

<b>Application No:</b>	<b>Consultees Name:</b>	<b>Received:</b>	<b>Comment:</b>	<b>Response:</b>
2022/1817/P	Meta Zimmeck	30/05/2022 21:36:42	OBJ	Dear Mr Marfleet

Planning application 2022/1817/P: 105-121 Judd Street, London WC1 (Native Land & Ashby Capital)

I have lived in Queen Alexandra Mansions since 1985 (37 years) and every day I have enjoyed the views from my windows - and in particular, the view of the pleasing frontage and eccentric corner & tower of the Salvation Army/RNIB Building.

I strongly oppose the proposal by these speculative developers to alter this building almost beyond recognition for no purpose other than greed.

(1) The proposal asserts that there is a need for additional office space and even for 'lab-enabled' office space (whatever that is - not explained in the proposal), but it does not provide any evidence of this need. As any resident knows, there is a large amount of office space already present or in the process of construction in the area - behind the British Library and in the Access building on the Euston Road. In addition the refurbished Town Hall will provide special accommodation for starter units. There is no pressing demand for additional office space in this residential area. Therefore I urge you to reject this proposal.

(2) The proposal asserts that it is only possible to meet demand by adding two extra floors plus plant - 19 extra feet in height. This height will have a detrimental impact on the surrounding blocks of flats and houses. The proposal argues that such a reduction in light and loss of views is relatively minimal and not a significant impediment to giving planning permission. It is clear that those directly affected take an entirely different view and have strongly objected. No residents should be worse off in their quality of life due to the proposed scheme. Therefore I urge you to reject the proposal.

(3) The proposal includes three terraces, one each on the third, fourth and fifth floors. This is, in fact, an increase from the initial proposal of one terrace, so the developers have indeed opened their mouths wide. This is an office building designed for people to work in and not to loll about taking in the views. If workers want fresh air, they can go to the two nearby parks. Although the proposal gives assurances that use will be controlled and screened from view, no one actually believes this. We have already been exposed to nuisance use of terraces in surrounding buildings - e.g. BT/Openreach in the past and The Standard more recently. Indeed residents of the Judd Street side of QAM fought a long campaign against use of the terraces in BT/Openreach, where people regularly ate their lunches off the balustrades and peered into our windows. No residents should lose privacy due to the proposed scheme. Therefore I urge you to reject the proposal.

(4) The proposal makes claims for the quality of the proposed build - 'exceptional quality and sustainable design', etc. etc. This design is plug ugly, a great grey lump stuck on top of a nice old building to show the modernist vogue for not matching the extension to the existing structure. Especially the weird Dracula's Castle peaky bits. This architectural show-offiness is clearly in line with design decisions re the Town Hall Annexe, which put some sort of flashy grain silos on top of a plain and neat tower block. Residents should not be forced to look at such bad design. Therefore I urge you to reject the proposal.

(5) The proposal includes the use of part of the ground floor as a café with tables and chairs placed externally. It also states that this would be 'open during daytime hours only and not into the late evening'. Again the proposal gives no evidence for need of additional café provision in the neighbourhood - with one pub and three

Application No:    Consultees Name:    Received:

Comment:    Response:

cafes already in existence in the stretch of Judd Street between Hastings Street and Cromer Street. It certainly does not define 'not into late evening'. It is also not very forthcoming about activities outside the building - whether they are intended to be within the curtilage of the building or intrude upon the public footpath. There is no local need and no local support for this café, particularly if it blocks the pavement. Therefore I urge you to reject the proposal.

(6) The proposal, if granted, will result in 18 months of construction, including the demolition of 25% of the building and rebuilding it bigger. Local residents have already had 18 months and still counting of construction on the Town Hall, with blockages of the street, dust and dirt, loss of residents' parking, noise from scaffolding, drilling, pounding, lorries and skips from 7.30AM onwards. The proposal does not provide sufficient benefit to local residents to be worth such massive disruption when lesser disruption of refurbishment of the existing building would be preferable. Therefore I urge you to reject the proposal.

Two final points:

I am rather confused by the developers' assertions about 'a thorough and constructive consultation process' with the community and using this as justification for their plans. I received the 4-page colour brochure back in January and attended a webinar (21 residents present) on 20 January. If I had not been in receipt of regular planning applications I would not have known that the application had been submitted and was open for comment. When I received this notice I checked the surrounding streets for public notices: there were 2A4 notices on the stretch of Judd Street between Hastings Street and Cromer Street, 2 on Thanet Street between Leigh Street and Hastings Street, and 1 on Hastings Street between Thanet Street and Judd Street. The developers did not send out a brochure informing us of their final proposals (even though these had been inaccurately stated in January) and they did not put up large announcements of their proposal on the building where they could be seen by all. When I spoke to local people in the immediate area, few knew about the application, even though it was going to affect them significantly.

Finally, I urge you to remember that this is primarily a residential neighbourhood. People live here and want to continue to live here with comfort and, indeed, pleasure. It is in a Conservation Zone but the benefits of this Zone in terms of quality of design and quality of life are being undermined and degraded by the 'superior' demands of the 'Knowledge Quarter', which is a Speculative Developer's Charter, and LB Camden's love of tower blocks and s.106 payments.

