

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2023/3141/P	Yunus Yucehan	21/10/2023 12:32:41	OBJ	<p>We object to this development as it is currently presented on the following grounds:</p> <p>There is a mapped stream running under or in close proximity to the proposed development. The size and the design of the proposed basement have a high risk of disrupting the stream and could result in flooding of properties lower on Platts Lane, including ours. At present, we don't have any issues with flooding.</p> <p>We would be more supportive of the development, if the developer produced a hydrology report and considered the flood risk in neighbouring properties with a specific plan to address this.</p> <p>We are also concerned with loss of on-street parking slots. The current structure has off-street closed parking area (i.e. the property occupants were not using on-street parking slots). The proposed new structure incorporates few on-street parking slots, resulting in net parking space loss for the neighbouring properties, vast majority of which does not have off-street parking. Could the proposal be revised to maintain the on-street parking slots?</p>

---

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2023/3319/P	Gremio Fernandes	22/10/2023 23:32:30	OBJ	<p>i oppose the proposal on the following grounds</p> <p>Location, which will cause a loss of amenity due to smell and noise:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>-In terms of proximity, the proposed extraction system will be less than: 3m to the terrace for flats 1-3; 7m to a window of flat 1; 7m to the private terrace of flat 1; 10m to the private terraces of flats 2 &amp; 3. These terraces are quiet havens for us to enjoy time outside with our friends and families.</li><li>-The immediate area is a residential and retail area. As such it is not suitable for a restaurant extraction system.</li><li>-The proposed position of the extraction system is away from the applicants own building. This means that the negative impacts of it are unfairly shifted on the neighbouring properties. If the applicant wants this, they should ensure that the extraction system is as far away from other properties as possible i.e. physically against their own building.</li></ul> <p>Design:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>-The proposed extraction system height is lower than nearby residential dwellings (by approximately two floors).</li><li>-This means that there would be an unacceptable impact from smell.</li></ul> <p>Aesthetics and setting: (Please refer to already shared photos of the area)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>-The proposed extraction system will be an eye sore. It is not designed to blend into the other buildings or make it visually acceptable.</li><li>-It stands out as the only visible extractor in a residential and terrace garden area.</li><li>-It sits prominently against the sky line.</li><li>-If it was clad in, for example, bricks it could blend to the area better and offer improved noise reduction.</li><li>-It is not fitting to the Seven Dials Conservation Area.</li></ul> <p>Conditions of Use:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>-Given that the area is a predominately a residential one, there should be strict pre-agreed conditions on use. Including but not limited to: proof of maintenance contracts being in place, annual inspections, agreed noise control, hours of use.</li><li>-The proposal notes hours of operation until 23:00. This is a residential area and the lateness of the operating hours would cause significant loss of amenity.</li></ul> <p>Applicants current planning breaches:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>-To my understanding, the applicant has committed a major breach of planning recently. Please refer to Enforcement Ref. EN23/0658. In short, the applicant has illegally partitioned 76 Neal Street into multiple flats (around ten) that they let out on a short-term basis only (airbnb style). They can accommodate up to 25 people. They do not have permission for either the division of the property into separate dwellings or to let out on a short-term basis. There are fire safety issues that are almost certainly likely to result from this.</li><li>-I raise this point as it helps illustrate the character of the applicant and why neighbors are concerned that this extraction system of theirs will cause a loss of amenity. Also, it helps explain the need for enforceable conditions of use.</li></ul>

