

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2023/3870/P	Anthony McEnery	19/10/2023 20:25:54	OBJ	<p>I have read with interest the comments made on this proposal by other residents of the Brunswick Centre. They all make points which I agree with about disruption, noise and inconvenience which I endorse wholeheartedly. The point about the abundant provision of hotels in the area, raising questions about the need for yet another hotel, are also well made. While endorsing those views, I would like to add some of my own.</p>

I read, with mounting horror, the casual attitude the proposal took to disabled residents in the Brunswick Centre. It is noted that those people using disabled car parking in the centre currently could find other spaces some distance from the building. This proposal is asking people who can safely store their cars with certainty, and make their way step free to their homes, to trust on their cars being safe on the streets in car parking places which may, or may not, be available when they need them. Statistics of usage are all well and good, but currently residents with parking spaces have a guarantee of a safe, convenient space. The usage statistics cannot make the same promise, they simply suggest that, on average, a space may be available. The spaces concerned will not provide step free access, a factor the report does not consider but which, surely, is of importance when considering disability.

The proposal is also almost entirely silent on what will happen to residents who currently have parking rights, though it goes out of its way to ensure that space will still be available for commercial use. This is ironic as the proposal claims that claims, in 1.1.5 that the proposal is in line with the desire of the council to 'seek to limit car parking for business / retail type uses, particularly in central London and support a movement towards car-free development'. This proposal ensures that this goal is not met by sustaining commercial parking while eliminating residential parking. I also note, in that respect, that the report, in being silent on residential parking, mixes together commercial (NCP) parking and residential parking. It could well be that the residential parking is better used than the commercial parking - as far as I can see, we are simply not told. Overall, a few words that showed that they have considered resident needs on a par with commercial needs would have been very welcome.

I come now to a series of points I made when I went to the information day about the proposal held in the Brunswick Centre. I felt then that I did not get good answers to my questions so I will restate them here:

- 1.) What will happen to the hotel if people chose not to stay in a box underground with no natural light? Will there be covenants in place to ensure that uses as anything other than a commercial hotel would not be allowed without resident approval? (The response at the event, and the example used by the representatives was that they would not convert it into a homeless hostel because they would make a profit as a hotel - they avoided the possibility of commercial failure).
- 2.) What will be the consequences of siting equipment on the roof of the Brunswick Centre? People beneath some of the heavy plant installed (of which I am not one) should really be considered and at the very least on-going monitoring of the impact of introducing a potential source of noise pollution should be arranged.
- 3.) I am aghast that windowless rooms are being provided - I appreciate that this is not the first development of this type, but I think people should be more concerned about it - people in windowless rooms serviced by artificial light have been shown to disrupt circadian rhythms and disturb sleep patterns (Kuller, R., 2002, The Influence of Light on Circadian Rhythms in Humans. Journal of Physiological Anthropology and Applied Human Science, 21, 87-91). Other studies have not found that artificial light boxes change this situation (Onodera, H., Ida, M. and Kawaguchi, M., 2023, Effect of False Windows on Light Exposure and Sleep Quality in Hospitalized Patients. Health, 15, 281-288). I would urge a serious review of the health impacts of this type of development.

**Application No:**    **Consultees Name:**    **Received:**

**Comment:**    **Response:**

4.) When quizzed, no real evidence was provided that other, less intrusive, alternatives to this proposal for the repurposing of some of the car park space had been considered. Many former car parks in the area have found a viable existence by providing storage space. When asked, the people at the event said that this was looked at, but then Covid came along, the idea was set aside and then the hotel idea was pursued. I for one would appreciate a fuller exploration of this option - it would probably enhance life for the residents in the Brunswick Centre, not degrade it as this proposal will.

5.) I puzzle slightly at the argument that more customers for the restaurants in the shopping precinct will be provided when a further subterranean restaurant for the hotel guests is being provided.

6.) Finally, the proposal does not seem to consider what bringing a large number of people to the area will mean for the residents - the area around the Brunswick Centre is already quite crowded and, because of elements of the night time economy, can be noisy into the small hours. I can only imagine that filling over 200 hotel rooms with more people will increase this issue.

---