to meet BRE criteria and there is a discernible loss of light. But there was no official consultant with the community (unless this was the event they termed an exhibition of the plans), but the plans have in no way been altered to reflect the view expressed by the local community during aforementioned “exhibition”.</li> </ul> <p>Suggested Mitigations:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Lowering the height of the proposed structure: When the developers presented their plans to the community, we were not told it was a consultation, numerous concerns were raise about the height of the proposed structure, however there was not alteration to the height of the building from exhibited plans to submitted plans. At the proposed height of the building it will inevitably and detrimentally restrict day light to existing residents. We suggest that the plans of the development be modified to keep the current height and profile of the existing building.</li> <li>Removal of rooftop triangular sedum roof: In addition to the top floor of the building there is to be large triangular sedum roof. These further decrease light to existing properties at the expense of existing residents. We propose that these are removed from the development.</li> <li>New Daylight and Sunlight Report Commission by Council planer recommended consultant: The existing Daylight and Sunlight Report is incorrect to the extent of being negligent. We propose that a new report be commissioned, that accounts for all windows and amenity areas. Additionally, the developers have shown themselves unable to select a competent and/or unbiased Daylight and Sunlight consultant, as illustrated by the poor quality and numerous mistakes within the report. We propose that the Daylight and Sunlight consultant be chosen by the community or by the council planners.</li> </ul> <p>2) Loss of Privacy:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The new building will back onto our property with windows considerably less than the 18meters required meter from our only outdoor amenity space, which is in constant use, and from windows to my bathroom and kitchen (the latter is left off lighting report may also no be considered in this basement by developer). This is less than the 18m required by BRE and Camden Planning Guidelines.</li> <li>As a results our privacy will be affect negatively, preventing me and my family from enjoying reasonable privacy.</li> </ul>

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

**Comment:**    **Response:**

- The development proposes that louvres (suggested being aluminium slats) are put in place to mitigate this. However, this is not sufficient the louvres will not fully block all views of my property (the DAS says they only limit), thus my privacy is still harmed. The below picture is taken from the DAS and is the developers illustration of louvres. One can clearly see they do not entirely obstruct the view out and serve little to maintain our privacy.

- It should be noted that in the planning statement the developers demurs from creating affordable housing because. "In order to avoid an unreasonable degree of overlooking to nearby residential units the design of any new residential unit on the site would be designed in a manner that would unduly restrict the outlook of that property and would therefore impact on any future occupier, should housing be accommodate at the application site." The developers themselves consider the building, if used for residential would create and "unreasonable degree of overlooking to nearby residential units". We would suggest that an office building, which would be in use at all hours of the day would also create an "unreasonable degree of overlooking to nearby residential units".

- Policy DP26 still requires measures to be taken to ensure that the privacy of residential occupants is maintained. The current development does not maintain our privacy but instead reduces it. We have no wish for the occupants of our property.

Suggested Mitigations:

- Lower Building Size: The current proposal suggests and 55 full time workers, this will create unduly high levels of traffic. We suggest to mitigate the noise effects that such a large increase in local population that the size of people within the development be limited.

- Reduce Building Height: Were the top floor of the proposed development removed from the plan then there would be a significant reduction in the privacy invasion and "unreasonable degree of overlooking" in adjacent residential properties.

3) Waste Management Strategy will directly affect 5 Britannia street and create unsafe and unhealthy environment.

- The below diagram shows that for waste disposal 8 x 240 litre bins will be placed in front of 3 and 5 Britannia Street.

- While the DAS suggests that these will be placed on the street on the day of waste disposal and removed thereafter, they provide no plans or measure on how this is to be accomplished suggesting lack of research and knowledge of the surrounding area.

- Rubbish on Britannia Street is collected 3 times a week on Monday, Wednesdays and Fridays. It is typically collected early in the morning normally before office hours. This means the new development would have to leave 8 bins in front of our property of my property and the neighbouring 3 Britannia Street from the close of business (17.00) until opening of business (9.00am) the next day.

- This means that rubbish will be amassed in front of our property for at least 16 hours three times a week, creating a potentially unsafe environment for residents.

- Furthermore, the current Britannia Street residents are unable to use waste disposal bins, due to high crime levels, as all previous bins have been stolen. Currently waste is left for collection in bags, and, due to high local crime rate, they are often ripped open through by homeless people or miscreants, creating a further unsafe environment. Additional waste from 8 bins in front of our property will on



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

**Comment:**    **Response:**

increase this issue main fold.

- Having 8 bins outside our property also prevents us from enjoying the view from our ground floor window and would create unpleasant and unhealthy odours which would be severely detrimental to the enjoyment and health of our property.

Suggested Mitigations:

- Secure off street storage for collection with private collection: The reasonable solution is for the development to plan to store waste for collection within their property, as opposed to on the street, and either have private waste collection recover it from there.

4) Increased Noise and Evening usage from Development:

- The existing light industrial concern within the development property was in regular daily use until the recent purchase of the property by the developers. However, this use ended at 5.00pm or earlier and had very light traffic and footfall with little or no discernible noise effect on us as neighbours.

• The new proposed development, with a proposed 55 office desks, will lead to considerably increased noise levels outside regular business hours; the hours in which we use our home.

- Office hours in London are no longer restricted to 9-5, this means that they will be constant entry and egress from the property. The opening and closing of entrance door, as given high crime rate they cannot be left open at night, will create additional noise: door banging and security cards beeping.

Given a significant amount of this noise will be created in evenings and early mornings this will prevent us from the quiet enjoyment of our property.

- The proposal to use the basement and/or other areas as a gallery and exhibition space further exacerbates the problem. Galleries predominately hold exhibitions outside office hours and often in evenings or night. This will create extra traffic outside in the evenings and mean that people will congregate outside the building entrance (e.g. smokers) which is directly next to our front door and window. This will drastically increase noise and result in further loss of privacy and quiet enjoyment of our property.

Suggested Mitigations:

- Lower Building Size: The current proposal suggests 55 full time workers, this will create unduly high levels of traffic. We suggest to mitigate the noise effects that such a large increase in local population that the size of people within the development be limited.
- Restrict building use to reasonable 08.00-18.00 office hours, only: Use of the building should be mandated to be restricted to reasonable office hours, such as 8.00-18.00.
- Do not use basement, or other areas of the building, for uses that require and/or encourage night or evening time activity: Social, leisure and night-time focused uses of the building be prohibited as a use in order to prevent undue disturbance to local residents.

5) Noise Pollution

- The courtyard area within the developed is proposed is surrounded by residential building. This creates the effect of an echo chamber which magnifies noise.

