

**Parnjit Singh**

---

**From:** Sian Wynn-Jones [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** 21 October 2021 09:59  
**To:** Planning Planning  
**Subject:** Incomplete comment on planning application 2021/3673/P

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

Many thanks

Sian Wynn-Jones  
@sian\_wj

—

**From:** [planning@camden.gov.uk](mailto:planning@camden.gov.uk)  
**Subject:** Comments on 2021/3673/P have been received by the council.  
**Date:** 15 October 2021 at 10:39:04 GMT+8  
**To:** [REDACTED]

We are writing to register our objection to the development proposed for the vacant office property, 85 Gray's Inn Road (planning application 2021/3673/P). It is a speculative development for life science laboratories. The property is currently permitted to be used as an office.

The development as proposed is unsuitable and detrimental to the residents of Brownlow Mews, and especially to those on the neighbouring properties in Brownlow Mews and Gray's Inn Road. The following points outline our main concerns:

**LOSS OF LIGHT AND PRIVACY FOR NEIGHBOURS**

The plans make insufficient consideration for the loss of light and privacy to the residences to the rear of Gray's Inn Road and Brownlow Mews.

We note a daylight and sunlight assessment has not been produced for 4-6 Brownlow Mews. This surprises us as a number of units in this building have windows and terraces to the rear. Those terraces that directly adjoin 85 Gray's Inn Road will be rendered unusable. The lightwell for the lower communal hallway of 4-

6 Brownlow Mews is also impacted.

#### EXCESSIVE NOISE

It is noted that the level of plant required exceeds that which can be accommodated on the roof. The proposal includes the infill of the courtyard area to accommodate the additional plant required for the site to operate as a life science laboratory.

The infill is directly adjoining the neighbouring residential properties. Using this space for plant will negatively impact the noise levels for all neighbouring properties.

The proposed daily diesel generator will only further exacerbate the noise levels.

As suggested by the accompanying report, moving plant furthest away from residential properties would be the far more preferable solution.

Furthermore, it is unclear what the operating hours of the building would be, and for what parts of their days residents would be exposed to this noise nuisance.

#### POLLUTION

The proposal to convert this office premises for use as a life science laboratory necessitates substantial fume extraction. It is noted that the substances to be used are not known at present, and that leakages will likely occur. It appears both unwise and unnecessary to introduce the associated risks of such an operation into an increasingly residential area.

#### INCREASED TRAFFIC

There is only one access point for vehicle to enter Brownlow Mews – the junction with Roger Street. (The access to Guilford Street being pedestrian only.)

The proposal is for several different companies operating within the premises rather than just one as previous. This will necessitate a significant increase in the deliveries required when the building is in operation.

It is unclear whether the access to the rear of the building (i.e. from Brownlow Mews) will be retained for delivery vehicles. The plans suggest that the courtyard would be used for bicycle, waste and clinical waste storage only. We are concerned that the absence of proper provision to receive vehicles inside the site's boundaries will cause undue congestion and obstruction to the residents and small businesses of Brownlow Mews. With multiple occupants in the building, this issue will necessarily increase.

#### ENERGY EFFICIENCY AND THE ENVIRONMENT

It is noted that "achieving higher targets [than B] for refurbishing a building of this era for laboratory purposes would be challenging". This would further suggest that this site is not the correct location for the plans proposed.

Additionally, the proposal makes no contribution to local or national environmental, sustainability or climate crisis plans.

--

Overall, this site is not suited to this development and proceeding as suggested will have a detrimental impact on local residents and neighbourhood. We therefore urge Camden to reject this proposal.

