

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2016/6356/P	Dr Aleksandra Krotodki	82 Derby Lodge Wicklow Street London Wc1x 9lf	12/04/2017 11:02:16	COMMNT	<p>I live in number 82 Derby Lodge, on the fifth floor of the Wicklow street building and I object for the following reasons:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) invasion of privacy - the balcony overlooking my flat 2) reduced light to my flat and to those on the floors below; light strategy has not been accurately described in the proposal 3) noise from building work for 18 months, and ongoing noise day and night from a business property adjacent to my flat 4) incongruous with the neighbourhood: it is a conservation area and residential. A building in the middle of the courtyard is not either conserving nor supporting the residential community 5) waste management strategy will impact residents of the property on Britannia street 6) there is no affordable housing in the build plan
2016/6356/P	Henry Blackshaw	Gagosian Gallery 6-24 Britannia St WC1X9JD WC1X9JD	12/04/2017 10:30:14	COMMNT	<p>We are concerned that the redevelopment does not take into account the needs of the Derby Lodge Residents. It seems very likely that re-building will compromise light levels and privacy of the Lodge tenants, something that is very unfair given how long many residents have been in the area.</p>

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2016/6356/P	Anarkali Musgrave	Flat 13 Derby Lodge Britannia Street WC1X 9BP WC1X 9BP	12/04/2017 12:19:27	OBJ	<p>I strongly object to this planning application for the following reasons:</p> <p>I. Size Of Development</p> <p>This development 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>The current proposal extends both above and below, adding yet another floor to the structure. It is going to be huge.</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</p>

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

Comment: **Response:**

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.

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

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

Comment: **Response:**

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 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.

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

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 users to see into the most private part of the residents' houses. 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.

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

Comment: **Response:**

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 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, foxes 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 already 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 – they were not described as such. 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

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

Comment: **Response:**

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 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.

The top of that warehouse is covered with asbestos. I would like to know how this is to be moved safely.

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.

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 don't just mean by the final product but also by what are bound to be extremely noisy and aggressive drilling which is going to go on for well over a year. 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.

I am very worried about the inaccuracies of the light and sound reports. They simply bear no resemblance to common sense. I would prefer an INDEPENDENT report which had the benefit of accuracy. I am very worried about the effect which the deep drilling for the basement will have on the foundations of the flats; and the potential this will have to cause cracks in our flats. This is bound to cause us money as well as inconvenience us with the dust flying up from the work itself.

I simply can't see the benefit of having yet another gallery on this road. The gallery we have (gagosian) is very poorly attended – in over 18months of living here I've seen about a dozen people enter in toto. This is not an exaggeration. I can't see how on earth it is proportionate for there to be another gallery built, given the extent of the inconvenience which this is going to bring to the residents, when there is simply no call for it and no use for the space.

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2016/6356/P	FREDERICK BACCANELLO	3 Britannia Street WC1X 9JT	12/04/2017 10:25:07	OBJ	<p>Objection from Residents of 3 Britannia Street to the proposed development of Rear Of 1-3, Britannia Street, London, WC1X 9BN (ref: 2016/6356/P0)</p> <p>In this comment of the proposed development of Rear Of 1-3, Britannia Street, London, WC1X 9BN (ref: 2016/6356/P0) I have outlined 8 key objections and issues with the proposed development, which will have a considerable detrimental effect and harm on the amenities of current residents. I have also suggested mitigating actions the developer can undertake to remove or lessen the detrimental effect the proposed development will have upon our property 3 Britannia Street, which is currently occupied by my five month pregnant wife Elizabeth Baccanello and myself Frederick Baccanello.</p> <p>It should also be note that the revised plans show that the developer has failed in any meaningful way to listen to our (my wife and I) or any residents concerns raised over first set of proposals, with many changes actually making the situation worse, especially with respect to privacy and light pollution. Furthermore it should be noted that the developer has failed to engage with and respond to residents, including invites to visit their properties, meet with residents and correct inaccurate supporting documents, including lighting report.</p> <p>Additionally, I have sent a paper copy of my comment to the address Development Management, Camden Town Hall, Judd Street, WC1H 9JE. Please read and refer to this report as it contains pictures and diagrams (cannot be submitted online) outlining some of the more serve issues, including a number of windows that are missing from the Daylight and Sunlight Report.</p> <p>The key issues are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Loss of Light and Inaccuracies of Daylight and Sunlight Report, • Loss of Privacy, • Waste Management Strategy will directly affect 3 Britannia street and create unsafe and unhealthy environment, • Increased Noise and Evening usage from Development, • Noise Pollution, • Light Pollution, • Detrimental Change of Character of Conservation Area • Lack of Affordable housing within Development <p>1) Loss of Light and Continued Inaccuracies of Daylight and Sunlight Report:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The two main complaints regarding daylight are the inaccuracies within the Daylight and Sunlight Report (provided as a supporting document to the planning application) - which omits the existence of around 10 windows (that we can observe) and omits an outdoor amenity area, and assumes that we and our neighbours do not use outdoor areas in spring – and the loss of light to our property. <p>Inaccuracies within the Daylight and Sunlight Report</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • For 3 Britannia Street a ground floor amenity area containing two windows has been completely

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

Comment: **Response:**

left off the Daylight and Sunlight report, both for windows measurement and amenity areas. This area is clearly visible and it is inexcusable that it has been left off the report.

- The Amenity area is the only outdoor area for the ground floor flat of 3 Britannia Street.
- The two windows that are missing from the report are important to us. One is the only source of light for a bathroom and the other, more importantly, one is the only source of light for a living room for flat the below excepted from the Daylight and Sunlight Report has been edited to show the relevant missing areas.

Exhibit 1.1 from (see p43 on Daylight and Sunlight Report)

- These are one of numerous errors within the report. For instance, very large and very visible window on 5 Britannia (circa 12ft by 6ft) is completely omitted. The missing items lead me to question the validity of the report as, not only are they easily observable but they are also the areas of the properties (3 & 5 Britannia street) that stand to lose the most amount of light. It seems hard to conceive that a competent light report could accidentally omit these window; leading us to question the 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.

- For instance, applying the area loss and gain to A1 on the above diagram would mean that substantial daylight hours loss to the omitted amenity area. This would, with high certainty, that the proportion receiving at least 2 hour of sun on 21 March would fall below BRE target of 50%, given it is currently at a marginal rating of only 52%. Similarly, for 5 Britannia Street, given that most of the amenity area will lose light (only 9% with 2 hours of daylight), down from a large majority that the missing window would fall far below BRE requirements.