• The development with an outdoor terrace, air conditioning and heating, and extractor fans from waste storage (which will pipe foul smelling waste gas into the courtyard) will all create on considerable and often constant noise.

- The development, in its current form, will further create increases to this noise which will likely render quiet enjoyment of outdoor space, such as my roof terrace impossible (e.g. without the

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

**Comment:**    **Response:**

background noise of constant air-conditioning fans and exhaust fumes), while also meaning it may become unpleasant for us to open our rear facing windows.

- There is little in the submitted planning documents that addresses this issue.

Suggested Mitigations:

- Restrict building use to reasonable 08.00-18.00 office hours, only: The acoustic suggests that air conditioning units only be used during office hours, however the modern office hours often range far into the night and people often work within weekends. Office workers cannot go without heating/air conditioning thus we propose to that building use is limited to 8.00-18.00 in order that residents may have quiet enjoyment of their property.

6) Light Pollution:

- The building will be in use beyond normal working hours, including the necessity of cleaners cleaning offices. This means that strong office lighting will leak out of proposed windows into the shared courtyard through windows.
- The proposed inclusion of triangular sedum roof with windows at the top of the building will further escalate this issue, as these will point directly at our property and will project harsh office light over a greater distance, and spoil night time use of the courtyard and nearby properties.
- In my, 5 Britannia Street, specific case light pollution will leak into an upstairs bedroom, not a desirable effect for a room people sleep in.

Suggested Mitigations:

- Removal of rooftop triangular sedum roof: This would serve to cut light pollution significantly.

7) Detrimental Change of Character of Conservation Area:

- Our property, 5 Britannia Street, is a grade 2 listed building. The majority of the buildings surrounding the property are also listed buildings.
- The design of the new development is highly modern and, as a result, would destroy the unique characteristics of the area. Two aspect of the building are significantly detriment to the charter and stand out against the existing buildings: the louvres and the triangular sedum roof.
- The proposed louvres are suggested to be aluminium, this is against the character of the area while they together with the triangular sedum roof also give a distinctly modern feel in an otherwise old listed area.
- The Camden Council's King's Cross / St. Pancras Conservation Area Audit notes that: "New development should be seen as an opportunity to preserve or enhance the character or appearance of the Conservation Area. New development should respect the built form and historic context of the area, local views, existing features such as building lines, roof lines, elevational design, and where appropriate, architectural characteristics, detailing, profile, and materials of adjoining buildings. Proposals should be guided by the UDP in terms of appropriate uses." The current development proposed is clearly not in keeping with listed buildings within the area including, but not limited to DL flats 1-48 and DL flats 49-144.

Suggested Mitigations:

- Redesign of building to match current area, including removal of louvres and triangular sedum roof.

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

8) Lack of Affordable housing in development:

- The area has a high proportion of affordable housing and the developers are neglecting their obligation to create affordable housing that would benefit the community.
- The Planning statement says that “he proposed development results in an increase in commercial floorspace of 371.7sqm GEA (310.3 sqm, GIA) providing a total GEA of 973.6 (878.6sqm GIA). As such, the proposal triggers the requirement of 50% of this additional floorspace to be provided as residential floorspace which results in 185.85 sqm GEA.”
- The primary rationales provided by the developer for not fulfilling their obligation to create affordable housing is that they cannot create a split entrance, a highly questionable ascertain given the width of the entrance, and that there would be “unreasonable degree of overlooking”. However, later in report they contradictory argue the building, as an office, would not create an infringement on current resident privacy (unreasonable overlooking), suggesting that either the office build would mean a significant lose of privacy to existing residents or that the privacy reason for refusing affordable housing is spurious.

Suggested Mitigations:

- Build required affordable housing.
-

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2016/6356/P	Debbie Radcliffe	91 Judd Street London WC1H 9NE	20/12/2016 10:58:20	OBJ	<p>BRAG (Bloomsbury Residents Action Group) was formed in June 2016 to be a Voice for residents who live in WC1, a corner of central London which has become a focus for developers who seem to have no interest in the wellbeing of the permanent residents who live there. This planning application is a case in point.</p> <p>BRAG strongly objects to the application to permit an existing low-rise warehouse to be replaced by a much larger three-storey office block in the courtyard of Derby Lodge, the residential building that completely wraps around the land-locked application site.</p> <p>Historic significance:</p> <p>Derby Lodge (formerly Derby Buildings) dates from 1865, one of the earliest examples of flatted residential accommodation built by Sydney Waterlow's Improved Industrial Dwellings Company. The buildings have been listed as Grade II listed since 1994. They are an important part of the historic streetscape in this part of London. They are also first and foremost – as per Historic England's Listing description - "philanthropic housing".</p> <p>Both the original residential purpose of the flats and their heritage significance underline how utterly inappropriate it is to allow the development of an over-scaled new office block with basement public gallery (which has absolutely no connection with the host building) within the curtilage of this historic residential block of flats.</p> <p>The courtyard is an integral part of the listed buildings. It is an area of land that is attached to the residential structure, a curtilage space that creates a single urban entity – as designed by Sydney Waterlow in the 19th century.</p> <p>Change of character:</p> <p>The existing warehouse (used as a mirror workshop with very few employees) has been a quiet and unobtrusive neighbour to the large number of residents who live near by. Its two-storey presence has not impinged unduly on residential amenity. Its use has not dominated or changed in any way the original residential nature of the surrounding dwellings.</p> <p>In contrast, the scale of the application building will fundamentally alter the character of the space and impact negatively on the residential amenity of all tenants and owner-occupiers that live in the adjacent flats, and in buildings close to the site along Kings Cross Road and Britannia Street.</p> <p>Impact on residential amenity:</p> <p>Global enterprise and activity means that the office building could be in use 24 hours a day. Terraces are proposed which will overlook people's homes. Office workers could access spaces that are connected to the application building. They could talk and smoke outside at all hours of the day and evening. Light pollution from offices after twilight will impact on residents who currently experience</p>

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

**Comment:**    **Response:**

darkness to the rear of their properties. Air conditioning units will add to increased noise at night. All this is an unacceptable intrusion on residential amenity.

As well as taking away light from existing residential homes, the courtyard acts as an echo chamber so ambient noise could increase substantially, simply due to the inappropriate imposition of an office block on a site for which use it was not intended. Excavation of the basement level to provide a gallery will impact negatively on residential amenity in terms of considerable noise and daily disturbance.

