

**From:** judith dainton [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** 13 December 2018 15:47  
**To:** McClue, Jonathan [REDACTED]; Planning [REDACTED]  
**Subject:** Re: Reply to Consultee letter for PlanningApplication Application: 2018/5715/P

Dear Jonathan

I have read the EIA (scoping application) and discussed it with the Mount Pleasant Executive members. I also notified the Forum public meeting held on Dec 10 that we would be responding to the planning application.

We would like to make the following points:-

1.The application appears very thorough and includes useful points like examining the sight-line corridors of view to St Paul's Cathedral and other normally required parameters. We welcome the section on Solar Glare.

2. The Forum was particularly focussed on issues concerning the immediate neighbourhood surrounding the development, ie the Calthorpe Project, Trinity Court and the New Calthorpe Estate (Fleet Square). We would require the EIA to

- place more noise location monitors on the Calthorpe Project land, since they will be heavily affected by noise from demolition and rebuilding, and there appear to be few of these monitors distributed over their land. (*para 200 and map locating monitors*).
- Light Pollution section (*para 249*) is not precise enough. It needs to define the sites and location of the testing equipment to include specified sites on the Calthorpe Project (in particular) and the New Calthorpe Estate.

3. The Forum noted that the whole section dealing with Local Effects of demolition and building, although comprehensive in general terms, was not specific when dealing with the occupants of the very near neighbourhood to the development site who will experience the adverse effects most strongly. It seems as if the monitoring systems have been calculated on a population basis solely, which might explain a lack of clarity about the Calthorpe Project, which has no residents at all but very many users( staff and public, including children).We would like more specific outlines of monitoring for all nuisances to be made for these areas which will be seriously affected - particularly in relation to air pollution

4. The Forum has emphasised in its Neighbourhood Plan (still in draft) the poor air quality in our neighbourhood, which our data from our own surveys (shown on our website [mountpleasantforum.org.uk](http://mountpleasantforum.org.uk) ) and the data collected by Camden Council's own survey (which included our Neighbourhood) shows to be above EC danger limits for N02 emissions (mainly caused by emissions from petrol and diesel. This data shows whilst the poor air quality exists throughout our Neighbourhood, the very high levels of N02 is concentrated near major roads, of which Gray's Inn Road is one. We know that large building sites add to this air pollution (though we cannot fully quantify this til we compare data from the Wimpey site at Mount Pleasant - which is still being collected. Therefore we ask the Planning Committee to consider lowering the levels of permitted air pollution from the usual WHO

levels to a more stringent level ( such as EU rulings perhaps?) to spare local residents from suffering ill-health. We do not know if this is within your power to alter or vary permitted levels of air pollution, but we would ask the Committee to consider their options in this matter in relation to this site.

5. The Forum notes that there appears to be no section relating to legal matters such as party wall agreements, obstruction of walkways and temporary use of land owned by third parties to facilitate demolition and construction. Should these matters not be helpfully included in this document., or do they fall into another section of planning requirements?

6. The Forum notes that a company, Indigo, is dealing with items concerning social issues (census data etc). Can you clarify whether or not this is the company (or part of the company)Indigo who worked with Royal Mail on the development of the Post Office lands at Mount Pleasant?

The Forum would also like to make two general comments which may fall outside the scope of this specific planning consultation.

- The project itself is undergoing revisions and is itself in pre-planning stages. Would it not be more helpful to provide a specific EIA tailored to the specific plan which will be applying for planning permission? This would help the EIA be more detailed to site specifics than it appears to be at the moment. So perhaps this EIA application is premature?
- 
- The EIA sets out tasks to be performed when the plan has been accepted and work has begun. Its findings will therefore be available in the future. Local residents, whilst they will welcome these findings, actually need a realistic estimation, before the work begins, of what they will face, so that they can make their own plans about their own living or working arrangements. Is it possible for the EIA to include a reliable forecast of expected issues, as a new section within the EIA,, or would the developers consider providing such advice as a separate document for local residents?

In essence, we would like to see more precision in relation to all scoping within the immediate neighbourhood of the proposed development with particular reference to its immediate next door neighbours.

Yours sincerely,

Judy Dainton  
(Chair, Mount Pleasant Neighbourhood Forum)

---

**From:** McClue, Jonathan [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** 03 December 2018 12:02  
**To:** judith dainton

[REDACTED]  
**Subject:** RE: Consultee letter for PlanningApplication Application: 2018/5715/P

Dear Judy

Thank you for your email. The application is an Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) scoping request. The Council needs to make a formal opinion on the scoping report by 18/12/2018. Any comments you have would be appreciated. There isn't a plan for you to assess, just the developer's scoping report which can be found on our website here:

<http://camdocs.camden.gov.uk/HPRMWebDrawer/Record/7464680/file/document?inline>

What this means is that the applicant has presumed they are going to submit an EIA alongside their planning application (predicted submission is spring 2019). The scoping request is their submission of the technical information they consider the EIA will need to contain. This is our opportunity to review their scoping submission and comment. What we say in our scoping opinion will influence what they finally submit as a formal EIA. The EIA and planning application will be formal submissions that you will have further opportunities to comment on. This process is about how significant you think the impacts are, what impacts should be scoped into the EIA and the level of information/methodology they should be using.

Kind regards

Jonathan McClue  
Principal Planner

[REDACTED]



**From:** judith dainton [REDACTED]

**Sent:** 02 December 2018 02:15

**To:** McClue, Jonathan [REDACTED]

**Subject:** Re: Consultee letter for PlanningApplication Application: 2018/5715/P

Dear Jonathan

Thank you for this letter. No plan or submission enclosed

Can you send them to me please?

Best regards,

Judy Dainton

---

**From:** McClue, Jonathan [REDACTED]

**Sent:** 21 November 2018 16:47  
[REDACTED]

**Subject:** Consultee letter for PlanningApplication Application: 2018/5715/P

Please find attached Consultee letter for PlanningApplication application 2018/5715/P

Y492878

This e-mail may contain information which is confidential, legally privileged and/or copyright protected. This e-mail is intended for the addressee only. If you receive this in error, please contact the sender and delete the material from your computer. See our new Privacy Notice here<<http://www.camden.gov.uk/privacystatement>> which tells you how we store and process the data we hold about you and residents.

This e-mail may contain information which is confidential, legally privileged and/or copyright protected. This e-mail is intended for the addressee only. If you receive this in error, please contact the sender and delete the material from your computer. See our new Privacy Notice [here](#) which tells you how we store and process the data we hold about you and residents.