- The report also suggests that “It is conceivable that most amenity spaces are mainly used during the summer months.” There is no basis to back this incorrect assumption. We, my wife and I, use the amenity area throughout the year, but also use it heavily in spring and March. We are at the stage were next year, health permitting, we will be parents; meaning need for outdoor area and sunlight will increase drastically. Likewise we constantly see our neighbour using his outdoor area.

- Additionally, we have planning permission and are starting building work on the amenity area such that it will be more pleasant for our use and more importantly safe for young person. Part of this development includes a skylight to provide additional light to the room below the amenity area. Both the amenity area and the window light would, on the basis of the provided Daylight and Sunlight Report, be adversely affected by the development.

- It should also be noted that when the developers exhibited the development to the local community. Myself and numerous others invited them to our properties (they even took down my name, address and contact details) so they could better judge the full impact of the development upon our lighting. After this meeting we had heard no contact. Had they wished to complete an accurate report with inspection of our properties they could have easily arranged it. This offer still stands.

- It seems hard to conceive that a competent light report could have accidentally missed the very large window and a whole amenity area. Leading me to suspect either an incompetent, incomplete and therefore invalid light report, or that these areas have been deliberately left out to make the report

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
					<p>appear better against BRE requirements (e.g. for at least 50% of areas receiving at least 2 hours of sunlight on March 21) which the development already fails to meet, though would do much worse if missing amenity and windows were included.</p> <p>Loss of Light:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The report shows that we will suffer a significant loss of light, we object to. Above I have highlighted the serve loss of sunlight hours to amenities. We will also see a 46% decrease APSH in winter time (when light is already rare) daylight hours, below 50%, on a first floor window (noted as W2 on report) which is a kitchen. According to BRE guidelines a decrease of >40% is considered “substantial impact”. This impact will greatly decrease the utility and enjoyment of the kitchen. • It is clear that windows left off the report (as mentioned above) will be affected to an even greater extent, and will likely lose the remaining sunlight they get. • We also consider the amount of light we lose on our outdoor amenities unfair. The report, which misses out a large area of the amenity, says our March 21st area receiving more 2 hours of sunlight will decline to 52%, barely considered “Adequate” under BRE guidelines. While the extent of the loss, which is 23% (nearly a quarter), is in excess of the “20%” BRE guidelines state as noticeable, while our neighbours will suffer a loss of 39%, to only 9% of their space receiving 2 hours of sunlight (see p 45on Daylight and Sunlight report) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The development, due to its excessive height, 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 (and even worse for 5 Britannia Street neighbours), which may soon include a child, and will severely curtail the ability to use and enjoy affected amenities and room. • 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”. <p>Suggested Mitigations:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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. • New Daylight and Sunlight Report commissioned by Council planer recommended consultant: The existing Daylight and Sunlight Report is incorrect to the extent of being negligent. We propose that a

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

Comment: **Response:**

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.

2) Loss of Privacy:

- 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 our bedroom and kitchen. This is less than the 18m required by BRE and Camden Planning Guidelines.
- As a results our privacy will be affect negatively, preventing us from enjoying reasonable 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, especially children, to be subject to the stares of unknown strangers.

Suggested Mitigations:

- 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.
- Removal of large number of windows and installation of privacy solutions: There are large number of windows that look directly into properties and are less than the required 18m, these should be removed from plans. Addental, the developers architect should suggest solutions that will prevent privacy breaches, little or not effort appears to have been expended in this area.

3) Waste Management Strategy will directly affect 3 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 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

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

Comment: **Response:**

week, creating a potentially unsafe environment for residents, especially for children.

- 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 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 servery detrimental to the enjoyment and health of our property, and be dangerous for our children.
- The fact that the developer chooses to place their waste in front of our property instead of theirs, shows that their lack of concern for the effect the development will have on local properties, putting their own concern to the fore, to such an extent that they are happy to put their waste in front of a house with children rather than their own property.

Suggested Mitigations:

- Secure off street storage for collection with private collection: The reasonable solution is for the development to plan to storage waste from 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 directly adjacent 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 hour 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 create in evenings and early mornings this will prevent us from the quiet enjoy 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 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 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.
- 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

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

Comment: **Response:**

in order to prevent undue disturbance to local residents, especially those adjacent to the property in 1 & 3 Britannia Street.

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, this is an issue the tenants of Derby lodge of previously raise with council.
- The development, in its current form, will further create increases to this noise which will likely render quiet enjoyment of outdoor space, such as our roof terrace impossible (e.g. without the 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 or use those rooms that back onto the development.
- The revised plans do little to address our concerns. In fact the inclusion of a large terrace with three doors opening on to it will further increase noise pollution, as office workers with little appreciation for the quiet residents are entitled to will be able to use the terrace through the day and evening.

Suggested Mitigations:

- Removal of terrace and openable windows and doors (to courtyard) from plans: The removal terrace and its access points would serve to reduce the issue of noise pollution considerably. In the terrace (and its access) current form the quiet use and enjoyment neighbouring properties would be impossible.
- 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.
- In our, 3 Britannia Street, specific case light pollution will leak into an upstairs bedrooms, not a desirable effect for a room people sleep in.
- The revised plan has not taken concerns of residents into account and will actually make light pollution worse. As the addition of massive central skylights and the removal of louvres mean light will flow uninhibited into the shared area.

Suggested Mitigations:

- Removal of rooftop skylights: This would serve to cut light pollution significantly.

Application No: Consultees Name: Consultees Addr: Received:

Comment: Response:

- Removal of large numbers of windows: This would serve to cut light pollution significantly.
- Removal of Gallery in basement that will decrease night-time use of the building.

7) Detrimental Change of Character of Conservation Area:

- Our property, 3 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, thus, would destroy the unique characteristics of the area. Two aspects of the building are significantly detrimental to the character and stand out against the existing buildings: the 3 large glass doors leading to the terrace and the hyper modern aspect of the windows especially stand out against the current environment; for instance current residents must, when installing new windows, keep the same design aesthetics. Aesthetics the proposed development makes no concessions to.
- 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 terrace doors and ensuring windows are of similar design to existing area.