A Section 106 covenant on restricted use of terraces etc is hard to enforce, especially with cuts to local government spending leading to shortage of staff to do so. As any potential wrongdoing will take place within the courtyard space, it will be hidden from wider public view and be extremely hard to monitor from the streets bordering the site. A patrolling policeman would not be able to see someone misusing the office terrace facilities from the street.

Objections:

1. BRAG objects to the demolition of the existing building and excavation of a new basement floor to create a new building which is unsuited to its location in relation to access, character and proximity of residential buildings which will have a loss of privacy due to the overlooking of neighbouring habitable rooms.
2. BRAG objects to change of use from Class B1c (light industrial business use) to class B1a (office use) and D1 (non residential institution use). Although the wider neighbourhood includes a mix of uses, and the warehouse has had commercial use within the courtyard, this has been extremely low-key and unobtrusive. The principal use of the host building is residential and Class B1a and D1 are inappropriate in context.
3. The application should be refused as it causes harm to residential amenity under Camden's Policy DP26, which aims to protect the quality of life of neighbours and occupiers.
4. The proposals will cause harm to the setting of a listed building and should be rejected under Policy DP25. The land-locked site, which is the location for the application proposal, is part of the curtilage of listed 19th century Industrial dwellings. The scale and massing of the proposed office block will cause harm, as it will change the character of the courtyard space and conflict with the residential use and character of the surrounding dwellings. In relation to the NPPF, there are no public benefits to the large number of residents who surround the site who will, on the contrary, be harmed by increase noise, loss of light and loss of privacy.

The aerial views of the site, (provided in the Applicant's Design and Access Statement) and sent by separate letter to Laura Hazelton, show the residential dwellings in very close proximity to the proposed development. This clearly demonstrates how the proposed office block will add to the density of the urban block and be unacceptably close to the flats that surround the courtyard of Derby Lodge, and those in Britannia Street and Kings Cross Road.

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

---

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2016/6356/P	Derby Lodge TRA	94 Derby Lodge Wicklow Street	21/12/2016 20:10:06	OBJ	<p>Derby Lodge Tenants and Residents Association (DLTRA) represents the many people that live at Derby Lodge, both in Wicklow Street and Britannia Street and is elected by those residents.</p> <p>The DLTRA has consulted with residents by arranging for Balcap Re (The Developer) to exhibit at the local DLTRA Hall, several TRA meetings, and assisting those that did not have accesses to the Internet.</p> <p>Many Residents expressed their concern that Camden Council, as the Landlord of Derby Lodge, would not represent the residents' best interests and that this will be the precedence for Camden Council to allow more large developments to take place in residential courtyards across the ward.</p> <p>Derby Lodge is classified by Camden Council as "Sensitive Lets" and has a very mixed community with many living in Derby Lodge for more than 20 years, some over 35 years.</p> <p>Many Residents are concerned that due to the complete disregard by the Developer of the surrounding buildings, poor communication with members of the DLTRA, key elements missing from the light report and confusing exhibition plans, the Developer will not be a good neighbour going forward.</p> <p>Here are the key objections residents have expressed in all the meetings with the TRA and DLTRA:</p> <p>1) PRIVACY The current design of slatted windows does not ensure the privacy of Derby Lodge Residents. Some properties are very close, many will overlook the Developers' windows and balconies and due to this, many Derby Lodge residents will have no privacy in their bedrooms.</p> <p>2) NOISE POLLUTION</p> <p>a) The Derby Lodge Courtyard is a quiet space surrounded by DL residents on both sides and the shops and residents on King's Cross Road on the East / North-East side, the section of the Courtyard this development occupies acts as an echo chamber and noise or conversation in the courtyard can be heard quite clearly from the Derby Lodge flats, a busy office in this space would impinge on the quality of life for many of the residents.</p> <p>b) Built in 1865, the windows of Derby Lodge are single glazed sash windows, this means there is no insulation from external noise. The quietness of the rear courtyard is essential to maintain a quality of life for the residents ensuring their bedrooms are not contaminated with unnecessary noise.</p> <p>c) For many years, the existing site (2k Mirrors) has been a very small 2-man company, the new development increases the number of employees to 55, this will create much more noise than the previous company.</p> <p>d) Air conditioning units will face directly into the main echo chamber, at the highest number of residents.</p> <p>3) DAYLIGHT and SUNLIGHT REPORT The Developer's Daylight and Sunlight Report has several serious inaccuracies and deliberately omits key windows and skylights of the following neighbouring properties: 3 &amp; 5 Britannia Street and 159 to</p>

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
					<p>163 King's Cross Road.</p> <p>The report also makes the false assumption that the nearby amenities (including roof gardens) are only used in Summer.</p> <p>In general the Developer's Light Report is biased and does not reflect the true nature of the surrounding properties.</p> <p>4) RIGHT TO LIGHT</p> <p>Several Residents will lose a considerable amount of light due to the size of this Development. In the evenings, there will be light pollution for nearly all of the Derby Lodge Residents.</p> <p>5) SIZE</p> <p>This is a huge development for this landlocked site and residents feel that the Developer has given no consideration to its neighbours.</p> <p>This development will increase the number of employees from 1-2 employee(s) to a much larger 55 employees</p> <p>The Camden Website Map shows that Derby Lodge's Boiler House is included in this development. Residents are concerned they will lose the Boiler House and the source of all their heating and hot water.</p> <p>6) COMMUNICATION</p> <p>a) Many people felt that the Exhibition the Developer held was misleading. For instance, in the brochure and exhibition boards, the photo of the rear of nearby 151 King's Cross Road was shown to give the impression of a rundown courtyard showing rubbish outside the property, when in fact the rear of the Developer's own site (163 King's Cross Road) has a very green and lively wall garden created by a resident of Derby Lodge. Residents do realise this is most likely to be because the Developer will have to destroy this green wall garden.</p> <p>b) The plans shown at the Exhibition were not very clear and did not show the true impact of the development. Many felt that the absence of key elevations were deliberate to hide the impact of this development to local residents</p> <p>c) The Developers promised to supply more in-depth plans for the DL TRA and the Concern Residents of Derby Lodge Courtyard (CRDLC is a separate group including the Derby Lodge Circle 33 Residents, private residents and businesses that all back onto the Derby Lodge Courtyard), but failed to provide them after several attempts and only did so with the intervention of Councillor Jonathan Simpson.</p> <p>d) The Light Report omits several key information about the neighbouring properties</p> <p>7) CONSTRUCTION</p> <p>18 months construction suggests it is fairly long for the size of the building. It took 36 months to build The Shard and the same for The Gherkin.</p> <p>A small river runs under parts of Derby Lodge and the courtyard and has caused problems with previous digging in the area. The river does not show up on any existing plans and was not discovered until the building of 2 Wicklow Street a few years ago.</p> <p>During the construction, there is also the possibility of construction of developments 2016/0672/P,</p>



Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
					<p>2016/5396/P and 2016/0450/P in Britannia Street and Wicklow Streets which will impact quality of life for many residents with construction on every side of their homes.</p> <p>Due to the one way system surrounding Britannia Street and the closure of Leake Street until the year 2020, road closures impact local resident's severely. During the building of the Depot Student Home and now 2 Britannia Street, residents have witnessed many unauthorised temporary road closures lasting several hours without any warning. The lack of oversight means that residents</p> <p>Due to the very limited parking on Britannia Street, Wicklow Street and surrounding streets, removal of parking spaces will have a big impact on residents that park in the area. When the Depot Student home was built, not all the parking bays were put back in place, exacerbating the parking problems near Derby Lodge.</p> <p>The Derby Lodge Boiler House is directly along one wall of this development, there are serious concerns that damage to this building or the supplies in and out will see 70 properties without heating or hot water!</p> <p>8) FINAL THOUGHTS OF RESIDENTS:</p> <p>a) Camden to provide plans for the mitigation of any impingement onto Derby Lodge. When 2 Wicklow Street impinged on the external walkway of Derby Lodge, reducing the size of the walkway and removing the frame to the external gate, the Camden Planning Department failed to resolve the issue.</p> <p>b) The Residents of Derby Lodge request that the size of the building to remain the same as the existing building with no external balconies. Windows to be frosted to respect the privacy of the Derby Lodge residents. No basement to be dug as this will increase construction time. Restrict the hours of operation to office hours only. Restrict access to the Derby Lodge Courtyard. Restrict roof access of the developments' employees.</p>

---

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2016/6356/P	Marcus O'Higgins	20 Derby Lodge Britannia Street WC1X 9BP WC1X 9BP	19/12/2016 15:06:01	OBJLETTE R	<p>To Whom It May Concern:</p> <p>I am very much in opposition to:</p> <p>Planning Application number: 2016/6356/P.</p> <p>I live on the ground floor of Derby Lodge, Britannia Street, and this application for a 4 - storey building will directly affect my quality of life for the worse.</p> <p>Window Tax – Daylight Robbery:</p> <p>Ambient daylight, principally for residents living on the lower floors of Derby Lodge, has always been limited in this sheltered courtyard environment, particularly during the Winter/Autumn months and when the sky is overcast throughout the rest of the year. It will diminish even further if such a project is approved. In fact, whatever time of year it is, it is always necessary to have a light on in my ground-floor kitchen during the day – thanks to the changeable English weather. This in turn has an effect on my electricity bill which would increase should this planning application be approved.</p> <p>Derby Lodge is an English Heritage Listed Building, and therefore residents and Camden Council are forbidden to modernise and install noise-cancelling-heat-retaining double glazed windows, or elevators in order to preserve the architectural integrity of this historically significant building which was built as a direct consequence of the repeal of the Window Tax in 1851 – commonly referred to by many at the time as ‘a tax on health’ and ‘a tax on light and air’ - to legally clear the way for The Crystal Palace to be built for the Great Exhibition of 1851, at which the prototype for this building was first unveiled as a template for modern, improved housing ‘with windows’ for the poor working classes, etc., etc.</p> <p>No such rule will apply to this new proposed development, which will most decidedly blemish the historic integrity of the surrounding area and will, ironically, bring new meaning to the term ‘Daylight robbery’, allegedly first coined during the days of the Window Tax. But this time, it won’t be necessary to brick-up any windows as was done in the 1800’s to avoid paying the Window Tax. The proposed 4 - storey building will do the job instead.</p> <p>Another irony is that the building’s architect has, as told to me by him personally, extended the height of the overbearing roof of the building’s design upwards in order to maximize the ambient light entering the upper floors for the benefit of all those who will work within this commercial building and, in so (thoughtlessly) doing, will further limit ambient light for its residential neighbours in Derby Lodge.</p> <p>Residential area.</p> <p>People forget that King’s Cross is a residential area, and Derby Lodge is a residential estate with</p>

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
					<p>approximately 100 flats (belonging to Camden Council, Circle 33 Housing association, and one other Housing Association) with in excess of 200 inhabitants and their children. Added to this there are, at a guesstimate, another 30-40 flats above the nearby shops on King's Cross Road, and also the residents of Numbers 1, 3, and 5 Britannia Street. All these properties and their residents will be adversely affected by the proposed Planning Application Number: 2016/6356/P</p> <p>The proposed application is for a commercial office complex which we have been led to believe will be hired out for short-term lets &amp; rentals (by the hour/week, potentially 24 hours a day). This will result in a heavy turnaround of office workers and their clients using the building day and night.</p> <p>These strangers will have access to the proposed building's roof terrace/garden which directly overlooks my flat giving them an unrestricted view of my kitchen interior which would result in my having to continuously use curtains or blinds to preserve my privacy, further reducing precious ambient daylight. However, this would not apply to users of the proposed building who will be shielded from our collective gaze by a trellis-like structure.</p> <p>I spend up to 14 hours per day in my kitchen working and this invasion of privacy and subsequent loss of ambient daylight would be a big problem for me. This would equally apply to my living room - adjacent to my kitchen - where I spend whatever free time I have. I am prone to walk around my flat in the altogether or wearing shorts at any time of the day. Such personal freedom, and other more private activities would have to cease!</p> <p>I also love to watch the sky at night from my kitchen and living room windows. This would be virtually impossible as the building's monolithic design structure would all but obliterate my view of it.</p> <p>Echo Chamber – noise and disturbance.</p> <p>The Derby Lodge communal courtyard is, in essence, one big echo chamber.</p> <p>Sound emanating from, in and around this area is greatly amplified because of the architectural design and recessed layout of the historic 3-5 storey buildings that completely surround and engulf it. As a result, all building work including building demolition, and excavation digging &amp; drilling will cause great anguish for all residents within range of the epicentre of 18-plus months of busy building construction, and also a lifetime of itinerant office workers and associated activity; potential road closures to deliver building supplies, and so on.</p> <p>Whatever noise levels have been officially deemed acceptable for this site must now be re-evaluated because of this unique acoustic anomaly.</p> <p>Building Works:</p>

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

**Comment:**    **Response:**

Over the years, Derby Lodge residents have had to endure two very long, intensive and noisy building maintenance works which were very stressful for all concerned from the day the scaffolding was installed until completion many, many overdue months later. To have to endure yet another intense protracted building project so close by, followed by the ensuing noise pollution created by the commercial operation of the completed business centre; loud music - should a music and/or performance licence be granted for the 'flexible' gallery space; air conditioning units; the daily (and nightly) goings-on of staff and occupants and their varied modes of transport resulting in an increased demand for a dearth of suitable parking spaces; discarded cigarette butts and other litter from the roof top smoking area, etc., is wholly unacceptable.

