

Sarah McKenzie
75 Jessel House
Judd Street
London WC1H 9NU

28/05/2022

RE: Objection to Planning Application Number 2022/1817/P, 105 Judd Street, made to the London Borough of Camden.

I am writing to object to the proposed height extension to 105 Judd Street based on the negative impact it would have on the surrounding conservation area, Jessel House residents, as well as its proposed use for Life Sciences.

The developer's consultations with local residents and businesses have been disingenuous. During the webinar consultation they were unwilling to answer directly what the additional height of the building would be resulting from rebuilding and extending the third floor, adding a fourth and fifth floor. They implied the refurbished building's height would be level with the height of the existing tower. In reality the developers are planning for the upward extension to be at least twice that height, with the building plant facilities above this. Their lack of transparency has undermined the whole consultation process and suggests the results of the various reports submitted as part of the application are unreliable.

I have grouped my objections as follows:

- 1. Impact on local area and streetscape**
- 2. Impact on access to light, the sky and privacy**
- 3. Threat posed to existing commercial entities**
- 4. Overprovision of Life Science office space in the area**
- 5. Life Science facilities should not be located in a dense residential area**
- 6. Developer's justification for oversized upper extension**
- 7. Additional Noise**
- 8. Conclusion**

1. Impact on local area and streetscape

The proposed upper extension is completely out of keeping with the conservation area in which it is located. 105 Judd Street is itself an elegant Edwardian façade, which sits well on Judd Street, complimenting the Edwardian buildings opposite (Jessel House and Queen Alexandra Mansions) and which abutts a row of listed Georgian town houses to the north. The proposed extra floors will add excessive height to the building and will be inappropriate for an area of historic and much lower buildings which run down either side of 105 Judd street. The forbidding, dark grey upward 'Blade Runner' style extension will dominate the currently attractive look of the street and is totally out of character with this section of Judd Street, Thanet Street and Hastings Street.

2. Impact on access to light, the sky and privacy.

All the flats located in Jessel House will have their access to light severely restricted by the disproportionate height extension with the view of the sky entirely cut off for many. The additional floors and window will invade the privacy of the living rooms and bedrooms of flats in the building. Any one of these three issues alone would result in an unacceptable

loss of quality of life and wellbeing for all residents and should result in the planning application being rejected but with the three together it must be rejected.

The theoretical analysis to the impact of light undertaken by the developer to the front of Jessel House is inaccurate and should be ignored by the planning committee

3. Threat posed to existing commercial entities

The developer is proposing to include a café and community space on the ground floor of 105 Judd Street and claim that this is one of the reasons they need such a huge height extension. However the proposed commercial entity will threaten the businesses of the three existing cafés (Nonos, Half Cup and Thenga) and the pub (Skinners Arms) on Judd Street located between Hastings Street and Cromer Street. There are also many cafes and restaurants within easy walking distance – many of which are struggling to survive post the pandemic.

There are also many community spaces within easy walking distance – these include Central YMCA at KX on the corner of Judd Street and Cromer Street as well as The Marchmont Community Centre, The N1C Centre, Five Pancras Square and The Mary Ward Centre.

There is no evidence that these proposed facilities are necessary or desirable on this small stretch of Judd Street.

The developer is once again being disingenuous to propose a need for them when there clearly is not.

4. Overprovision of Life Sciences office space in the area

The local area is well provided with both environmentally friendly and traditional office space – with many new developments still being built. In addition, the British Library, the 10 story office and research building for US pharmaceuticals giant Merck opposite King's Cross station and the works on Grays Inn Road are all providing new office space for the Life Sciences. Clearly there is an over provision of both office space and in particular Life Science office space in the area.

This type of speculative development should not be allowed in an area already over-provided with ecological and traditional office space, especially at a time when fewer people are regularly working in centralised offices.

5. Life Sciences facilities should not be located in a dense residential area

Life sciences comprise the branches of science that involve the scientific study of life – such as microorganisms, plants and animals including human beings. Animals experiments are commonly used for life science research as is generating microorganisms that can be dangerous to the environment, wild life, human beings and domestic animals - should there be an accident.

This development could:

- Encourage the cruel and unacceptable use of animal experimentation in a residential area, and
- Endanger the local environment, local people, wild life and domestic animals

Camden Council should not support a planning application where the location of the facilities could endanger the local community and support unethical practices.

6. Developer's justification for oversized upper extension

The developer has justified the need to greatly extend the height of the property (the third floor, adding fourth and fifth floors and then locating the building plant on top of these additions) as:

- The need to include a café and community space – both of which are clearly not required given the extensive supply of both in the immediate and wider local area (see 3. Above)
- To provide more office space in the area, and in particular for Life Sciences. Again not required in the area given the oversupply of both in the area – and certainly not a reason to destroy the unique ambiance of the conservation area and the quality of life for so many residents. (refer to 4. above)

7. Additional Noise

The developer is intending to heat the hugely extended building by using air heat pumps – the plant for which will be placed on top of the new three floor extension. Air heat pumps have been shown to be a less effective source of heat generation in refurbished buildings and use substantial amounts of electricity to run effectively in these environments.

Research has also proven that air heat pumps for this scale of building are extremally noisy - much noisier than traditional heating alternatives. This will further destroy the well being and quality of life for residents on the four sides of 105 Judd Street.

8. Conclusion

It seems clear that this planning application must be rejected by Camden Council. To recap:

- The proposed development will have a massively negative impact on the local area and to the immediate residents on the four sides of 105 Judd Street and those further afield.
- It is not in keeping stylistically with the neighbourhood and the conservation area within which it is located.
- The loss of light, privacy and increased noise will have an irreparable impact on the quality of life and well being of residents in the area. It is imperative the planning application is rejected.
- The area has an over provision of both ecological and traditional office space and for life sciences in particular.
- It provides a commercial threat to some local business and provides no commercial benefit to the local area.
- Locating Life Science facilities in a residential area endangers life and the environment.

The developer's disingenuous approach to the oversized extension to 105 Judd Street undermines the validity of the planning application they have submitted.