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2023/3319/P	Amol Dhote	22/10/2023 23:27:02	OBJ	<p>I think the proposal should be rejected on the following grounds</p> <p>Location, which will cause a loss of amenity due to smell and noise:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>-In terms of proximity, the proposed extraction system will be less than: 3m to the terrace for flats 1-3; 7m to a window of flat 1; 7m to the private terrace of flat 1; 10m to the private terraces of flats 2 &amp; 3. These terraces are quiet havens for us to enjoy time outside with our friends and families.</li><li>-The immediate area is a residential and retail area. As such it is not suitable for a restaurant extraction system.</li><li>-The proposed position of the extraction system is away from the applicants own building. This means that the negative impacts of it are unfairly shifted on the neighbouring properties. If the applicant wants this, they should ensure that the extraction system is as far away from other properties as possible i.e. physically against their own building.</li></ul> <p>Design:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>-The proposed extraction system height is lower than nearby residential dwellings (by approximately two floors).</li><li>-This means that there would be an unacceptable impact from smell.</li></ul> <p>Aesthetics and setting: (Please refer to already shared photos of the area)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>-The proposed extraction system will be an eye sore. It is not designed to blend into the other buildings or make it visually acceptable.</li><li>-It stands out as the only visible extractor in a residential and terrace garden area.</li><li>-It sits prominently against the sky line.</li><li>-If it was clad in, for example, bricks it could blend to the area better and offer improved noise reduction.</li><li>-It is not fitting to the Seven Dials Conservation Area.</li></ul> <p>Conditions of Use:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>-Given that the area is a predominately a residential one, there should be strict pre-agreed conditions on use. Including but not limited to: proof of maintenance contracts being in place, annual inspections, agreed noise control, hours of use.</li><li>-The proposal notes hours of operation until 23:00. This is a residential area and the lateness of the operating hours would cause significant loss of amenity.</li></ul> <p>Applicants current planning breaches:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>-To my understanding, the applicant has committed a major breach of planning recently. Please refer to Enforcement Ref. EN23/0658. In short, the applicant has illegally partitioned 76 Neal Street into multiple flats (around ten) that they let out on a short-term basis only (Airbnb style). They can accommodate up to 25 people. They do not have permission for either the division of the property into separate dwellings or to let out on a short-term basis. There are fire safety issues that are almost certainly likely to result from this.</li><li>-I raise this point as it helps illustrate the character of the applicant and why neighbors are concerned that this extraction system of theirs will cause a loss of amenity. Also, it helps explain the need for enforceable conditions of use.</li></ul>

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2023/3319P	Amrit Maan	22/10/2023 23:41:14	OBJ	<p>wish to object to the proposals for the following reasons</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"><li>1. insufficient details, the drawings submitted are far from clear, and also confusing as they have the same drawing number so it is not possible to distinguish which works refer to which drawing for example the existing plans (basement and ground) is given on drawing number P100 rev D whereas the existing elevations rear and back are also given the same drawing number p100 but with revision o2.</li><li>2. the proposed exhaust duct is shown through the part wall between 76 Neal street and 74 Neal street, see plan P205 rev O. Clearly this is not possible as the applicant does now own 74 Neal street and the flu will be trespassing on this property. in addition the proposed duct exhaust shown to the rear elevation drawing shows the flu projecting into the rear of 72/74 rear yard, the applicant does not own 72/74 Neal street, this is not possible.</li><li>3. the statutory drawing P250 Rev shows a metal spiral staircase that links to the basement to the ground floor and a means for escape route.it is not clear at ground level how patrons using the spiral stairwell will gain access to the street level as it is entirely enclosed by neighboring properties , there is no apparent dedicated dedicated fire route to the street.  in additional the spiral staircase clearly does not comply with building regulations with regards to its width step dimensions, so currently the fire evacuation proposals are seriously defective</li><li>4. the suggestion in the design of access statement that patrons will have cycle storage facilities in the basement is clearly fanciful, as it will not be possible to bring cycles up and down a staircase patrons are using to gain access to the sitting and bakery area. Similarly, the suggestion that employees will have provision of three cycle places in the ground floor is not shown the submitted plans and again not practical.</li><li>5. the suggestion in the design and access statement that the rear extract fan will somehow reduce noise and pollution is clearly not possible. the exhaust will clause additional noise. and the extract fumes despite the filters being installed will increase air pollution</li><li>6. the most serious objection to the proposals that the exhaust flue is only 3/4 metres from the rear windows of the residential accommodation next to the proposed bakery/kitchen as is the location of the flue and the noise will inevitably worsen the quality of life of the established residential flats at 74 Neal and residential flats at 78 Neal Street which include families and young children.  In addition both 72 and 74 Neal street has residential accommodation over 4 floor levels and the proposed site of the flue will visually and environmentally adversely affect the amenity of the flats in question.</li><li>7. The design of the flue and is setting in the seven dials conversation area will cause harm to the quality of the conservation area. although not visible to the public, it will be very unlikely for the remainder of 72/74 Neal street</li><li>8. Finally being in the conservation area the addition of another restaurant/cafe will do harm to the street, as</li></ol>

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
				there should be a balance of retail users to restaurants . the proliferation of restaurants/cafes within the street is harmful both visually and damaging to the special retail quality of Neal Street. 9. individual rooms above 76 Neal Street are being illegally let on on booking.com and airbnb