We have also had to endure countless roadworks; 5 x 2-3 week road closures, traffic redirections, and reduced parking to accommodate the installation of Richard Serra's monolithic sculptures at The Gagosian Galley on Britannia Street; months of repair of gas pipes by the National Grid, and so on and so forth. The list just goes on, and on.

1-3 Britannia Street London WC1X 9BN

Ever since I can remember, this site has been used as a low-key second-hand office furniture shop, also selling mirrors, and providing a picture framing & glass cutting service. The maximum number of employees on the site has usually been 3-5, and life has been relatively peaceful. However, the current tenant seems to be the only local who actively supports such an inappropriate volte-face in the change of use and design of this site. And with an almost evangelical zeal. Perhaps this is due to him having been given one year's free rent in lieu of him wholeheartedly backing the project.

A community or residential property with a more considerate and less intrusive design & building construction program, and not the frenetic hustle and bustle of a 24-hour commercial office complex, would be far more in keeping with the residential character of the area and better suit this particular site.

There are already far too many offices/hotels/hostels/student digs, with the increased footfall they produce, in the immediate area, and developers and the Council should respect the fact that Britannia & Wicklow Streets are a residential area with young families to take into account.

A fairer balance between the needs of commerce and the local resident's quality of life and privacy needs to be sought, and this proposal is not the answer.

Yours sincerely,

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

Marcus O'Higgins.  
Derby Lodge, Britannia Street.

---

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

2016/6356/P	Milanka and Tijana Mamula	Flat C 161 King's Cross Road	21/12/2016 17:36:23	COMMNT	Dear Camden Council:
-------------	------------------------------	------------------------------------	---------------------	--------	----------------------

We wish to make you aware of a number of strong objections that we have with regard to the demolition of the industrial building to the rear of 1-3 Britannia Street and the construction of a 3-storey plus basement office building on the same site (application number 2016/6356/P), as proposed by Balcap Re Ltd. As an immediate neighbour to the site of the proposed development, we are of the view that the proposed development will have a serious and negative impact on the standard of living in 159-161 King's Cross Road. Our specific objections are as follows:

Most importantly, the proposed building would demonstrably harm the amenities enjoyed by local residents, in particular valuable light, privacy and the right to enjoy a quiet residential environment. Flats A and C of 161 King's Cross Road, which give onto the courtyard exclusively, would find both their bedrooms and living rooms directly facing the proposed building, with consequent substantial loss of light and privacy. The same loss of light and privacy would also apply to the communal areas of 161 King's Cross Road, which likewise face only the courtyard where the proposed building is to be erected. These drawbacks pertain likewise to the many flats within the adjacent terrace houses, as well as to the first, second and (though to a slightly lesser extent) third floor flats within the Derby Lodge buildings. We believe that it would be a gross injustice to substantially diminish exposure to light and impinge on the privacy of numerous residential properties for the benefit of a sole office building. We are also deeply concerned about the increase in noise levels and artificial light that such a substantial office building would be likely to generate.

We further believe that the proposed development is a direct contravention to several of the statements contained in Policy DP24.

In the first instance, the proposal does not respect local context and, in particular, the form, scale, character and materials of surrounding buildings. The properties along this portion of King's Cross Road, Britannia Street and Wicklow Street consist of mostly small Victorian terrace houses as well as the Grade II listed Derby Lodge, also Victorian. All of the buildings that face the courtyard where the proposed office building would be constructed thus date to the mid-1800s. The proposed building is instead a modern, three storey block that is extremely large compared to the terrace houses that face it and with respect to the limited space within the courtyard. We believe that the proposed building does not consider the prevailing pattern, density or scale of the surrounding development, and impacts negatively on existing rhythms, symmetries and uniformities. The proposed building materials are likewise mostly incompatible with the surrounding courtyard. As a result, both the scale and design of the development will be entirely out of keeping with the immediately neighboring houses. Development Policy Statement 24.4 states that good design should be appropriate to its context and improve the character and quality of an area. Design which is inappropriate in its context, or which fails to take the opportunities available for improving the character and quality of an area and the way it functions, should therefore not be accepted.

In addition, we believe that the proposed building is a direct contravention to Policy Statement 24.9,

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

**Comment:**    **Response:**

which stipulates that “the re-use of existing buildings preserves the ‘embodied’ energy expended in their original construction, minimizes construction waste and reduces the use of new materials.” The proposal to completely demolish the existing warehouse — which is instead in keeping with the scale and character of the surrounding buildings — and erect a new construction entirely from scratch in its place, is an environmentally wasteful solution and one that would, moreover, also contribute to a substantial increase in both air and noise pollution for the area during the lengthy period (a proposed 18 months) of construction work required.

We would be deeply grateful if the council would take our objections into consideration when deciding this application.

Respectfully,

Milanka and Tijana Mamula (leaseholder and tenant, Flat C, 161 King’s Cross Road)

---

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2016/6356/P	On Behalf of the Concerned Residents of Derby Lodge Courtyard	88 Derby Lodge Wicklow Street	19/12/2016 12:36:49	OBJ	Application No: 2016/6356/P2016/6356/P Rear of 1-3, Britannia Street formerly known as 159/163, King's Cross Road.

We strongly object to this planning application for the following reasons:

I. Size Of Development

1. Effect on the visual amenity of the residents.

It is not accepted that the development is comparable to previously approved applications on this site. On the contrary, the proposals appear to extend the current structure by over 200% to a 4 floor office block. There will be a significant increase in scale and massing, which is the extra storey on top of the height of the current warehouses, which will mean that the loss of amenity to the residents is of seeing a wide, clear view across the courtyard, which is uninterrupted. It will also affect the provision of natural light available to the residents (see below).

2. Not in keeping with the area.

This is going to make a significant difference to the size of the building overall, which is both aggressive looking and imposing. It will mean that the outlook across the basin will be significantly changed as we are not looking any more at the backs of Victorian residential buildings, but will have a large, monolithic and claustrophobic dark office block in the middle of what is currently a light residential courtyard. It is not in keeping with the area (a conservation area), and marks a massive and detrimental change from the status quo.

The size of the development is hugely out of scale and a large modern development within the context of what is essentially a small residential courtyard and comes up just metres away from residents' bedrooms, bathrooms and kitchens. It is very imposing. The current warehouse does not do this.