Despite the developers' assertion that this proposal, if implemented, will provide 'no harm', this is patently untrue. It offers no benefits at all to local residents and should, therefore, be rejected in favour of a refurbishment of the existing building.

---

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2022/1817/P	Andre da Silveira	30/05/2022 19:27:30	OBJ	<p>I am very concerned about the increased height of this building. It will have a severe impact on the Conservation Area and the loss of daylight must be unacceptable for the surrounding buildings.</p> <p>The heritage of the building is also disregarded and the project contravenes points 6 and 7 of the Camden local plan, which mentions that "the Council will seek to protect the quality of life of occupiers and neighbours. We will grant permission for development unless this causes unacceptable harm to amenity" and "The Council will seek to secure high quality design in development. The Council will require that development:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. respects local context and character;</li> <li>b. preserves or enhances the historic environment and heritage assets in accordance with Policy D2 Heritage".</li> </ul>
2022/1817/P	Daniela Pimenta Penas da Silveira	30/05/2022 19:29:30	OBJ	<p>I am very concerned about the increased height of this building. It will have a severe impact on the Conservation Area and the loss of daylight must be unacceptable for the surrounding buildings.</p> <p>The heritage of the building is also disregarded and the project contravenes points 6 and 7 of the Camden local plan, which mentions that "the Council will seek to protect the quality of life of occupiers and neighbours. We will grant permission for development unless this causes unacceptable harm to amenity" and "The Council will seek to secure high quality design in development. The Council will require that development:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. respects local context and character;</li> <li>b. preserves or enhances the historic environment and heritage assets in accordance with Policy D2 Heritage".</li> </ul>

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2022/1817/P	Trevor Shonfeld	30/05/2022 17:15:17	OBJ	<p>As a nearby resident, I object to the redevelopment of 105 Judd Street as submitted in this planning application.</p> <p>The building occupies a site between Judd Street, Hastings Street and Thanet Street. The proposal to increase the existing office space by adding two additional floors (plus a third for plant) will inevitably increase the need for extra services, adding to those that already support residents and businesses on these local streets. The building is to be serviced from Thanet Street, which is a very narrow residential street, with parking on both sides. Vehicle movements (for refuse / deliveries etc) will increase. More height at no 105 equals more space for the developer's rental aspirations but more noise, disturbance and inconvenience for people who live nearby.</p> <p>The additional two floors are intended to increase the offer of office space at this location. It is noted that some 600,000 sq. ft. of new office space will be provided by the British Library Extension development, close by on the other side of the Euston Road. The soon to be constructed 10 storey building at Belgrove House (opposite Kings Cross station) will have many new floors of office space. At the end of Judd Street, office space has been created by the recently refurbished Camden Town Hall. How much new office space is actually needed in this area?</p> <p>With many more people living a hybrid working pattern following the pandemic, are two extra floors of office space required when this will destroy the façade and roofline of a fine Edwardian building with its familiar landmark turret. The design of the roof extension is utterly out of character when seen in the context of neighbouring Edwardian mansion blocks.</p> <p>Reverberation from demolition and construction, plus the daily to-ing and fro-ing of construction traffic will impact on the sensitive Grade II listed heritage buildings that adjoin 105 on Judd Street and Thanet Street.</p> <p>Extra footfall from an increase of office space at 105 Judd Street will not benefit existing residents or businesses. A café is proposed within the renovated building, but this will only take business away from several cafes in the nearby vicinity.</p> <p>Argyle Primary School is located very close by in Tonbridge Street. The school has already had to cope with the two-year renovation of Camden Town Hall. Just as this refurbishment ends, another building site will emerge nearby, on Judd Street, with construction traffic, construction noise etc. Has the school been consulted on 105's proposals? Has the Skinner's Arms pub? What about the businesses on the parade of shops opposite? Is Half Cup happy with the proposed competition opposite? What about Thenga Café in the YMCA building? And the café at the corner of Hastings and Sandwich Streets?</p> <p>Construction projects have a cumulative negative effect on the quality of life of nearby residents and businesses. Demolition should be kept to a minimum. Refurbishment is sufficient. The additional storeys and roof extensions to 105 Judd Street are simply not necessary and the application should be refused.</p>

<b>Application No:</b>	<b>Consultees Name:</b>	<b>Received:</b>	<b>Comment:</b>	<b>Response:</b>
2022/1817/P	Enrique Ferreiro Miguez	30/05/2022 10:08:19	OBJ	<p>Dear Sirs, I would like to object to the proposed development on behalf of my household. As pensioners living in close proximity, directly opposite, on the 2nd floor of Sinclair House on Thanet Street, direct loss of daylight would be significant and have a detrimental impact on our wellbeing. Our living room and the bedroom face directly the proposed development for which daylight would be materially compromised</p> <p>The Daylight and Sunlight Assessment submitted does not seem to give appropriate assessments of impacts to specific Thanet/Sinclair flats and has made arbitrary assumptions about the use of rooms across our building.</p> <p>Part 2 of the report also shows concerning loss of light percentages in staircases 'G' and 'H' of our block, with a few cases, 50+%.</p> <p>Being pensioners and in the flat during the day, we would be affected not only by the considerable daylight loss but also by the potential for noise if the development proposals for roof terraces to be used 8 am - 8 pm weekdays goes ahead and the significant disruption during the period of development</p> <p>Therefore we strongly object and petition for the proposal to to be rejected</p>

---