---

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2023/3319/P	Vincent Kirehner	20/10/2023 20:42:34	OBJ	<p>I am a resident of 74 Neal Street, which is the neighbouring block of x6 flats, that will be negatively impacted by this proposal.</p> <p>To note the core reasons why I think the proposal should be rejected:</p> <p>Location, which will cause a loss of amenity due to smell and noise:                      -In terms of proximity, the proposed extraction system will be less than: 3m to the terrace for flats 1-3; 7m to a window of flat 1; 7m to the private terrace of flat 1; 10m to the private terraces of flats 2 &amp; 3. These terraces are quiet havens for us to enjoy time outside with our friends and families.                      -The immediate area is a residential and retail area. As such it is not suitable for a restaurant extraction system.                      -The proposed position of the extraction system is away from the applicants own building. This means that the negative impacts of it are unfairly shifted on the neighbouring properties. If the applicant wants this, they should ensure that the extraction system is as far away from other properties as possible i.e. physically against their own building.</p> <p>Design:                      -The proposed extraction system height is lower than nearby residential dwellings (by approximately two floors).                      -This means that there would be an unacceptable impact from smell.</p> <p>Aesthetics and setting: (Please refer to already shared photos of the area)                      -The proposed extraction system will be an eye sore. It is not designed to blend into the other buildings or make it visually acceptable.                      -It stands out as the only visible extractor in a residential and terrace garden area.                      -It sits prominently against the sky line.                      -If it was clad in, for example, bricks it could blend to the area better and offer improved noise reduction.                      -It is not fitting to the Seven Dials Conservation Area.</p> <p>Conditions of Use:                      -Given that the area is a predominately a residential one, there should be strict pre-agreed conditions on use. Including but not limited to: proof of maintenance contracts being in place, annual inspections, agreed noise control, hours of use.                      -The proposal notes hours of operation until 23:00. This is a residential area and the lateness of the operating hours would cause significant loss of amenity.</p> <p>Applicants current planning breaches:                      -To my understanding, the applicant has committed a major breach of planning recently. Please refer to Enforcement Ref. EN23/0658. In short, the applicant has illegally partitioned 76 Neal Street into multiple flats (around ten) that they let out on a short-term basis only (airbnb style). They can accommodate up to 25 people. They do not have permission for either the division of the property into separate dwellings or to let out on a short-term basis. There are fire safety issues that are almost certainly likely to result from this.                      -I raise this point as it helps illustrate the character of the applicant and why neighbours are concerned that this extraction system of theirs will cause a loss of amenity. Also, it helps explain the need for enforceable conditions of use.</p>

Application No:    Consultees Name:    Received:    Comment:    Response:

---

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2023/3319/P	Henry Hogarth	20/10/2023 15:47:28	OBJ	<p>I am a resident of 74 Neal Street, which is the neighbouring block of x6 flats, that will be negatively impacted by this proposal.</p> <p>To note the core reasons why I think the proposal should be rejected:</p> <p>Location, which will cause a loss of amenity due to smell and noise: -In terms of proximity, the proposed extraction system will be less than: 3m to the terrace for flats 1-3; 7m to a window of flat 1; 7m to the private terrace of flat 1; 10m to the private terraces of flats 2 &amp; 3. These terraces are quiet havens for us to enjoy time outside with our friends and families. -The immediate area is a residential and retail area. As such it is not suitable for a restaurant extraction system. -The proposed position of the extraction system is away from the applicants own building. This means that the negative impacts of it are unfairly shifted on the neighbouring properties. If the applicant wants this, they should ensure that the extraction system is as far away from other properties as possible i.e. physically against their own building.</p> <p>Design: -The proposed extraction system height is lower than nearby residential dwellings (by approximately two floors). -This means that there would be an unacceptable impact from smell.</p> <p>Aesthetics and setting: (Please refer to already shared photos of the area) -The proposed extraction system will be an eye sore. It is not designed to blend into the other buildings or make it visually acceptable. -It stands out as the only visible extractor in a residential and terrace garden area. -It sits prominently against the sky line. -If it was clad in, for example, bricks it could blend to the area better and offer improved noise reduction. -It is not fitting to the Seven Dials Conservation Area.</p> <p>Conditions of Use: -Given that the area is a predominately a residential one, there should be strict pre-agreed conditions on use. Including but not limited to: proof of maintenance contracts being in place, annual inspections, agreed noise control, hours of use. -The proposal notes hours of operation until 23:00. This is a residential area and the lateness of the operating hours would cause significant loss of amenity.</p> <p>Applicants current planning breaches: -To my understanding, the applicant has committed a major breach of planning recently. Please refer to Enforcement Ref. EN23/0658. In short, the applicant has illegally partitioned 76 Neal Street into multiple flats (around ten) that they let out on a short-term basis only (airbnb style). They can accommodate up to 25 people. They do not have permission for either the division of the property into separate dwellings or to let out on a short-term basis. There are fire safety issues that are almost certainly likely to result from this. -I raise this point as it helps illustrate the character of the applicant and why neighbours are concerned that this extraction system of theirs will cause a loss of amenity. Also, it helps explain the need for enforceable conditions of use.</p>



Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2023/3319/P	janey mykura	20/10/2023 17:19:36	OBJ/NOT	<p>I am a resident at 74 Neal Street, in Flat 6. I want to object to this application as it will cause real damage to local residents: it will be noisy, it will smell, it will pollute and have a very negative impact on the area. There are terraces at the back of the 74 Neal Street flats and the proposed extraction system is only a few metres from these quiet family areas. The extraction system is much closer to these flats than the applicant's own building so they are shifting the noise and smell to the neighbouring properties and the families living there. I object to the proposal as it will cause a major loss of amenity and quality of life for these residents. Neal Street is a residential area and the proposal is totally out of keeping with the neighbourhood and will be very detrimental to a large number of families.</p> <p>The proposed structure is an eyesore, totally out of keeping with the residential flats and the Seven Dials conservation area.</p> <p>The hours of use are totally unsuitable for a residential area with families and children. They propose operating hours until 2300 which will be awful for the residents.</p> <p>In addition residents are already experiencing problems with 76 Neal Street having been partitioned into short term flats so the residents would want to ensure there were enforceable conditions of use including hours, fire safety, noise control.</p>

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2023/3319/P	Joir Benedetti	20/10/2023 17:58:17	COMMNT	<p>I am a resident of Flat 5 74 Neal Street, which is the neighbouring block of x6 flats, that will be negatively impacted by this proposal.</p> <p>To note the core reasons why I think the proposal should be rejected:</p> <p>Location, which will cause a loss of amenity due to smell and noise: -In terms of proximity, the proposed extraction system will be less than: 3m to the terrace for flats 1-3; 7m to a window of flat 1; 7m to the private terrace of flat 1; 10m to the private terraces of flats 2 &amp; 3. These terraces are quiet havens for us to enjoy time outside with our friends and families. -The immediate area is a residential and retail area. As such it is not suitable for a restaurant extraction system. -The proposed position of the extraction system is away from the applicants own building. This means that the negative impacts of it are unfairly shifted on the neighbouring properties. If the applicant wants this, they should ensure that the extraction system is as far away from other properties as possible i.e. physically against their own building.</p> <p>Design: -The proposed extraction system height is lower than nearby residential dwellings (by approximately two floors). -This means that there would be an unacceptable impact from smell.</p> <p>Aesthetics and setting: (Please refer to already shared photos of the area) -The proposed extraction system will be an eye sore. It is not designed to blend into the other buildings or make it visually acceptable. -It stands out as the only visible extractor in a residential and terrace garden area. -It sits prominently against the sky line. -If it was clad in, for example, bricks it could blend to the area better and offer improved noise reduction. -It is not fitting to the Seven Dials Conservation Area.</p> <p>Conditions of Use: -Given that the area is a predominately a residential one, there should be strict pre-agreed conditions on use. Including but not limited to: proof of maintenance contracts being in place, annual inspections, agreed noise control, hours of use. -The proposal notes hours of operation until 23:00. This is a residential area and the lateness of the operating hours would cause significant loss of amenity.</p> <p>Applicants current planning breaches: -To my understanding, the applicant has committed a major breach of planning recently. Please refer to Enforcement Ref. EN23/0658. In short, the applicant has illegally partitioned 76 Neal Street into multiple flats (around ten) that they let out on a short-term basis only (airbnb style). They can accommodate up to 25 people. They do not have permission for either the division of the property into separate dwellings or to let out on a short-term basis. There are fire safety issues that are almost certainly likely to result from this.</p>