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 "the 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 assertion given the width of the entrance, and that there would be "unreasonable degree of overlooking". However, later in report they contradictorily 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 loss 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	Jill Dealey	6 Sycamore House Athelstan Road Winchester SO23 7GA	12/04/2017 14:41:47	COMMNT	I object strongly to this development. My sister lives in Derby Lodge and her property will be significantly and negatively affected by the proposed development. She will lose light in her flat, and, very importantly, her privacy will be compromised as due to her freelance work she is often at home in office hours. In my opinion, any new build should not be higher than the existing buildings around it.
2016/6356/P	Beverley Klein	25 Bedford Road N22 7AU N22 7AU	12/04/2017 10:16:33	OBJEMPER	As a leaseholder at Derby Lodge, I am concerned that this huge office building will be out of keeping with the residential nature of our listed buildings, overlook and block light to neighbours who back onto the courtyard, and cause great upheaval during the proposed building works. If it were built then the disturbance of an office building in an already densely populated area, with more traffic, parking issues, lights from offices late into the night, people smoking outside will be detrimental to the block. It seems out of scale with my block and those in our neighbourhood.
2016/6356/P	Jill Dealey	6 Sycamore House Athelstan Road Winchester SO23 7GA	12/04/2017 14:41:12	COMMNT	I object strongly to this development. My sister lives in Derby Lodge and her property will be significantly and negatively affected by the proposed development. She will lose light in her flat, and, very importantly, her privacy will be compromised as due to her freelance work she is often at home in office hours. In my opinion, any new build should not be higher than the existing buildings around it.
2016/6356/P	joan	50 Kings Quarter 170 Copenhagen St	11/04/2017 12:42:51	SUPPEMPE R	This is far too big a building to squeeze into a small courtyard and will reduce light considerably into neighbouring flats. Derby lodge is a listed building and shouldn't have a modern building added so close.

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2016/6356/P	Stephen Daldry	5 Britannia Street WC1X 9JH	12/04/2017 12:01:53	OBJ	I, Stephen Daldry CBE, 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.

I also wish to highlight the poor treatment of residents and intransigence on behalf of the developers in reference to our previous comments on the development and lack of communication and engagement with the community.

Additionally, I have sent a paper copy of my comment to the address Development Management, Camden Town Hall, Judd Street, WC1H 9JE. Please read and refer to this report as it contains pictures and diagrams (cannot be submitted online) outlining some of the more serve issues, including a number of windows that are missing from the Daylight and Sunlight Report.

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. They also missed a lightwell amenity and the large windows at the back of my kitchen
- 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, servely damaginglight in an important family room and falling well below BRE guidelines.

Application No: Consultees Name: Consultees Addr: Received:

Comment: Response:

- 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 81%(Pr/Ex value of 0.19) from the previous value of 12.45hours! Effectively it will render my outdoor space without sunlight for most of spring, making it cold and uninviting, destroying its utility as an outdoor space of enjoyment.

- 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.

- 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.

- 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”.

Suggested Mitigations:

- 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.

- 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.

- 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

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

Comment: **Response:**

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.

2) Loss of Privacy:

- 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 not be considered in this basement by developer). This is less than the 18m required by BRE and Camden Planning Guidelines.
- The new development proposals also include a terrace with three large entry doors. Users of this terrace will be directly over looking my outdoor amenity area, be able to look directly into my kitchen, bedroom and bathroom from a distance of considerably less than 18m.
- As a results our privacy will be affect negatively, preventing me and my family from enjoying reasonable 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:

- 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.
- Removal of Terrace: The terrace, with its overlooking position of my property is completely incompatible with my right to privacy.
- Removal of large number of windows and installation of privacy solutions: There are large number of windows that look directly into properties and are less than the required 18m, these should be removed from plans. Addental, the developers architect should suggest solutions that will prevent privacy breaches, little or not effort appears to have been expended in this area.

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.

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

Comment: **Response:**

- 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 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 servery 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 storage 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 hour 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 create in evenings and early mornings this will prevent us from the quiet enjoy 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 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 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.

- 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

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

Comment: **Response:**

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 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 revised plan has not taken concerns of residents into account and will actually make light pollution worse. As the addition of massive central skylights and the removal of louvres mean light will flow uninhibited into the shared area.
- 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 skylights: This would serve to cut light pollution significantly.
- Removal of large numbers of windows: This would serve to cut light pollution significantly.
- Removal of Gallery in basement that will decrease night-time use of the building.

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, thus, would destroy the unique characteristics of the area. Two aspects of the building are significantly detrimental to the character and stand out against the existing buildings: the 3 large glass door leading to the terrace and the hyper modern aspect of the windows especially stand out against the current environment; for instance current residents must, when installing new windows, keep the same design aesthetics. Aesthetics the proposed

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
					<p>development makes no concessions to.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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. <p>Suggested Mitigations:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Redesign of building to match current area, including terrace doors and ensuring windows are of similar design to existing area. <p>8) Lack of Affordable housing in development:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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. <p>Suggested Mitigations:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Build required affordable housing.

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2016/6356/P	louise constad	15/17 Micawber wharf Micawber street	12/04/2017 17:26:10	OBJ	<p>I strongly object to this planning application for the following reasons;</p> <p>This large, imposing, piece of ugly architecture is not in keeping with the surrounding Grade 11 listed property. This is a Conservation Area and this building is inappropriate in this setting.</p> <p>This development will be in a small courtyard which belongs to Derby Lodge and will dominate and overlook the surrounding homes , depriving residents of their right to daylight/ sunlight and privacy.</p> <p>The office workers will be able to look directly into the residents bedroom and living room windows.</p> <p>All the properties have views on to the internal courtyard and have the right to expect darkness at night apart except from light emitted from windows of other residential dwellings. However by planting an office block with enormous glass skylight windows on the roof will flood artificial light from the offices into this residential environment is totally unacceptable.</p> <p>From studying the aerial view of the site it is obvious that it is unacceptable to build an office block of this height and size within such a small courtyard which is surrounded by social housing.</p> <p>The idea to dig out a 4 metre deep basement to create an art gallery, where there will be private views at night with vast numbers of guests who will stand outside drinking and smoking is totally ridiculous when it is so close to so many residential homes.</p> <p>I am shocked that despite the large number of objections to the previous application the developer has paid little if any attention to what the local residents were complaining about.</p>