3. Effect on the nature of the community

At the moment, most residents can see straight across the basin. This will no longer be the case if the development goes ahead as it will block the views of the residents. The only thing they will see out of their bedroom, living room and bathroom windows will be the office block - because of its disproportionately huge size. It will affect the nature of the residential community, making it more fractured and less cohesive.

4. The basement

It is not in keeping with the area - which currently does not have any underground areas. It means that the development is going to be absolutely huge for a gallery. It means that the current size of the



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

**Comment:**    **Response:**

warehouse is going to be increased by up to 200%. Further, there appears to be no Basement Impact Assessment which should have been part of the application. The Residents are properly concerned that the drilling and building of the basement will have an adverse impact on the foundations and walls of what are very old flats, not built to sustain such significant proximate pounding.

5.    The upper floor

This appears to be there simply to minimise the light pollution from the office space. However, it means that the residents lose light as a result. This is a very good example of the way in which this proposal puts at the bottom of its priorities the concerns and the interests of the residents, who are overwhelmingly concerned about the implications of the proposal on the light levels which they currently enjoy. In pretending to prioritise the light pollution arising from the invasive character of this development, the architects and developers are exacerbating the loss of light which so concerns the residents.

II.    Daylight and Sunlight.

1.    Significant inaccuracies within the report

Balcap Re state in their proposal that only one window is going to be affected by the plans. This simply cannot be the case. Their own plans miss out at least 10 residents' windows in their drawings, which suggests that those windows have not been taken into account and is a good indicator of the lack of care and attention which has been taken in compiling the light report and its conclusions. Further, the report writer appears not to have been into any of the surrounding properties while writing the report, which further undermines the accuracy of the recommendation.

It is perfectly obvious that all the residents up to the fourth stories will be SIGNIFICANTLY affected by the proposals in terms of the light they receive. Further, the backyards of the Victorian houses along the start of Britannia Street and the Kings Cross Road are going to be hugely impinged on by this development and its imposing nature, and the light wells in their properties, which appear entirely to have been overlooked in the report.

It follows that the council do not have the information necessary in order to make approve the plans as the report is not accurate and cannot be relied upon.

The residents of the flats currently enjoy a large amount of light coming over courtyard over the course of the day due to the aspect and the uninterrupted space which the courtyard admits. The size of the proposed building makes it so that it will be very difficult for this light to continue to reach the windows as the size of the building is so large that it will interrupt the light coming into the flats and houses. It is plain that at the ground and first floor, the proposal will entirely occlude their access to natural lighting.

It is hard to see how the first and second floors (and therefore most of the houses, especially those on

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

**Comment:**    **Response:**

the the Kings Cross Road) are not going to find that there is much less light coming into their flats and houses if a large, dark building is now the most proximate building close to their windows- just metres away. The loss of light is going to be really quite dramatic and will mean that the residential dwellings lose access to this.

The windows of the dwellings cannot be changed as they are grade 2 listed so the residents have no way of ameliorating the loss of light by e.g. making their windows larger.

## 2. Breach of the 25 degree rule

The residents argue that the proposal breaches the 25 degree rule. Increasing the height of the building from the existing 1 storey plus pitched roof to 3 storeys high within just a few metres of the residents bedrooms, bathrooms and living rooms will inevitably cut the light to those rooms significantly and breaches the guidelines as the walls are right next to the building and the encroachment is going to be at least 65 degrees, if not higher.

it is also plain that by increasing the height of the building as proposed, the first and second floors will all but lose access to the natural light which they currently enjoy. These dwellings have been here for over 150 years and have a well-established right to light. The view and light of these lower floors will be entirely taken up with and obscured by, the new building

## III. Overlooking, Privacy And Outlook

### 1. Overlooking

This new building is going to be surrounded by and overlook residential dwellings. It overlooks the rest of the courtyard and the residential buildings surrounding that part of the courtyard. There are proposals for a balcony and outdoor space for smokers/ drinks parties, which will have the effect of encouraging office workers to peer into the back of the homes of ordinary residents in the area. It is enormously invasive and intrusive, and totally changes the environment of the area. The flats at Derby lodge are "sensitive lets", which means that more vulnerable members of the community are housed here. This will have the effect of intruding upon their privacy in an aggressive and unpleasant way.

### 2. Privacy

As the proposal is taking place at the back of the residents' homes, this will have the effect of looking into the most intimate and private parts of their dwellings, such as the bathrooms, bedrooms and kitchens. All the flats are designed so that the less intimate parts of the flat face out onto the street, away from the noise and the general public. At the moment, the space between the residents in the courtyard means that there is a large degree of privacy within the courtyard because the distance around the courtyard makes it difficult to actually see much through the windows. It will be very easy for office

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

**Comment:**    **Response:**

users to see into the most private part of the residents' houses, especially if the office workers are smoking or drinking on the terrace. It is unacceptable and will affect the way in which the residents use their homes. This is particularly concerning for families with children.

As mentioned above, the flats are designed so that dwellers can have the privacy of the courtyard facing onto the more private areas of their flats. The surrounding streets are extremely noisy, marked particularly by shouting and traffic. The courtyard as it currently stands is locked even from residents. It is extremely unusual to see a single person using it.

It is difficult to see how the 1.8m recommendations for privacy screens will be an acceptable solution to the privacy issues surrounding the terrace. On the contrary, such screens will almost certainly affect those affected residents' outlooks and access to daylight.

### 3. Outlook

As above, the outlook of the courtyard will be transformed detrimentally by the building. At the moment, residents currently enjoy views across the courtyard and beyond. This will be entirely occluded by the proposed development because of its height. Not only will this obscure the view to the other sides of the courtyard, but it will mean that views across to the Kings Cross Road and the buildings abutting Pentonville Road will be lost.

## IV. Other Objections

### 1. The character of the proposal

The nature of the proposals are to make offices and a gallery within a residential area. The development will entirely change the nature of the area for the worse. As things stand, the residents are a united and cohesive group who share the same interests and concerns about where they live. The nature of the relationship that office workers and the property management companies have with the places they work is entirely different to that relationship with people who actually live in the area. For example, they are not concerned about noise, or light pollution or any other form of pollution and these are typically the sorts of concerns which do tend to preoccupy residents. To make this minimally used warehouse into an office block does therefore bring 2 very different sets of priorities and interests into conflict. Office workers are unlikely to care much about the space they work in, whereas for residents this will be the very hearts of their lives. There is no comfortable relationship with the surrounding buildings.

