

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2022/1817/P	Isobel Cole-Hamilton	17/05/2022 12:18:09	OBJ	<p>From a resident of Jessel House: 108-110 Judd Street</p> <p>Please find below my serious objections to the proposed upwards extension of 105 Judd Street. At the webinar held to show the proposals to the residents we were told that the refurbished building's height would be level with the height of the existing tower. It turns out that the developers are planning for the upward extension to be at least twice that height. We were initially misled on this matter. This, in itself, is of concern to me. However, I have other substantial objections, listed below.</p> <p>1 Impact on local area and streetscape The look of the proposed upper extension is completely out of place in the conservation area. The proposed extra floors will add excessive height to the building and is inappropriate for the red brick building and the others on the street. The grey upward extension will dominate the currently attractive look of the street and is totally disproportionate in this section of Judd Street.</p> <p>2 Impact on my access to light and views of the sky I live on the 3rd floor of Jessel House, immediately opposite the Judd Street entrance to 105. The negative impact on my quality of life, in my flat, will be substantial. There will be almost total loss of the sky view from my living room and a significant loss of light into my living room. This will be the case for the living rooms of most of the flats in Jessel House opposite 105. The living rooms are almost all on the Judd Street side of the building. There will also be a significant reduction in privacy in our flats with the extra floors providing more windows overlooking our building. The theoretical analysis of the impact of light into the front of Jessel House is not at all realistic. If the developers had come to my flat to actually see what impact their proposals will have they would, almost certainly, have come to a different conclusion. They are welcome to come now, as are members of Camden's planning department and committee.</p> <p>3. The apparent justification for the oversized upper extension As local residents we have been told that the extension is necessary to allow the developers to provide a community space and café on the ground floor, opening onto Judd Street. I don't know anyone in the area who thinks we need either. There are community spaces provided in other local buildings and I don't think we need one here. In addition we already have one pub and three cafes on Judd Street, between Hastings Street and Cromer Street. (The Skinners Arms, Nonos, Half Cup and Thenga.) There is no evidence that another would be either necessary or welcome on the same small stretch of Judd Street. So this rationale for extending so far upwards is totally fictitious. There are also very many cafes in the area, some of which are struggling to survive.</p> <p>4 Overprovision of Life Sciences office space in the area We are told that the reason for the upward extension is to provide more office space in the area, especially for the Life Sciences. This whole area is well provided with office space and new provision is being made all the time. The British Library, the Access building opposite Kings cross station and the works on Grays Inn Road are all providing new office space for the Life Sciences. Am I correct in thinking that, if an application is being made for this type of office space, the planning rules are relaxed? If so – I urge you to consider the real reason for the use of this type of application, especially when no potential clients have been found for renting this property. This sort of speculative building should not be allowed in an area already over-provided with office space, especially at a time when fewer people are regularly working in centralised offices.</p>

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2022/1817/P	Undisclosed	17/05/2022 19:59:09	OBJ	I strongly object to the proposed development plans.

The proposed development plan comprehensively fails to protect the amenity of the residents of Thanet Street, Hastings Street and in particular Jessel House and the building itself, which is over one hundred years old. It is therefore contrary to the provisions of the Camden Local Plan Point 6.

The proposed fourth floor terrace and roof terrace in particular, are unnecessary to the normal and proper commercial use of a building and critically impacts the residents in Jessel House.

In their current form, the plans for the terraces, especially the out of character fourth-floor terrace plan, the over large walkways and impractical seating areas will look directly into the residents' properties in Jessel House and the other residential properties on Thanet Street and Hastings Street. This will mean that residents in their property will be overlooked by numerous strangers at any time. This not only impacts amenity but also the residents' personal safety and privacy. Particularly floors three to six at Jessel House.

Notably, the fourth floor roof terrace should not be permitted as sought, in any form, as it severely impacts residents privacy. These proposed terraces demonstrably offend Point 6, Policy A1 of the Camden Local Plan sections a-n, which is quite rightly designed to ensure the amenity of neighbours (a), visual privacy outlook (e), sunlight, daylight and overshadowing (f).

The proposed erection of external alterations to all elevations, erection of roof extensions at third, fourth and fifth floor level with rooftop plant roof, terraces at levels three, four and five and grey cladding is extremely unsightly – it compromises and is out of appearance to the local context and character. This proposed development will also irrevocably ruin the building in question, 105 Judd Street, which has a longstanding history of local and London-wide historical value. Any such external changes would severely and conclusively impact the historical integrity of the building.

The conservation of this Edwardian building should be paramount as most sensibly detailed in the Camden Local Plan Point 7.

I do not object to the building being used for commercial use and very minor external adjustments that may be made in keeping with the local character. However, the proposed fourth floor plan, fifth floor plan and roof plan are extensive, intrusive, constructional developments to a valued Edwardian building, that will negatively impact the Conservation area, community and the residents. As mentioned, the terrace plans, specifically the fourth floor terrace plan, is not only unnecessary for normal and proper commercial use of a building but also presents an unacceptably high personal and privacy risk to residents particularly in Jessel House but also in Thanet Street & Hastings Street.

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2022/1817/P	Rhiannon Evans	17/05/2022 16:48:31	OBJ	<p>I object to this development. The extension will impact on natural light, privacy, and views from living area for residents of Jessel House opposite. We do not need another eyesore blocking our view of the Post Office tower.</p> <p>The grey cladding will also affect the charming look of Judd Street, with its beautifully old red brick buildings. The extension would contravene the Design & Heritage section listed in Camden's 2017 Camden Local Plan document.</p> <p>I also object to the idea of needing a community space and cafe. A small, independent cafe nearby has already been struggling since the lockdown, so to add another as competition will only make things more difficult for the owner.</p>