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2016/6356/P	Concerned Resident of Derby Lodge Courtyard	3 Britannia Street WC1X 9JT	12/04/2017 11:41:39	OBJ	<p>The Concerned Residents Of Derby Lodge, Britannia Street and King Cross Road: The Concerned Residents of Derby Lodge Courtyard (abbreviated to Concerned Residents in this document) are a group formed residents Derby Lodge, Britannia Street and Kings Cross Road who will be affected negatively by the proposed development who have come together as a community to raise and register their concerns as to the detrimental impact that the proposed development will have upon their lives, homes and community.</p> <p>We are made up of a highly diverse membership representing many different social groups, however the largest proportion are those from the flats at Derby lodge which include "sensitive lets", which means that more vulnerable members of the community are housed here. Many of us have known know each other as neighbours and friends for years if not decades, whilst others are newer to the area but still form a valuable part in our local community. All of us feel that the proposed development in its current form will have a potentially devastating impact on our community, our homes and our lives. As such we are united in our objection to the development as it currently stands but would welcome conversation with the developer to create a development which could be mutually satisfactory.</p> <p>Our Objections to the proposed development of Rear of 1-3, Britannia Street formerly known as 159/163, King's Cross Road: It is important to note that the community does, in principal, not object to the development of properties within our community or shared local space. However, we unanimously object to the proposed development in its current form and the developers lack of engagement with the community (suggesting they will not be the most accommodating of neighbours) and neglecting of social responsibility (such no inclusion of social/low cost housing in the proposed site).</p> <p>This document lays out the community's objections to proposed development and the treatment of the community by the developer. We have also suggested mitigation that will help elevate the concerns and detrimental effects of residents and the community that the proposed development will have.</p> <p>1. Developer's failure to consult properly, lack of engagement, poor treatment and ignoring of residents' concerns raised in previous objections:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> We, as a community, feel harshly treated if not completely ignored by the developer in both the first and set second set of proposals for the development of Rear of 1-3, Britannia Street formerly known as 159/163, King's Cross Road. Many residents raise concerns relating to privacy, loss of daylight, noise and light pollution, inaccurate documentation, and the effect of the local conservation area in our previous objections. We feel these concerns were largely ignored by the developer, with the new plans in many cases (especially in terms privacy, light and noise pollution, and loss of daylight) have made the situation worse. Additionally, the developer has, in the process of re-submitting the plans, made no attempt to contact or consult with the local community, which the development will reduce the local residents' quality of life significantly. 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

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

Comment: **Response:**

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.

- The community is understandably concerned as to the behaviour of the developer as a neighbour given their total disregard for local community. Many of our members, in their prior objections and suggests to the previous submission reached out to the developer inviting them to see how the proposed development would effect their lives and quiet enjoyment of their properties, no-one (including this group of concerned residents) was contacted by the developer. The new plans make little or no effort to accommodate and allay our concerns as to the negative effect the development will have on the community's lives, leading us to believe the developer has either not read our concerns or has chosen to ignore them.

Suggested Mitigation:

- Developer listens to the community and adjusts plans accordingly.
- The developer meets with the local community in person to hear first-hand the objections. We would view this as a very positive step in repairing currently neglected relations and reaching a proposed set plans for the development that would satisfy both residents and developer.

2. Inaccuracies in supporting documents and developers failure to rectify these inaccuracies as pointed out in community comments on previous proposal:

- The community is disappointed that the development has reached this stage of the planning process (having passed pre-approval) given the glaring errors and omission in the documents supporting the application.
- We would consider any approval granted based upon the current 'Supporting Documents' to be negligent and we, as a whole community, would immediately look to appeal any planning consent which is based upon incorrect and incomplete documents.
- There are numerous inaccuracies and thus false conclusions in the applications and we outline these in this documents, as well as individual residents in their own comment to the application.

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

Comment: **Response:**

However, the largest inaccuracy, which has been raised by numerous concerned residents is the inaccurate Daylight and Sunlight Report that not only omits at least 10 windows (one of which is 12ft by 6ft and easily viewable from the development) but also has incorrect conclusions. For instance The Daylight and Sunlight Report and in the DAS say there would be “no discernible loss” of daylight despite the report (even in its current flawed state) showing the development will push numerous properties will fall below BRE regulatory limits. Some falling registering a 46% fall in ASPH which BRE states as “substantial impact”, and numerous properties registering an APSH decline of 20% which BRE state is Noticeable.

- Pictures and diagrams of omitted windows are shown in the hard copy of this comment on the development mailed to the planning department, as picture are unable to be submitted through web-portal.
- These concerns/inaccuracies in the last planning submission were raised by numerous residents but in the most recent submission have not been remedied. For example, the aforementioned Daylight and Sunlight Report is listed as ‘superseded’ on ‘Related Documents’ section of the planning application but no new report is forthcoming despite massive inaccuracies of the first report and a change to the proposed developments shape.
- 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.
- 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.

Suggested Mitigation:

- New Daylight and Sunlight Report Commissioned 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, as well as proposed new shape of the building in the current submission. 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 and/or by the council planners.
- The Developer in its planning submission recognises the real loss of light to residents and their amenities, and also remove the untrue “no discernible loss” from their application.
- Application is withdrawn until factually correct supporting documents are submitted.
- Developer meets with affected residents who are happy to invite them into their homes to show the inaccuracies within the report. Once again the community asks that the developer actively engages with the community.

3. Reference to Consented Scheme:

- The newly submitted plans make constant reference to ‘the Consented Scheme’. This is the old application from 2008 (approved under different planning policy and regulation), which is lapsed, and thus no longer consented, and thus should bear no reference to the case.
- Additionally the currently proposed development bear little resemblance to the “Consented

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

Comment: **Response:**

scheme". The "Consented" scheme had only circa 5 side windows and no outdoor area in order to minimise disruption to residents' property and lives, as well as including residential aspects in the development. The proposed development has a large number of windows that will overlook residents' properties, a large terrace with three large doors accessing it and no residential element.

- Many residents within the community who were residents of the time of the 2008 application mentioned they were not informed of this application and therefore were unable to raise their concerns.
- A good number of current residents within the community were not living in the area when the 2008 application was approved. They are entitled, over people who no-longer reside in the affected area, to protect the quiet enjoyment of their properties and register their objections to a development, which in its current form will be detrimental to their lives.

Suggested Mitigation:

- Drop reference to consented scheme from current and future applications, as it has no bearing to existing application and is (having lapsed) no longer consented.

4. Size of Development:

- 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 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). 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
- 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.
- The basement is not in keeping with the area - which currently does not have any sizeable underground areas. It means that the development is going to be absolutely huge for a gallery, which will greatly increase evening and night noise. 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.
- The additional (top) floor and increase in height 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 invasive character of this development, the architects and developers are exacerbating the loss of light which so concerns the residents.

Suggested Mitigation:

- Reduce Building Size, removal of top floor from plans: The primary concerns of residents is the huge scale, far above the scale of the existing property to be developed. The single most significant step the developer can take in order to create plans that work both for them and the community is to reduce the size of the building by removing the top storey which is causing the majority of issues.