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2023/3319/P	Joaquim Menino Fernandes	22/10/2023 23:29:35	OBJ	<p>the core reasons why I think the proposal should be rejected:</p> <p>Location, which will cause a loss of amenity due to smell and noise:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>-In terms of proximity, the proposed extraction system will be less than: 3m to the terrace for flats 1-3; 7m to a window of flat 1; 7m to the private terrace of flat 1; 10m to the private terraces of flats 2 &amp; 3. These terraces are quiet havens for us to enjoy time outside with our friends and families.</li><li>-The immediate area is a residential and retail area. As such it is not suitable for a restaurant extraction system.</li><li>-The proposed position of the extraction system is away from the applicants own building. This means that the negative impacts of it are unfairly shifted on the neighbouring properties. If the applicant wants this, they should ensure that the extraction system is as far away from other properties as possible i.e. physically against their own building.</li></ul> <p>Design:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>-The proposed extraction system height is lower than nearby residential dwellings (by approximately two floors).</li><li>-This means that there would be an unacceptable impact from smell.</li></ul> <p>Aesthetics and setting: (Please refer to already shared photos of the area)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>-The proposed extraction system will be an eye sore. It is not designed to blend into the other buildings or make it visually acceptable.</li><li>-It stands out as the only visible extractor in a residential and terrace garden area.</li><li>-It sits prominently against the sky line.</li><li>-If it was clad in, for example, bricks it could blend to the area better and offer improved noise reduction.</li><li>-It is not fitting to the Seven Dials Conservation Area.</li></ul> <p>Conditions of Use:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>-Given that the area is a predominately a residential one, there should be strict pre-agreed conditions on use. Including but not limited to: proof of maintenance contracts being in place, annual inspections, agreed noise control, hours of use.</li><li>-The proposal notes hours of operation until 23:00. This is a residential area and the lateness of the operating hours would cause significant loss of amenity.</li></ul> <p>Applicants current planning breaches:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>-To my understanding, the applicant has committed a major breach of planning recently. Please refer to Enforcement Ref. EN23/0658. In short, the applicant has illegally partitioned 76 Neal Street into multiple flats (around ten) that they let out on a short-term basis only (airbnb style). They can accommodate up to 25 people. They do not have permission for either the division of the property into separate dwellings or to let out on a short-term basis. There are fire safety issues that are almost certainly likely to result from this.</li><li>-I raise this point as it helps illustrate the character of the applicant and why neighbors are concerned that this extraction system of theirs will cause a loss of amenity. Also, it helps explain the need for enforceable conditions of use.</li></ul>

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2023/3319/P	Eric Stuart	22/10/2023 22:02:12	OBJ	<p>I am writing to object to the installation of the ventilation system and flue duct as a local resident of a neighbouring building to the premises. My objections are based on (1) noise, (2) unsightliness and (3) smells and the attendant loss of amenity to nearby residents.</p> <p>The equipment to be installed will result in noise in an area that is valued by residents for its quiet. The rear area between Neal Street, Endell Street, Shaftesbury Avenue and Shorts Garden is completely surrounded by buildings, which very effectively shields the rear area from street noise. For a residential community in the heart of the West End this is critically important. Visitors often note that it is remarkable how quiet the rear of the properties are despite being in the middle of an active and lively area. Many of the surrounding properties have rear gardens as well as bedrooms that face the rear. Disturbing noise from machinery will disrupt the quiet that residents need. The applicant's noise survey does not provide a full picture of the situation at the rear. The lowest recorded noise is given only for two periods: 07.00-23.00 and 23.00-07.00. The latter period is irrelevant if out of the hours of operation of the equipment. The former period is too broad a timeframe - separate measurements should have been given at the least from 19.00-23.00 to distinguish noise levels during the day, which are generally higher, from those at night which are lower and when residents are most likely to be at home. Measurements should have also been taken for more than one 24 hour period which may not be representative, including a weekday and a weekend day.</p> <p>No thought has been given to the design of the flue duct, of shiny metal, which will be the only flue duct visible in an area otherwise characterised by brickwork, roof slates and tiles, and painted iron and steel fixtures. As mentioned previously, this is overlooked by rear windows and gardens and significantly detracts residents' views of the Seven Dials Conservation Area by adding visual clutter in a material that is not harmonious with those of the surrounding buildings.</p> <p>The flats neighbouring the site and their rear gardens are all located above the shops of Neal Street and Endell Street, at first or second floor level. As mentioned earlier, this area is fully enclosed by the surrounding buildings. The proposed flue duct terminates at second floor level - very close to the windows and gardens of the neighbouring flats. It is likely that exhaust smells will flow into those windows and gardens given the enclosed nature of the area.</p> <p>For the reasons above, I ask that the application be denied. If the application were to be approved, I would ask that strict conditions be attached - these should include maximum permitted noise levels, restricted hours of use, and annual inspections and maintenance requirements - although I will explain below why I do not believe that even these will be sufficient. The applicant's noise survey states that certain mitigation measures are needed to achieve the sound level and rating assessment shown in that survey - these are detailed in sections 5.5 and 6.0 and should form part of any required conditions. Given the proximity to residential windows, hours of operation should be limited to 11.00-21.00 only. The flue duct should also be placed within brick cladding to fit in with the surrounding area.</p> <p>I am very concerned that the applicant and its tenant will not comply with any conditions imposed by the Council and may even operate outside of agreed hours. The applicant has a history of non-compliance with planning obligations and requirements. Specifically, 2014/4417/P approved a change of use of 2nd and 3rd floors from office to 2 x 1 bedroom flats and 2015/5354/P approved a change of use from office to 1 x 1 bedroom flat at 1st floor level. These floors now contain about 9 studio flats that are being used for permanent AirBnB-style short term holiday lets in violation of planning consents and permitted use - in addition to the loss</p>

