

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2018/1325/P	Peter Dunbar	18/06/2018 16:27:34	OBJ/NOT	<p>Our Client, Fordham University are long term Tenants and in process of finishing a major refurbishment of 2 Eyre Street Hill, London EC1R 5ET. They would lose considerable amount of outlook and amenity of daylight (circa 80%) to long established windows on their east elevation if the proposed extensions of 144A Clerkenwell Road are approved and built and thus Object most strongly to this Planning Application. This proposal is in breach of the London Borough of Camden Local Plan Policy A1 which adopts the "Building Research Establishment Site Layout Planning for Daylight and Sunlight - A Guide to Good Practice 2011". Also note that the Pre Application Officer comments include "no development would be found acceptable unless it was fully demonstrated that the works would not result in detrimental impact upon the neighbouring occupiers". No such demonstration has been submitted nor can one be justified due to the proximity of the subject buildings.</p>
2018/1325/P	Paul Newdick	24/06/2018 08:52:05	OBJ/NOT	<p>I am one of the leaseholders of a flat on the 4th Floor of 1-10 Summers Street and wish to object to the proposed development. I endorse the objections from the other residents of 1-10 Summers Street and those from the Planning and Design Group, on behalf of our Residents Committee. I will not repeat the wider concerns about the development, but limit my comments to the impact this proposed development will have on our own flat.</p> <p>Whilst there will not be the same level of impact on daylight/sunlight as those on the lower floors, we will suffer from a significant loss of privacy, serious overlooking, security risks and considerable noise interference. The proposed roof terrace would be at the same height as our flat. The southern aspect of our flat is made up of floor to ceiling glass and has two balconies. The proposed roof terrace would enable direct viewing into the entire living space of our flat [REDACTED] from only a few feet away. There would be a significant security risk, as our balconies could be stepped onto from the proposed roof terrace. The noise from any social functions on the proposed roof terrace would be significant, meaning we could not use our balconies, and the noise would carry into our flat, which has Crittal style windows, some of which are single glazed.</p> <p>The proposed in-filling of White Bear Yard to this height would create a density of development which would ruin the lives of all of us who have made our homes in Summers Street.</p>
2018/1325/P	Paul Vaight	22/06/2018 12:55:07	OBJ	This extension and erection of a new floor on the building immediately behind ours will cause a significant loss of amenity to residents through the loss of light and privacy for the all rooms facing the courtyard.
2018/1325/P	Paul Vaight	22/06/2018 12:55:08	OBJ	This extension and erection of a new floor on the building immediately behind ours will cause a significant loss of amenity to residents through the loss of light and privacy for the all rooms facing the courtyard.
2018/1325/P	Sarah Chin	21/06/2018 19:35:35	OBJ/EMAIL	I would like to register my opposition and objection. The proposal will seriously harm three essentials of everyday life of many of my neighbours – their rights to quiet, light and privacy in their own homes.



Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2018/1325/P	susan vaight	19/06/2018 10:53:36	OBJ	<p>I object to this development as it will block light to the south-facing facade of our apartment building. The assessment submitted with the application acknowledges this and gives figures for amount of light that are unacceptable. It offends against our Right to Light. Daylight to windows on this facade will be severely curtailed and those getting direct sunlight at present will no longer.</p> <p>Furthermore the proposed new glass walled office will be within 2 or 3 metres of windows in our building, leading to a complete loss of privacy to habitable rooms at that level. These will have to install blinds or other screens, even further limiting daylight. It will be living in a darkened cave.</p> <p>The proposed new roof terrace will similarly look directly at windows in our building at that level, a loss of privacy. Screening the terrace would be unacceptable as it would exacerbate the loss of light. Development at such proximity and causing obstruction of light should be refused.</p> <p>As a comment on procedure, I find it surprising that there was no prior consultation with anyone in our building, nor did we receive individual letters notifying us of this application.</p>



Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2018/1325/P	GIA (on behalf of Manhattan Loft Corporation)	27/06/2018 14:48:38	OBJECTION	<p>We (Gordon Ingram Associates) write on behalf of our client Manhattan Loft Corporation N.V, the freeholder of 1 - 10 Summer Street, EC1R 5BD (the Property) to object to the recent application 2018/1325/P, received by Camden Council on 14th May 2018 for the development of the site at 144A Clerkenwell Road (the Proposed Scheme).</p> <p>The Proposed Scheme is for the extension of the existing 3rd floor and erection of the new 4th floor above, to provide a 1 x 2 bedroom residential flat, alterations to Black Hill entrance, erection of new external spiral staircase to northern lightwell and refurbishment of existing office space.</p> <p>From our review of the Proposed Scheme in consideration of the Property, it is evident the development utilises the entire red line boundary as detailed upon the title plan (reference NGL24995), attached for your reference. We consider the Proposed Scheme to be an overdevelopment of the site resulting in further significant impacts upon the daylight and sunlight amenity currently enjoyed by the Property.</p> <p>We have received the associated Daylight, Sunlight and Overshadowing Report submitted by Hilson Moran (reference 24812/S/DL/RP01/00), the Report which considers Daylight and Sunlight amenity upon the Property with reference to the Building Research Establishment Guidelines, Site Layout Planning for Daylight and Sunlight - A Guide to Good Practice 2nd Edition (2011) (the BRE).</p> <p>Importantly, the Camden Planning Guidance 6 (CPG6) document which supports the Local Development Framework (LDM) provides guidance on daylight and sunlight amenity for existing dwellings and strongly supports the aims of the BRE methodology for assessing sunlight and daylight and references the Vertical Sky Component (VSC) and the Average Daylight Factor (ADF) as the most common measurements of daylight.</p> <p>In consideration of this, we make reference to the Report which describes the impacts of daylight levels within 1 - 10 Summers Street, utilising the VSC methodology. Of noteworthy importance is the Consultants own conclusion of the impacts for which it is stated:</p> <p>Consequently, it is believed that there is likely to be a major adverse effect for the 32 receptors having the greatest reduction in daylight and that can lead the occupants to observe a significant loss of light and rooms to appear darker.</p> <p>Furthermore, the Report also considers the impact upon sunlight levels within 1 - 10 Summers Street for which the Consultant concludes:</p> <p>Overall, there is likely to be a major adverse effect on a significant amount of sunlight receptors of 1-10 Summers Street, the majority of which are located on the third floor. Additionally, results showed that a few of them can experience a reduction greater than 90% which can make the loss of sunlight highly noticeable by the occupants.</p> <p>The Report clearly demonstrates the Proposed Scheme is not only contrary to the BRE Guidance and Camden's Planning Guidance 6 (CPG6) but is significantly beyond what the guidelines recommend, resulting in major adverse daylight and sunlight impacts to the Property. As a result, a significant proportion of rooms will experience noticeable changes to the daylight and sunlight amenity which is not being balanced by any</p>

Application No: [REDACTED] Consultees Name: Received: Comment: Response:

meaningful additional amenity benefits from the proposal. In line with recommendations set out within the CP06, it is recommended that where a proposed development results in noticeable effects on amenity, applications may be refused. On this basis, and as supported by the conclusions of the applicants Report, we express our clients strong objection to the application.

In consideration of the above we would request that no decision is made in favour of the application until the applicants have paid due attention to the daylight amenity of our clients property.

Kind regards,

Yours sincerely
For and on behalf of GIA

Abigail Woods
Surveyor
[REDACTED]

Cc Jerome Webb - GIA

2018/1325/P	Denise	24/06/2018 18:18:48	OBJ	I wholeheartedly object to the above planning application. It will seriously affect mine and my neighbours privacy, and right to light. We recently lived through a 2/3 year conversion in Back Hill, Herbal House which has compromised our privacy and should this planning application go ahead then Camden Council will ruin lots of peoples lives.
-------------	--------	---------------------	-----	---

2018/1325/P	Professor Itesh Sachdev	18/06/2018 16:41:49	OBJ	<p>Dear Ms. Hazelton</p> <p>I wish to register my strong objection to the roof extension proposed to 144A Clerkenwell Road as part of planning application 2018/1325/P.</p> <p>My property is on the 2nd floor of 1-10 Sumners Street. I note that a number of windows will lose significant amount of light - in excess of 60%.</p> <p>I read that Camden Councils policy is to comply with BREEAM standards which state that a loss of more than 20% of light is unacceptable and I urge you to reject this planning application as it will significantly impact on my enjoyment of my property which currently receives a good amount of natural light.</p> <p>I recognize that development is inevitable in central London but please ask you to protect me and my neighbours from this overbearing development - if something is to be approved, I would ask that it be significantly scaled back such that the loss of my light be kept to much lower levels.</p> <p>In addition, I note that the proposal is to replace the current use of the building which is office space for small creative businesses with yet another furniture showroom, taking jobs and vibrancy out of the local area. This is a shame and is the sort of change of use which I hope Camden Council will agree should not be supported.</p>
-------------	-------------------------	---------------------	-----	--

[REDACTED]

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2018/1325/P	Robin Lewis	21/06/2018 19:44:29	OBJEMAIL	I strongly object to the proposal I accept that it is a privilege to live in Central London, and that I must balance my wishes with those of my neighbours -- residents, businesses and property owners. This proposal is wrong because it shows no sense of that balance, and is therefore completely unneighbourly. It will have a seriously harmful effect on the amenity of the 50 or so residents who make up the community of this building, and it shows only marginal (if any) benefit in return.