Application No: Consultees Name: Consultees Addr: Received:

Comment: Response:

- Recue scope of basement to minimise disruption:

5. Loss of Privacy:

- The new building will have many windows and a terrace considerably less than the 18 meters from multiple residential properties that which is in constant use This is less than the 18m required by BRE and Camden Planning Guidelines.
- 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 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.
- Users of the proposed office block will be able to look directly into resident's properties, even the proposed set back windows do not serve to prevent this. There appears almost not concern from the developer as to the right of privacy resident's are entitled to.
- 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, especially children, to be subject to the stares of unknown strangers

Suggested Mitigations:

- Reduce Building Height: This is the most requested amendment to the proposed development among the community. 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, as building height the windows at the upper floor create the largest degree of overlooking and invasion of privacy.
- Remove Terrace from proposal. The terrace is in clear breach of privacy, allowing its users to look out in all direction massively increasing the number of properties terrace users can look into. A terrace is not required for a modern office (very few have them) and is superfluous and should be dropped from plans.
- Removal of large number of windows and installation of privacy solutions: There are large number of windows that look directly into properties and are less than the required 18m, these should be

Application No: Consultees Name: Consultees Addr: Received:

Comment: Response:

removed from plans. Addental, the developers architect should suggest solutions that will prevent privacy breaches, little or not effort appears to have been expended in this area.

6. Loss of Day and Sun Light:

- This is a very common concern among the community and relates to the excessive increase in height the proposed development would entail, which would massively deprive residents of daylight as it their right.

- While the Daylight and Sunlight Report, prepared by Malcolm Hollis LLP, has numerous flaws and omissions (as laid out below) and does not account for the dimension of the latest revised planning – as such we view that it does not provide a factual representation of the effect he building will have upon residents affected by the development. In the online application, the document is listed a ‘superseded’ but no new document has been forthcoming despite numerous requests from the community.

Windows Omitted within the Daylight and Sunlight Report :

- 5 Britannia Street: The omission 12ft by 6ft window skylight window of the ground floor kitchen that is the primary source of light for the family kitchen and only source of direct sunlight for the room. The Daylight and Sun report completely omits this very large and easily observable window. Also omitted, are windows and French windows that back onto outside at rear of kitchen.

- 3 Britannia Street: Lightwell and 2 windows that provide only source of light for ground floor living room and bathroom.

- 159-163 Kings Cross Road: 5 skylight windows that provide only source of natural light for rooms that include a kitchen, living area and workrooms.

- It should be noted that the proposed height of the building will have significant detrimental effects of a large number of properties within Derby Lodge, Britannia Street and King Cross Road. Especially those on ground or first floor. Even though the report has omitted many of the most affected windows the development still does not meet BRE requirements; with four properties suffering a reduction of daylight that puts their daylight below required standards and prevents them from enjoying their property.

- The report notes that 5 Britannia Street will see only 9% of its outdoor amenity area received sunlight(well below BRE guidelines) in Spring, a massive 81% (Pr/Ex ratio of 0.19) it currently received, massively failing BRE criteria. 3 Britannia Street will see a decline from of 31% (Pr/Ex Ratio of 0.69).

- The developer states that these amenities are not used during spring, in a vain attempt to ignore measurement that did meet standards. This is untrue, and a possibly deliberately misleading, anyone observing the current area and enjoying the current lovely spring weather.

- The DAS included in the submission states there was “no discernible loss” [of light]. 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. Some properties registering a 81% fall in ASPH which BRE states as “substantial impact”, and numerous properties registering an APSH declines in excess of 20% which BRE sate is noticeable.

- 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.

- It is hard to see how the first and second floors (and therefore most of the houses are not going to

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

Comment: **Response:**

find that there is much less light coming into their flats and houses if a large, large building is now the most proximate building close to their windows- just metres away.

- Breach of 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

Suggested Mitigations:

- Lowering the height of the proposed structure: 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.
- The Developer in its planning submission recognises the real loss of light to residents and their amenities, and also remove the untrue “no discernible loss” from their application.
- New Daylight and Sunlight Report Commissioned by Council planner recommended consultant:

7. Light Pollution:

- The community’s enjoyment and use of their property in the evenings is of great concern to existing and the light pollution that will be caused by the new development will affect almost all residents as they back onto the area of the proposed development.
- 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 and skylights into the shared space and through residential windows.
- 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.
- The revised plan has not taken concerns of residents into account and will actually make light pollution worse. As the addition of massive central skylights and the removal of louvres mean light will flow uninhibited into the shared area.

Suggested Mitigations:

- Removal of rooftop skylight: This would serve to cut light pollution significantly.
- Removal of large numbers of windows: This would serve to cut light pollution significantly.
- Removal of Gallery in basement that will decrease night-time use of the building.

Application No: Consultees Name: Consultees Addr: Received:

Comment: Response:

8. 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 such as the proposed 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 terrace and its access (three large doors leading directly to offices) are of particular concern, given its substantial size and the likelihood that doors will be opened in warmer months, mean that the courtyard will be polluted by the noise of an office as well as terrace users and smokers.
- 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.
- There is little in the submitted planning documents that addresses this issue.

Suggested Mitigations:

- Removal of terrace and openable windows and doors (to courtyard) from plans:
- Restrict building use to reasonable 08.00-18.00 office hours, only: The acoustic report 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. This requires the removal from plans of the use of basement as a gallery.

9. Detrimental Change of Character of Conservation Area and Local Community:

- 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; 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
- It is not clear why the Derby Lodge courtyard needs office space. This end of the road is entirely 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 office space is likely to have high double figures workers coming that day every working day, and the 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, to the detriment of residents .
- 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.

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

Comment: **Response:**

- The design of the new development is highly modern and, thus, would destroy the unique characteristics of the area. Three aspects of the building are significantly detrimental to the character and stand out against the existing buildings: its needless size, the 3 large glass doors leading to the terrace and the hyper modern aspect of the windows especially stand out against the current environment; for instance current residents must, when installing new windows, keep the same design aesthetics.

Aesthetics the proposed development makes no concessions to.

- The size of the building overall, which is both aggressive looking and imposing 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 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.

Suggested Mitigations:

- Redesign of building to match current area, including terrace doors and ensuring windows are of similar design to existing area.
- Reduce Building height and size.

10. 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 “the proposal triggers the requirement of 50% of this additional floor space to be provided as residential floor space 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 contradictorily 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 loss of privacy to existing residents or that the privacy reason for refusing affordable housing is spurious.
- It should be noted that the 2008 application that the developer (incorrectly) states as “consented” included residential housing, showing there is no reason for the developer not to uphold its social and community commitments.

Suggested Mitigations:

- Build required affordable housing:

11. Construction Disturbance and Noise:

- 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,

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

the self-employed and the families in the area.

- 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. 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.

Conclusion:

The residents of stand united against the development in its current form. While we have above outlined our key concerns and suggestions on how to mitigate the negative effects associated with the development. We think in order to create suitable proposals that will not negatively affect the existing residents it is necessary for the developer to meet, engage and listen to existing residents.