There is also a gallery proposed. Britannia Street already has one gallery, which notably is not hidden behind residential buildings. It is deeply inappropriate to open up a residential unit to office workers, but even more so to members of the public coming at different times of the day into the office/gallery space.

It is not clear why the Derby Lodge courtyard needs office space. This end of the road is entirely

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

**Comment:**    **Response:**

residential in nature. Although there are flats further up the road, there are no other offices towards the top of the road, and no other examples of office or gallery space being imposed into, and surrounded by, the most central residential space, as this is.

The courtyard was envisaged by the same Victorian architects who designed the flats surrounding it. The area was designed to be residential and is Grade 2 listed. These proposals are entirely out of keeping with the philosophy behind the architecture of the buildings and the heritage status of those buildings, which was to improve the LIVING conditions of the working poor in London. The nature of this proposal entirely subverts the stated aim of the Victorian buildings by prioritising office workers' interests. It is not accepted that the current light industrial usage status does interfere as significantly with the heritage status of the surrounding buildings as the warehouse has no open spaces or windows nor is overlooking nor imposing on the flats.

This warehouse historically has housed a mirror workshop which has typically employed between 3 and 5 employees. The office space is likely to have high double figures workers coming that day every working day, and if there is a gallery, then this may well increase the footfall well into the weekends and the evenings too. The very nature of all the comings and goings will change the nature of this area enormously, and without a single benefit to the residents. On the contrary, their living conditions are only going to be compromised by the proposal.

Access to the site is by way of a single, small entrance on Britannia street. This will make the matter of congestion, noise and disturbance particularly acute.

Building a large office block within a courtyard with many families living there is simply odd and inappropriate.

## 2. Noise

The Residents are very concerned about the increase in foot fall around the entrance of the office space. It will have the effect of making the houses and flats close to the entrance very intruded upon and it will be really quite invasive in the mornings, at lunch times and in the evenings. It will affect the noise going into the houses. It means that the street will be significantly more congested, leading to a significant loss of amenity to residents, many of whom are families.

It is concerning that Balcap Re have proposed the digging out of a gallery space and an underground floor. This will have huge implications on the residents as they are going to have to endure at least 12 months + of constant, intensive and very noisy drilling. The effect on those residents who have come here as a sensitive let council dwelling will be catastrophic and enormous. It is bound to affect the mental health of those vulnerable and elderly residents, as well as night or shift workers, the self-employed and the families in the area.

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

The acoustics of the courtyard are particularly striking as the noise from open windows is extremely echoey. It is possible to hear a tap running and washing up from an open kitchen window from across the other side of the courtyard. Within this environment the noise from the terraces and the large air conditioning units will be amplified and exacerbated, making the proposed use of the building constantly intrusive for the residents. It is also very difficult to see how the proposed development will not be breaking the noise limits with the drilling which is necessary for any form of their proposal (but especially the creation of the basement floor). Given that this is a heritage area, the residents are not permitted to have double glazing in their windows. This will make the noise even more unbearable.

### 3. Failure to Consult properly

Balcap Re have hosted 2 "exhibitions" which showed inchoate drawings and designs in relation to the proposal. It was not clear from the pictures how each flat or house will be affected. A large part of the exhibition appeared to be drawings of other buildings which they have changed or built. Due to the misleading terminology of the "exhibition" there is potential for the residents not to have really been in any way aware that there was in fact a consultation taking place about the proposals. It was an event which did not have a clear picture of how the proposed building would affect the residents in a practical sense as much of the proposal was drawn and shaded in by way of somewhat confusing cross hatching. Given that these flats contain sensitive lets and vulnerable residents, there was no attempt made to make the proposals easy to read or use, or in any way accessible. On the contrary, they were difficult to follow for the more able of the residents. It is therefore not accepted by the residents that the exhibition was a proper consultation; and it is further contended that the proper process has not been followed.

It is deeply concerning that Balcap Re have refused to attend meetings to answer any further questions the residents have had. They have additionally refused to provide the drawings which they used at the exhibition until they were prevailed upon by a local councillor to do so. It speaks volumes about their attitude to residents that they refused to do this and sadly means that we can have no confidence that at any stage of the construction process they will ameliorate or mitigate the work in a way in which takes account the residents' very real concerns about either the construction of the building; nor that once built the office workers will actually be prevailed upon to use the building in a respectful or considerate manner.

### 4. Style of the building

The proposals are unreflective of the current type of building surrounding the courtyard, which is late Victorian and listed. It is hard to see how the 2 styles can be in any way reconciled. Of course, the warehouse is not late Victorian, but it has the merit of being modest and unobtrusive. It is hard to see how even the most generous view could see the plans as anything other than the most insensitive, crude and quality designs, which have the effect of destroying Camden's heritage of listed buildings around a silent courtyard. As stated above, these buildings were designed by Waterlow in order to improve the conditions of the less affluent workers in London. Part of this is providing a quiet and restful place to live, which is replete with a wide, undeveloped aspect at the back. The style of the proposal works entirely against the ethos of the original plans. If it is approved, an important part of Camden's

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

**Comment:**    **Response:**

architectural heritage will be lost with this proposal.

5. Light pollution

The back of Derby Lodge is currently very dark, which allows residents to sleep well. The office blocks are going to be noisy at all hours of the day because of the air conditioning, and will also be intrusive because of the light pollution in the evening. It will disturb the residents in the area. There are significant lightwells in the area which will have the effect of lightening the area in a way which is not acceptable given that residents' bedrooms back onto the building.

6. Sustainability

It is hard to see how the offices are going to be sustainable, given the Brexit vote. As things stand, there are many unused office spaces within the Kings cross area (most notably the lighthouse). It is hard to see why there is a need for further office development in this area or why it needs to change from light industrial use.

7. Transport

It has been proposed that more bicycle stands are implemented. This will cause extra congestion on pavements around Britannia Street and Kings Cross Road which are already going to be thick with office workers and gallery visitors during the week (and possibly weekend).

Concerned Residents of Derby Lodge Courtyard.

