

Printed on: 20/09/2021 09:10:06

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2021/3603/P	tom gibbons	18/09/2021 09:45:03	OBJ	<p>Dear Sir/Madam,</p> <p>Re: 2021/3603/P</p> <p>I live at 179 Kings Cross Road and I am writing to strongly object to the planning application.</p> <p>I am a [REDACTED] and required to undertake 50% of my clinical work from home. The planned building works will be detrimental to my work from home environment. Apart from any construction noise, the planned extension and intrusive balconies will overshadow my home/office.</p> <p>The natural light will be diminished in my study and my privacy will be lost. The affect this building would have on my family and home life is distressing to contemplate.</p> <p>I am hopeful that the applicant will reconsider the overbearing extension and intrusive balconies.</p> <p>Doctor Francesca Fanari Change Grow Live Clinical Lead</p>
2021/3603/P	tom gibbons	18/09/2021 10:17:54	COMMENT	<p>It looks as though the revised plans still show a balcony overlooking Field Place. I object to a balcony overlooking the rear of our properties for reasons stated in the formal objection letter - I would like to understand more of the proposed balcony screen; will it be 7 foot tall and soundproofed?</p> <p>The height of the proposed building extension will still mean that we have no sky view from our living rooms.</p>

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2021/3603/P	Chockchai Wongkaew	17/09/2021 11:25:55	OBJ	<p>I am [REDACTED] on property 181 Kings Cross Road. It is our family home and business. Please consider the impact the planned building will have on our privacy, views and light. I want to object to the plans.</p> <p>One of my main concerns is the height of the building and how close and overshadowing our quite garden where I often take my child out to play. Therefore, the planned balconies for flats will overlook our quiet balcony and the rooms to the rear of our home. The height of the building will impact the cityscape views from our balcony and reduce the light we have into our home.</p> <p>My other concern is that a refurbishment will effected or a disruption the business on the ground floor. For instance;</p> <p>The traffic come in and out on field street (if they use as a main entrance for construction). Not to mention the noises effects our customers come to dining.</p> <p>The vibration when using digging machine or heavy machine may caused cracking and leaking to the ceiling on the basement. This incident haapened to my previous property.</p> <p>The situation of hospitality is bad enough. We cannot afford another disruption. Please consider an independent local business has been in area over decade.</p> <p>Best regards,</p>

Printed on: 20/09/2021 09:10:06

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2021/3603/P	Simon Hogg & Colin Melia	17/09/2021 11:47:12	COMMENT	<p>Kristina Smith Planning Department London Borough of Camden 2nd Floor, 5 Pancras Square c/o Town Hall, Judd Street London WC1H 9JE</p> <p>29 Field Street London WC1X 9DA</p> <p>15th. September 2021</p>

Dear Ms Smith,

Ref Camden: Application Number: 2021/3603/P

I write in response to the public consultation for Planning Application Number: 2021/3603/P, 14 - 16 Leeke Street and 1 - 6 Field Street WC1X 9HJ. I also write on behalf of the resident at 29 Field Street

This response focuses on the impact the above proposed development will have on 29/30 Field Street, which we currently occupy. Our concerns can be summarised as:

1. Over dominant building form detrimental to the character of the street/public realm.

The proposal for an additional floor in this location will radically change the nature of the historic urban development typical of this area. This is particularly evident when one applies sound principles of urban design and analyses the street height/width relationship (see attached illustration). The way in which the additional floor unacceptably increases the height ratio is fundamentally poor practice and erodes the traditional street pattern. Furthermore, the proposed elevational treatment adds little in the way of articulation and its scale is over dominant. The proposed height of the building would cause unacceptable harm to the living conditions currently experienced by unit 29 Field Street and is symptomatic of tower development.

2. Loss of daylight/sunlight to units 29 and 30 Field Street.

The proposed increase in height of 1 - 6 Field Street will directly affect the amount of daylight/sunlight experienced by 29/30 Field Street, particularly to the residential apartment. The additional height would also affect the amount of light currently experienced within the outdoor amenity space (private roof terrace). No sky at all would be visible from the main living room and bedroom windows of 29/30 Field Street if the proposal in its current form goes ahead.