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2016/6356/P	Marcus O'Higgins	20 Derby Lodge Britannia Street WC1X 9BP WC1X 9BP	12/04/2017 23:54:07	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>This is the second application by the same developer. However, there would appear to be little or no difference between both applications apart from the height of the building's roof.</p> <p>In addition to all that I have previously written in my first response to the original plan presented by Balcap RE Ltd about the negative effects of this invasive building construction plan (posted approx. 04.12.2017. Please see full transcript following these updated observations), I have some more observations relating to this new application.</p> <p>1. No more views of blue skies or clouds of grey.</p> <p>Every morning, as I sip my wake-up mug of lemon tea, I look out of my kitchen window at the sky – today it is bright powder blue – and meditate on the needs of the day before me. If planning permission for the current design of this commercial business complex is granted, this is a morning ritual I will never be able to enjoy again.</p> <p>Because even though the project's architect has lowered the roof's design by 1.4.meters, this extended roof design will still all but obliterate the already partial view of the sky I have from my kitchen window. The shadow it would cast would also reduce the amount of ambient light available to me and my neighbours. Even on such a sunny summer's day as today (09.04.2017), I still need to use a desk lamp to illuminate my work. If this current application goes ahead, I will have to increase usage of electric light thereby increasing my electricity bill. I would, therefore, suggest that any future applications made by this commercial property developer, or others, should be modified to maintain the current height and profile of the existing building, with the added benefit of maintaining the historical integrity of the listed buildings that surround it.</p> <p>It would also appear that the new Daylight and Sunlight report used for this application is wildly inaccurate, biased and misleading, and I would ask that a new up-to-date Daylight and Sunlight report be commissioned and carried out by an independent consultant selected by the local community.</p> <p>And it is questionable for the developer to suggest that there is 'no discernible loss'. This misinformation needs to be removed from the planning application altogether as it even goes against Balcap's own findings.</p>

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

Comment: **Response:**

They should also drop all reference to 'the Consented Scheme' from current and future applications as it is outdated and irrelevant to current planning law. Although I have been a resident since before 2008 when it was first commissioned (and since lapsed), I was unaware of this and therefore unable to object. Were the Consented Scheme to be resubmitted in the future, I would examine the facts presented very carefully and exercise my right to object, if necessary.

2. Noise Pollution.

My bedroom window, which is on the opposite side away from the proposed new development, is overlooked by a first-floor balcony/veranda accessed by workers of the Westgreen building (We're Here To Help Musicians) 7-11 Britannia Street WC1X 9JS for cigarette breaks. Because of the unique echo-chamber layout of the backyard area and the buildings that surround it, whenever they use this veranda, their clearly audible speaking voices are greatly amplified and have woken me up.

If the green light is given to the current application number: 2016/6356/P, this will only add noise pollution from those workers within the building using the substantial roof terrace as a cigarette smoking area, client/staff rest area, parties/gallery exhibition openings, etc. Hot summers will necessitate workers having to open several windows for ventilation further adding to noise pollution.

Added to this would be the constant noise of the proposed air-conditioning and heating units, and extractor fans from waste storage, expelling foul smelling waste gas into the courtyard necessitating residents having to close their flat windows to escape the ensuing smell and pollution, none of which has been addressed in this application.

There is a real fear among residents that this commercial office complex could potentially be open for round-the-clock business and/or be maintained by cleaners 24hrs a day, 7 days a week, causing great concern and forever sleepless nights for residents who, heretofore, have lived and slept in relative peace.

Therefore the removal of this terrace and door access from the current design would reduce this infringement on the resident's rights to continue the quiet enjoyment of their homes. Restricting business hours of operation to normal working hours (9-5) and removing the proposed basement gallery from the plans would also enable residents to continue to benefit from the quiet enjoyment of their properties. Also limiting use of air-conditioning units to daytime use would reduce night-time noise pollution and allow residents to continue to enjoy the quiet enjoyment of our homes – there's already too much noise pollution as it is.

Apropos of the noise pollution caused by months and months of excavation and building work, etc., the comments made in my first letter of objection still stand and can be found further below (please see Echo Chamber – noise and disturbance).

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

Comment: **Response:**

Light pollution.

Outside my bedroom window is an outdoor light (fixed to one of the walls of the resident association's meeting room) which has oft times been left on overnight for many weeks at a stretch. Unable to sleep with the light on, I had to buy a blackout blind. But the adjacent bathroom would still be bathed in light throughout the night.

There is also light pollution coming from the Westgreen building (We're Here To Help Musicians) 7-11 Britannia Street WC1X 9JS whenever they leave their office lighting on overnight. So I have a good idea of what would be to come should this current building design be approved.

As I occasionally have guests to visit and/or stay over on my sofa-bed, I would have to buy blackout blinds for both my kitchen and living room which face the proposed building complex if my guests and I wanted to escape the light pollution emanating potentially 24 hrs a day, 7 days a week. I would also be unable to open any windows to ventilate my flat in hot/warm weather because of the office noise pollution due to considerable night time use as outlined in the travel report. This lack of fresh air would not be healthy for me.

Removing the rooftop skylight and the large numbers of windows overlooking the residential shared courtyard would remove such infringement of our right to live peacefully.

Wrong building – wrong location.

It is now nearly midnight (10th April 2017), and as I look out of my living room window into the empty space of the communal courtyard, and the sky beyond, it is relatively peaceful apart from the constant hum of King's Cross traffic, and numerous air-conditioning units, and the shuddering vibrations of the underground trains that pass below, occasionally vigorously rattling windows and doors. It is dark-ish. Five windows from the flats opposite (Wicklow Street) softly illuminate the brick walls. I can see the pale grey sky. I can gaze into the middle-distance – sleepily thinking and unwinding - safe in the knowledge that I cannot be seen. This is comforting.

Now, five minutes later, I am 'imagining' how all this would look drowned in the stark office lighting projected out from the newly added rooftop skylights and enlarged windows of the proposed office building complex. As this harsh light hits my face and illuminates my flat interior, I feel exposed and vulnerable, and I wonder if anyone (the cleaner or late-night office workers?) might be watching me from the terrace and disturbing the quiet enjoyment and 'sanctuary' of my home. This feels invasive.

I am not against the development of this site per se, but I strongly feel that this commercial office block proposal is the wrong building for this location and would create an unnecessary degree of light & noise pollution, and 'overlooking' into nearby residential units. Our privacy is in no way being protected by this proposal. Quite the contrary. It feels uncomfortable to know that the potentially high turnover of complete strangers visiting this proposed office building will have an unrestricted view of

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

Comment: **Response:**

residents and their children, and guests.

A residential development restricted to the current building's layout offering the recommended affordable housing quota would be of greater benefit to a family residential area such as Derby Lodge – a listed building of historic importance (please also see: Window Tax – Daylight Robbery paragraph further below).

Detrimental Change of Character of Conservation Area.