---

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2016/6356/P	Claudio Mannucci	Flat D 161 King's Cross Road WC1X 9BN	21/12/2016 19:19:02	COMMNT	<p>Dear Camden Council:</p> <p>I wish to second the objections to the proposal application number 2016/6356/P (the demolition of the warehouse to the rear of 1-3 Britannia Street and the erection of a “3 storey plus basement building to provide office,” made by Balcap Re Ltd) put forth by Valerio Mannucci, my brother and co-owner and tenant of Flat D, 161 King’s Cross Road.</p> <p>I am in full agreement with all of the points set out in my brother’s letter, and would like to further underline the extent to which I believe that this proposal, were it to go through, would be detrimental to our building and to the immediately surrounding ones.</p> <p>The proposal, which entails the wholesale demolition of an existing industrial building, would involve at least a year and a half of heavy construction work, bringing with it a level of air and noise pollution that, given the almost entirely residential and very space-constrained nature of the building site, is to my view completely unacceptable. Furthermore, the proposed design not only clashes deeply with the surrounding buildings in architectural terms, but is also grossly disproportionate to them in scale and would, were it erected according to the current plan, impinge upon the space and light exposure of the flats that face it (as well as the communal areas of 161 King’s Cross Road) in a way that far surpasses the warehouse set to be demolished. Finally, the proposal, which does not involve salvaging any part of the building it aims to replace, is environmentally wasteful in a way that seems, to me, profoundly unnecessary and misguided.</p> <p>I would be sincerely grateful if the council would take my objections into consideration when deciding this application.</p> <p>With respect,</p> <p>Claudio Mannucci (co-owner, Flat D, 161 King’s Cross Road)</p>
2016/6356/P	Jose Angel Riarola	Flat 9 Derby Lodge Britannia Street WC1X 9BP London	20/12/2016 16:11:30	OBJ	<p>I am concerned about the noise and disturbance that will follow, none of our properties were designed to cope with a modern level of noise.</p> <p>It will also damage the character of this conservation area as the proposed building doesn't follow the aesthetics of the structures that surround it.</p> <p>Also, although I am not directly affected, I am aware that it will reduce the available sunlight of my neighbours and the new terraces and windows will reduce their privacy, this would be my top concern if I were in their same position.</p>

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2016/6356/P	Yanis Sims	Wicklow Street 91 Derby Lodge WC1X9LF WC1X9LF	20/12/2016 16:47:28	OBJ	<p>I object to this planning application.</p> <p>I'd like to start with the 25 degree rule. This structure is clearly in contravention of this rule, on at least the lower ground three floors of Derby Lodge. It seems to me that, for this reason alone, this application must be rejected. The proposal will obviously have a huge detrimental impact on light available to residents, some of whom are housebound or otherwise sensitive tenants.</p> <p>Lack of consultation with residents. The developers and their proxies hosted what they termed an 'exhibition' on the other side of Kings Cross, which they leafleted Derby Lodge for. Only after being harangued by residents, and with involvement from our Councillors, were they effectively forced to stage another 'exhibition' at the Derby Lodge Community Building. For the latter 'exhibition', they said that they had sent by post leaflets to all Derby Lodge residents. These were never received in the post, and only after more haranguing did they hand deliver some leaflets three days before the 'exhibition'. It is clear that their claim that they sent us all leaflets in good time, by post, is a lie.</p> <p>More to point, an 'exhibition' is not a consultation. They did not do any consultation with residents in fact. Given the context of the proposal to develop an office block within a residential courtyard, I would expect Camden to be particularly concerned about the integrity of the developer and their claims.</p> <p>Derby Lodge Courtyard is a very quiet space; it is also an echo chamber. The effect of having an outside space where people - not just office workers but visitors to the gallery - may socialise and do the things that people do will have a horrendous effect on residents, at potentially all hours of the days. Derby Lodge has many residents who are housed here specifically because the flats are classed as 'sensitive lets'. This proposal is totally inappropriate for this demographic considering the impact it will have of a. 18 months demolition and construction, b. noise pollution, c. light pollution, d. inevitable presence of more non-residents in the courtyard (it's currently closed with only key access), and the effect this will have on residents' insecurity, e. invasion of privacy – some flats have all their habitation windows facing the yard, f. effect of massively reduced daylight.</p>

---



Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2016/6356/P	Jennifer Lee	Flat 10 Derby Lodge Britannia Street Kings Cross WC1X 9BP WC1X 9BP	19/12/2016 21:57:50	OBJ	<p>Dear all,</p> <p>Please accept this as an objection to the proposed works due to take place in the Derby Lodge courtyard.</p> <p>My primary concern is related to the noise that will be unavoidably caused due to the extensive construction works and the daily noise generated by the office block itself. I have a medical condition which is severely exacerbated by sleep disruption and emotional distress. I can honestly say, given the experience with the construction which has been taking place opposite the flat block, that works directly outside my bedroom will have a severe and negative impact to my health, wellbeing and quality of life.</p> <p>The flat has single glazed windows, which alongside the echoing nature of the courtyard itself, will mean that all noise generated by the office building will be heard by ALL residents in their bedrooms, bathrooms and kitchens. This includes office workers outside on the proposed terrace and building street entrance, air conditioning units, and the general noise which can be expected as part of building maintenance.</p> <p>Britannia Street is a very quite road, which means that ALL conversations taking place on the street outside can be heard at a very loud volume - Even on the 3rd floor! The inevitable increase in people traffic will mean that noise will now increase both in front of and behind the flat block. Therefore, there will be no room within my flat that I will be able to use to rest and recuperate during days of intense pain related to my health condition.</p> <p>This entire proposal is quite frankly ridiculous and completely inappropriate for the surrounding architecture and the vulnerable residents which occupy many of the flats. Approval of this proposal would indicate that the Council are very much "out of touch" with the community and the needs of its vulnerable members.</p> <p>Many of the residents are supportive of the disused buildings transformation into a valuable space for business and prosperity to the King's Cross area. However, the construction of such high and modern looking building, in the centre of a flat block which will cause so much disruption, is absurd. I take pride in the historic appearance of my home and feel that this office block will strip away this fantastic area of London heritage, which should be preserved and protected for generations more to enjoy.</p> <p>Derby Lodge has a fantastic sense of community, which I believe is supported by the circular nature of the Derby Lodge building. The construction of a four floor office block IN THE CENTRE of this circle will not only restrict the view of our neighbours, but will also severely impact upon the community spirit amongst the residents. Many residents will have an office wall less than 3 metres away from all but one window in their property. I cannot help but feel very distressed thinking about the incredibly vulnerable residents and those on the ground floor, who will have a significant proportion of their nature light stolen by this ridiculous building. We are on the third floor and are deeply distressed about the natural light that will be taken by the strange (and honestly ugly) structures the architects are</p>

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

proposing in this current plan.

It is my understanding that you have received many objections to this proposal. I cannot understand how this absurd, insensitive and "out of touch" plan has reached this stage, but I do advise that you listen to all concerned and DO NOT approve this application.

Please do not hesitate to contact me should you wish to discuss anything further.

Best wishes,  
Jenny Lee  
Flat 10, Derby Lodge

---