Application No:    Consultees Name:    Received:

Comment:

Response:

of badly needed housing for Camden, the Council may be being deprived of the appropriate Council tax revenue given the current use of the property. 2019/0934/P approved installation of aluminium framed doors and glazing to shopfront but the shopfront installed differed from that on the plans. 2011/0826/P denied the replacement of existing shopfront and installation of new doors at ground floor level of existing commercial retail unit and enforcement action was to be taken in respect of the old shopfront which had been removed and which was noted as a shopfront of merit in the Seven Dials Conservation Area Statement. The enforcement notice was never complied with. In around 2019, metal Critall-style windows at the rear and side elevation of the property were removed and replaced with modern uPVC windows to the detriment of the Seven Dials Conservation Area without obtaining planning permission. Most recently, preparations are currently being made for an fluorescent light internally illuminated fascia sign to the shopfront with no application having been made for the requisite advertising consent. This would be against the principles set out in the Council's Seven Dials Conservation Area Statement as well as in the Seven Dials Study put out by the Seven Dials Trust. All of this demonstrates a disregard by the applicant and its tenant of the Council and its planning requirements, its neighbours and its neighbourhood, and shows that any approval, even with conditions, is subject to high risk of non-compliance.

---

Printed on: 23/10/2023 09:10:48

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2023/3346P	Nobuyuki Takasugi	21/10/2023 10:50:57	OBJ	I don't like building a new roof, because of the following reasons. 1. Our garden may get darker and wetter because of less sunshine. 2. We can enjoy less sky view from our window.

---

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2023/3492/P	Susanne Drayson	22/10/2023 09:37:54	OBJ	<p>The last time one of the owners of the north facing mews houses applied for a planning permission for an extra floor, it was refused on the grounds of conservation restrictions.</p> <p>The only mews house with the same depth and extra floor (No. 9), is located on the opposite side at the end of mews. In the front of No. 9 the street widens to double the size and the house faces the mews houses in Daleham Mews with no windows on the ground floor level or nor any on the first floor facing our Mews.</p> <p>Our house is facing No. 15 and our source of direct sunlight is only provided by the south facing window to the entire ground floor for our living room, kitchen and dining area. The view from the sofa is the sky, the chimneys and the antennas from Baynes Mews, so as the kitchen. By adding another floor we will lose light and direct sunlight. The proposed extension will come to the edge of the mews and will block direct sunlight and light to the entire ground floor, for at least 6 to 7 months of the year.</p> <p>For the last 3 months Camden Council is relaying the cobble stones in our mews which is obviously time consuming and costly. Digging a basement is going to damage the work, block the traffic and be disruptive to the lives of the residents of such a narrow mews (there are 10 houses beyond No. 15).</p>
2023/3492/P	michael collins	20/10/2023 11:59:37	OBJ	<p>I am the freeholder of 1 and 2 Baynes Mews NW35BH. I obtained consent to build into the roof space of the above inter communicating properties which comprise of a double bedroom and bathrooms. Daylight emanating from 2 velux windows to the rear roof will be blocked if the application received consent. It is quite clear from the street plan that the proposed additional storey ( 2nd floor) on the roof of 15 Belsize Park Mews will block 50% of the natural daylight to No 2 Baynes Mews which is totally unacceptable and as a result the residence will be extremely dark and destroy our quality of life. I find therefore that the proposed is totally unacceptable as above in addition that I am 82 years old and my wife will be 79 ( [REDACTED] ) I sincerely hope that this application considering the above is refused. I have sent a further objection to the proposed basement construction on a separate objection. michael collins. [REDACTED]</p>

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2023/3870/P	Margaret Duffy	21/10/2023 13:33:00	OBJ	

Planning Application Reference: 2023/3870/P  
 Address: Basement Car Park, Brunswick Centre, London, WC1N 1AE, 38A Brunswick Centre, London, WC1N 1AE

I object to the subject planning application to build an underground hotel in the basement / car park of The Brunswick (with associated works on the ground/roof) for the following reasons:

✦ Noise

Whilst I accept living in central London comes at a price (at the same time many benefits) we are inundated by 'normal' noise on Marchmont Street. In particular by businesses not respecting the law or lacking consideration of residents, allowing extreme noise nearby or on the pavement into the early hours. Every day, between 5-5.30am a platoon of wheeled suitcases pass by our flats, departing from local hostel/hotels, to Russell Square tube station. There is ongoing noise throughout the day and night from people (conversation and bikes) using the bicycle parks located on the pavement outside our homes. It is part of our everyday life.