As I have written further below in my first letter of objection to Planning Application number: 2016/6356/P, Derby Lodge is a listed building and residents are forbidden to make adjustments to the building, i.e., install double glazed windows or even a lift, etc., to preserve the architectural integrity and historic quality of the immediate area.

The new building design is very modern and as such would contrast greatly with the period architecture of Derby Lodge (Britannia & Wicklow Streets) and the surrounding buildings, many of which are also listed.

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.

Any current or future planning applications should take this into consideration when designing buildings so as to blend in with the period architectural style of the area.

My original letter of objection of 04.12.2017.

I am very much in opposition to:

Planning Application number: 2016/6356/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.

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

Window Tax – Daylight Robbery:

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.

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.

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.

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.

Residential area.

People forget that King’s Cross is a residential area, and Derby Lodge is a residential estate with 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

The proposed application is for a commercial office complex which we have been led to believe will be hired out for short-term lets & rentals (by the hour/week, potentially 24 hours a day). This will result in

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

Comment: **Response:**

a heavy turnaround of office workers and their clients using the building day and night.

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.

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!

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.

Echo Chamber – noise and disturbance.

The Derby Lodge communal courtyard is, in essence, one big echo chamber.

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 & drilling will cause great anguish for all residents within range of the epicentre of 18-plus months of busy building construction [The Shard, a significantly larger building, took only 36 months to complete by comparison. Added 11.04.2017], and also a lifetime of itinerant office workers and associated activity; potential road closures to deliver building supplies, and so on.

Whatever noise levels have been officially deemed acceptable for this site must now be re-evaluated because of this unique acoustic anomaly.

Building Works:

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

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

Comment: **Response:**

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,

Marcus O'Higgins.
Derby Lodge, Britannia Street.

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2016/6356/P	Edward Weidman	Flat 11 Derby Lodge Britannia Street WC1X 9BP WC1X 9BP	10/04/2017 13:33:07	OBJ	<p>This development cannot be allowed to proceed. It's an enormous building and the plan is to dump it between a community of flats, between listed buildings which have been here for over a century, and in a conservation area. The only access to the site is via an entrance the size and height of a garage door.</p> <p>The Derby Lodge community is something special - among other things it's an example of real people living and working in central London. It's a wonderful mix of people in a wonderful environment. The community and what it represents must be protected.</p> <p>Further comments as follows:</p> <p>Noise and disturbance - the presence of a large office building with outdoor spaces and aircon and ventilation systems outside our windows will cause considerable noise and disturbance.</p> <p>Loss of daylight and sunlight - from the plans it's clear that many flats will experience considerable loss of light if the development proceeds. That is simply not acceptable.</p> <p>Overlooking and loss of privacy - the presence of outside spaces and windows will mean loss of privacy.</p> <p>Not in keeping - I like modern architecture but to stick an enormous modern office block right up against Victorian listed buildings is simply not appropriate.</p> <p>Conservation area / listed buildings - as above</p> <p>Development noise and disruption - building and road works on and around Britannia Street have been incredibly involved over the last couple of years (still on-going). Further disruption to the street, pavements, parking bays etc is simply not on. There has to be a limit. Once again, the only access to the site is via an entrance the size and height of a garage door. It's just not practical.</p>

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2016/6356/P	Elizabeth Harriet Errington	3 Britannia Street WC1X 9JT	12/04/2017 10:28:55	OBJ	<p>Objection from Residents of 3 Britannia Street to the proposed development of Rear Of 1-3, Britannia Street, London, WC1X 9BN (ref: 2016/6356/P0)</p> <p>In this comment of the proposed development of Rear Of 1-3, Britannia Street, London, WC1X 9BN (ref: 2016/6356/P0) I have outlined 8 key objections and issues with the proposed development, which will have a considerable detrimental effect and harm on the amenities of current residents. I have also suggested mitigating actions the developer can undertake to remove or lessen the detrimental effect the proposed development will have upon our property 3 Britannia Street, which is currently occupied by my husband Frederick Baccanello and myself Elizabeth Harriet Errington. I am currently pregnant and expecting a child in the coming months so this development which will have detrimental effects to our use of our property and refuse planning will threaten the health of our child.</p> <p>It should also be note that the revised plans show that the developer has failed in any meaningful way to listen to our (my wife and I) or any residents concerns raised over first set of proposals, with many changes actually making the situation worse, especially with respect to privacy and light pollution. Furthermore it should be noted that the developer has failed to engage with and respond to residents, including invites to visit their properties, meet with residents and correct inaccurate supporting documents, including lighting report.</p> <p>Additionally, I have sent a paper copy of my comment to the address Development Management, Camden Town Hall, Judd Street, WC1H 9JE. Please read and refer to this report as it contains pictures and diagrams (cannot be submitted online) outlining some of the more serve issues, including a number of windows that are missing from the Daylight and Sunlight Report.</p> <p>The key issues are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Loss of Light and Inaccuracies of Daylight and Sunlight Report, • Loss of Privacy, • Waste Management Strategy will directly affect 3 Britannia street and create unsafe and unhealthy environment, • Increased Noise and Evening usage from Development, • Noise Pollution, • Light Pollution, • Detrimental Change of Character of Conservation Area • Lack of Affordable housing within Development <p>1) Loss of Light and Continued Inaccuracies of Daylight and Sunlight Report:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The two main complaints regarding daylight are the inaccuracies within the Daylight and Sunlight Report (provided as a supporting document to the planning application) - which omits the existence of around 10 windows (that we can observe) and omits an outdoor amenity area, and assumes that we and our neighbours do not use outdoor areas in spring – and the loss of light to our property.

Application No: Consultees Name: Consultees Addr: Received:

Comment: Response:

Inaccuracies within the Daylight and Sunlight Report

- For 3 Britannia Street a ground floor amenity area containing two windows has been completely left off the Daylight and Sunlight report, both for windows measurement and amenity areas. This area is clearly visible and it is inexcusable that it has been left off the report.
- The Amenity area is the only outdoor area for the ground floor flat of 3 Britannia Street.
- The two windows that are missing from the report are important to us. One is the only source of light for a bathroom and the other, more importantly, one is the only source of light for a living room for flat the below excepted from the Daylight and Sunlight Report has been edited to show the relevant missing areas.

Exhibit 1.1 from (see p43 on Daylight and Sunlight Report)

- These are one of numerous errors within the report. For instance, very large and very visible window on 5 Britannia (circa 12ft by 6ft) is completely omitted. The missing items lead me to question the validity of the report as, not only are they easily observable but they are also the areas of the properties (3 & 5 Britannia street) that stand to lose the most amount of light. It seems hard to conceive that a competent light report could accidentally omit these window; leading us to question the 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.