3. Substantial loss of privacy and visual amenity to 29 Field Street.

The proposed elevational treatment to the Field Street facade includes the removal and remodelling of windows at both first and second floors. At present, the facade contains small opaque windows at first floor level with larger windows at second floor. The replacement of the small first floor windows with large areas of clear glazing will lead to direct overlooking and visual intrusion into the living room and both bedrooms (all the habitable floor space) of 29 Field Street. This would result in a direct loss of privacy in all aspects of daily living for number 29 and is unacceptable.

Application No: Consultees Name: Received:

Comment:

Response:

4. Impact of the proposed development on the private open amenity space of 29 Field Street.

There would be direct loss of privacy to the only outdoor amenity space (private roof terrace) of number 29, which would be directly overlooked if the proposal goes ahead in its current form.

We are aware of and support the current drive for new residential development, especially social housing, in central locations and understand that new developments may have particularly close relationships window-to-window, which may be acceptable when it is all part of one new development. When unacceptable window distances give rise to severe loss of outlook and privacy to existing units, it is quite another matter. New development should not be encouraged or welcomed when it significantly diminishes the living standards of an existing unit, creating sub-standard conditions for the existing or future occupiers.

The proposal is against LPA policies D1 Design, D2 Heritage and A1 Managing the Impact of development and Camden's Planning Guidance on Amenity dated January 2021

Currently, the proposal is unacceptable and the new floor level to 1 - 6 Field Street should be removed from the scheme or significantly reconfigured. Further, the fenestration to the Field Street elevation should also be reconsidered, particularly the first floor windows - perhaps a bay window configuration with opaque glass directly facing the street and number 29/30 Field Street, with clear vision side panels to afford potential occupiers clear views along the street in one or both directions. Whatever form the proposal takes, it should directly address the immediate built context and respect its neighbours existing amenity. Good quality urban repair and sensitive design would be welcomed.

To further inform these observations/objections of the above proposal I attach a letter regarding the light prepared by William Brook of Waldrams Ltd a Daylight Sunlight and Rights of Light specialist which is self-explanatory. I also ask that you consider the light pollution and potential noise impact arising from clear glazed and open windows opposite the residential accommodation.

We would urge the local authority to seek amendments to the proposal in order to reduce the very severe harm this current proposal would cause to number 29/30 Field Street and the wider public realm.

We look forward to hearing from you and would very much appreciate a LPA site visit to 29 Field Street, to assess the true impact and harm to privacy and amenity that would be caused by this development.

Yours sincerely

Simon Lanyon-Hogg owner
Colin Melia owner
Please reply to 29 Field St.

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:	Printed on: 20/09/2021 09:10:06
-----------------	------------------	-----------	----------	-----------	---------------------------------

Summary of Primary Objections to proposed additional floor and changes to window pattern.

Cross section through Field St showing existing and proposed impact of overlooking and loss of privacy. New 1st Floor windows directly overlooking the 1st F living Room. The 3rd Floor terrace overlooking the established private terrace.

The copper cladding will be removed, no clear description of the elevational materials is provided. 80% of the 1st floor will be come glazed.
The proposed terraces and windows on the 3rd F will increase overlooking and substantially cause loss of privacy.

The eastern infill will erode to amount of sky which is visible from the living room at 1st floor
The proposed new windows amount to 80% of the wall and will be directly opposite the living room

Printed on: 20/09/2021 09:10:06

Application No: Consultees Name: Received:

Comment: Response:

The additional floor and proposed terrace opposite No. 29 Field Street will cause overlooking directly into the bedrooms and direct overlooking of the terrace which will cause a loss of privacy to the existing residential accommodation

Proposed Amendment
Revised design to 1st floor windows with oblique bays, clear glass to provide long view along Field Street and obscured glazing opposite accommodation in 29 Field Street.

Proposed Amendment
Form bay windows with Juliette balconies facing east or west and clear glass.
Glazed panel opposite No. 29 to be permanently obscure glazed.
1st Floor: Form oblique bays with clear view along Field Street and obscured glazing opposite existing residential accommodation