...in this context, the potential hotel development will cause much worse noise, due to drilling of the core concrete fabric and heavy vehicles on our street. The work on the roof, given the unresolved reported noise generated by similar infrastructure in the area, raised at the latest consultation meeting, is another concern that was not addressed by the developers. The overall long-term impact of this extreme noise on tenants and other residents nearby will be horrific.

✦ Pollution

I love living where I do. I am a volunteer gardener for the tree-pits on Marchmont Street and a 'Friend of Brunswick Square'. We do our best to protect our environment. There are also many children living and using the area, not least at nearby Coram. The immense dust and additional heavy traffic will impact negatively.

✦ Traffic / pressures on local infrastructure

There is a small, not particularly user-friendly (lifts) tube station. Other than a great bus service that I cannot envisage the hotel customers using, there is not that much of transport flux in such a densely populated area.

✦ Vulnerable tenants

I am a (volunteer) tenant representative of Sheltered Housing tenants in Foundling Court, The Brunswick. You may or may not imagine how difficult it is (for some) SH tenants to be aware of this planning application, let alone have the language / IT skills and equipment to respond. There are also some too afraid to put their heads above the parapet given the influence of the developers on our homes. In this respect it is an unfair process. There would be many more objections otherwise.

✦ Viability of works

I am not an engineer but there is something about this plan to smash an entire lower ground floor down onto the basement floor that fills me with dread. Admittedly I have nothing but a gut feeling it is not going to work. The developers, though, did not demonstrate grasp of detail, e.g. size of the 'slabs' when asked at the last consultation. I envisage they will eventually get their plans amended and as a result save a lot of money to the detriment of the environment (i.e. freedom to transport an extra 600 tonnes of rubble) and our lives.



Application No:    Consultees Name:    Received:

Comment:    Response:

❖ Lack of need or value

My strength is finance and I know from research of this proposal that, given current conditions, there is no 'economic' justification for this type of hotel in the area, considering local occupancy levels and abundance of wide-ranging hotel accommodation. The extra footfall to the centre is simply not worth the cost / negative impact on our lives.

❖ Better / other options

I think the initial suggestion by Camden Council to use the space for storage is more appropriate. For example, how many museums and universities would pay for this close-by space?

Margaret Duffy  
Flat 153 Foundling Court  
The Brunswick  
London WC1N 1AN

---

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2023/4151/T	Jean Pocci	21/10/2023 13:52:08	AMEND	Please amend the height of the trees given in my previous comment. They are 12 metres tall not 25 as stated in my previous comment. I will also email photos of the trees showing them in the treescape of which they form a central part.
2023/4151/T	Lisa Holt	21/10/2023 13:29:57	INT	As the owner of number 7 Ormonde Court NW34UP, I object to these trees being destroyed. The destruction of these trees will ruin the natural habitat of many birds and animals in the vicinity and will spoil the beauty of the gardens at the back of Ormonde Court and other residential buildings. The trees also provide natural screen for the block which acts as a form of security and privacy.
2023/4151/T	George Vergoulas	22/10/2023 15:27:57	OBJ/NOT	I object to the felling of these two trees. This was not in the original planning application (2022/3470/P) which I had accepted on the premise that the other trees that were earmarked for cutting would be replaced. However I never heard anything back from the Council or the developer.  Now I come across this poorly placed noticed on the street. This will change the character of the neighbourhood which is a conservation area, yet in this instance no explanation is given as to this decision. These trees are not close to the proposed building, and provide nature and character to many flats facing over this plot of land. This is predominantly a visual issue. These trees provide natural beauty and visual cover from all the flat across but also light pollution from the proposed home.  I'll also add that in the main planning application (2022/3470/P), the supporting Arboricultural Survey & Impact Assessment report ( <a href="https://camdocs.camden.gov.uk/HPRMWebDrawer/Record/9726520/file/document?inline">https://camdocs.camden.gov.uk/HPRMWebDrawer/Record/9726520/file/document?inline</a> ) these tow trees (referred to as T7 and T8) are highlighted to protection, not felling. If its a question of safety, then these trees can be safely managed and their life extended.