- For instance, applying the area loss and gain to A1 on the above diagram would mean that substantial daylight hours loss to the omitted amenity area. This would, with high certainty, that the proportion receiving at least 2 hour of sun on 21 March would fall below BRE target of 50%, given it is currently at a marginal rating of only 52%. Similarly, for 5 Britannia Street, given that most of the amenity area will lose light (only 9% with 2 hours of daylight), down from a large majority that the missing window would fall far below BRE requirements.

- The report also suggests that “It is conceivable that most amenity spaces are mainly used during the summer

months.” There is no basis to back this incorrect assumption. We, my wife and I, use the amenity area throughout the year, but also use it heavily in spring and March. We are at the stage were next year, health permitting, we will be parents; meaning need for outdoor area and sunlight will increase drastically. Likewise we constantly see our neighbour using his outdoor area.

- Additionally, we have planning permission and are starting building work on the amenity area such that it will be more pleasant for our use and more importantly safe for young person. Part of this development includes a skylight to provide additional light to the room below the amenity area. Both the amenity area and the window light would, on the basis of the provided Daylight and Sunlight Report, be adversely affected by the development.

- It should also be noted that when the developers exhibited the development to the local community. Myself and numerous others invited them to our properties (they even took down my name, address and contact details) so they could better judge the full impact of the development upon our lighting. After this meeting we had heard no contact. Had they wished to complete an accurate report with inspection of our properties they could have easily arranged it. This offer still stands.

- It seems hard to conceive that a competent light report could have accidentally missed the very

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
					<p>large window and a whole amenity area. Leading me to suspect either an incompetent, incomplete and therefore invalid light report, or that these areas have been deliberately left out to make the report appear better against BRE requirements (e.g. for at least 50% of areas receiving at least 2 hours of sunlight on March 21) which the development already fails to meet, though would do much worse if missing amenity and windows were included.</p> <p>Loss of Light:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The report shows that we will suffer a significant loss of light, we object to. Above I have highlighted the serve loss of sunlight hours to amenities. We will also see a 46% decrease APSH in winter time (when light is already rare) daylight hours, below 50%, on a first floor window (noted as W2 on report) which is a kitchen. According to BRE guidelines a decrease of >40% is considered “substantial impact”. This impact will greatly decrease the utility and enjoyment of the kitchen. • It is clear that windows left off the report (as mentioned above) will be affected to an even greater extent, and will likely lose the remaining sunlight they get. • We also consider the amount of light we lose on our outdoor amenities unfair. The report, which misses out a large area of the amenity, says our March 21st area receiving more 2 hours of sunlight will decline to 52%, barely considered “Adequate” under BRE guidelines. While the extent of the loss, which is 23% (nearly a quarter), is in excess of the “20%” BRE guidelines state as noticeable, while our neighbours will suffer a loss of 39%, to only 9% of their space receiving 2 hours of sunlight (see p 45on Daylight and Sunlight report) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The development, due to its excessive height, 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 (and even worse for 5 Britannia Street neighbours), which may soon include a child, and will severely curtail the ability to use and enjoy affected amenities and room. • 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”. <p>Suggested Mitigations:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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.

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

Comment: **Response:**

- New Daylight and Sunlight Report commissioned by Council planner 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.

2) Loss of Privacy:

- 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 our bedroom and kitchen. This is less than the 18m required by BRE and Camden Planning Guidelines.
- As a results our privacy will be affect negatively, preventing us from enjoying reasonable 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, especially children, to be subject to the stares of unknown strangers.

Suggested Mitigations:

- 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.
- Removal of large number of windows and installation of privacy solutions: There are large number of windows that look directly into properties and are less than the required 18m, these should be removed from plans. Addental, the developers architect should suggest solutions that will prevent privacy breaches, little or not effort appears to have been expended in this area.

3) Waste Management Strategy will directly affect 3 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 3 Britannia Street from the close of business

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
					<p>(17.00) until opening of business (9.00am) the next day.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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, especially for children. 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 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 servery detrimental to the enjoyment and health of our property, and be dangerous for our children. The fact that the developer chooses to place their waste in front of our property instead of theirs, shows that their lack of concern for the effect the development will have on local properties, putting their own concern to the fore, to such an extent that they are happy to put their waste in front of a house with children rather than their own property. <p>Suggested Mitigations:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Secure off street storage for collection with private collection: The reasonable solution is for the development to plan to storage waste from collection within their property, as opposed to on the street, and either have private waste collection recover it from there. <p>4) Increased Noise and Evening usage from Development:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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 directly adjacent 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 hour 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 create in evenings and early mornings this will prevent us from the quiet enjoy 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 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. <p>Suggested Mitigations:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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. 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.

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

Comment: **Response:**

- 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, especially those adjacent to the property in 1 & 3 Britannia Street.

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, this is an issue the tenants of Derby lodge of previously raise with council.
- The development, in its current form, will further create increases to this noise which will likely render quiet enjoyment of outdoor space, such as our roof terrace impossible (e.g. without the 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 or use those rooms that back onto the development.
- The revised plans do little to address our concerns. In fact the inclusion of a large terrace with three doors opening on to it will further increase noise pollution, as office workers with little appreciation for the quiet residents are entitled to will be able to use the terrace through the day and evening.

Suggested Mitigations:

- Removal of terrace and openable windows and doors (to courtyard) from plans: The removal terrace and its access points would serve to reduce the issue of noise pollution considerably. In the terrace (and its access) current form the quiet use and enjoyment neighbouring properties would be impossible.
- 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.
- In our, 3 Britannia Street, specific case light pollution will leak into an upstairs bedrooms, not a desirable effect for a room people sleep in.
- The revised plan has not taken concerns of residents into account and will actually make light pollution worse. As the addition of massive central skylights and the removal of louvres mean light will flow uninhibited into the shared area.

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

Comment: **Response:**

Suggested Mitigations:

- Removal of rooftop skylights: This would serve to cut light pollution significantly.
- Removal of large numbers of windows: This would serve to cut light pollution significantly.
- Removal of Gallery in basement that will decrease night-time use of the building.

7) Detrimental Change of Character of Conservation Area:

- Our property, 3 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, thus, would destroy the unique characteristics of the area. Two aspects of the building are significantly detrimental to the character and stand out against the existing buildings: the 3 large glass doors leading to the terrace and the hyper modern aspect of the windows especially stand out against the current environment; for instance current residents must, when installing new windows, keep the same design aesthetics. Aesthetics the proposed development makes no concessions to.
- 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 terrace doors and ensuring windows are of similar design to existing area.

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 "the 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 assertion given the width of the entrance, and that there would be "unreasonable degree of overlooking". However, later in report they contradictorily 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 loss 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:**