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2023/4151/T	Jean Pececi	20/10/2023 13:29:21	OBJ	<p>I strongly object to the proposed felling of these two mature 25 metre tall cypress trees. The land formed by the rear gardens of the buildings on Primrose Hill Gardens, Belsize Park Gardens, and Belsize Grove forms a green corridor of visually beautiful treescape. Felling these trees will leave a large ugly gap in the centre of the treescape and eliminate the year-round privacy and screening which they afford to the numerous surrounding flats.</p> <p>The trees are also home to numerous birds, and, as evergreens, provide valuable shelter for them in the winter months. The photo included in the tree-felling request is very misleading. It makes the trees look much smaller (they are actually 25 metres high) and does not show them as an integral part of a much larger treescape.</p> <p>When planning permission was requested to construct a 3 bedroom house on this land last year, the accompanying arboricultural survey specifically stated that these trees would be kept, pointed out that they do not interfere or encroach on the planned construction area, and provided shelter to the adjacent Cotton Willow tree. See planning request 2022/3470/P.</p> <p>Now that planning permission has been granted for the house, the owner is requesting to fell these two trees anyway with no justification provided whatsoever.</p> <p>Finally, please note that the "Neighbour Details" provided is grossly inaccurate. It completely omits Ormonde Court (10-14 Belsize Grove). The building's communal gardens directly border the land in question and share a party wall with it. Fourteen of Ormonde Court's flats directly face the treescape in question (Flats 2, 3, 5, 7, 8, 9, 11, 12, 14, 17, 18, 19, 22, 23). It also omits the block of flats at 16 Belsize Grove which also overlooks the treescape.</p>
2023/4151/T	Jean Pececi	21/10/2023 13:52:04	AMEND	<p>Please amend the height of the trees given in my previous comment. They are 12 metres tall not 25 as stated in my previous comment. I will also email photos of the trees showing them in the treescape of which they form a central part.</p>
2023/4151/T	Jean Pececi	21/10/2023 13:52:06	AMEND	<p>Please amend the height of the trees given in my previous comment. They are 12 metres tall not 25 as stated in my previous comment. I will also email photos of the trees showing them in the treescape of which they form a central part.</p>
2023/4151/T	susie oppenheim	21/10/2023 14:01:36	OBJ	<p>We object to the felling of these large mature trees due to the impact on the environment. They are home to large number of birds and wildlife and are large trees over 25 m high. In addition, when initial permission was granted to build a house here it was expressly stated that the trees should not be cut down.</p> <p>These trees form part of a large treescape, which would be significantly damaged by their felling. It will severely affect the view of numerous properties in the surrounding area:</p> <p>Fourteen of Ormonde Court's flats directly face the treescape in question (Flats 2, 3, 5, 7, 8, 9, 11, 12, 14, 17, 18, 19, 22, 23).</p> <p>In an age of global warming, cutting down trees unnecessarily should be avoided at all costs</p>

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2023/4151/T	Sophie Hamilton	22/10/2023 19:24:34	SUPPRT	<p>We write in support of the planning application to fell the Leyland trees at 50 Belsize Park Gardens (BPG). We recently moved into a garden flat on Primrose Gardens which backs onto 50 BPG. The Leyland are damaged and unsafe as large branches have fallen down towards our garden and have also fallen into our neighbouring property, flattening the fence.</p> <p>We hired a tree surgeon to assess these trees and they concluded that they are indeed dangerous and advised us not to stand in the back of our garden until they have been removed due to safety concerns for our family. The photographs of the Leyland trees which we see in the supporting document for this application show trees which are substantially smaller than they are today. This shows that these trees are very fast growing and will need regular crowning going forward which will be expensive and disruptive to those who neighbour this plot. We proudly live in a conservation area and strongly support that our greenspaces and wildlife should be protected and that residential privacy is maintained.</p> <p>We therefore would encourage and support the replacement of different trees in place of the Leyland, supporting the suggested action to fell the trees for safety purposes.</p>

---

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2023/4301/P	Tom James	20/10/2023 12:00:40	OBJ	<p>I'm writing to ask you to reject this application for two reasons.</p> <p>1) This is a beautiful and well designed building. Kilburn High Road is ugly enough - downtrodden, dirty and in a state of disrepair. The new buildings that have been built on it are cheap and ugly. We should be taking care of our architectural heritage, not just demolishing it so that a developer can build poor quality housing and make a profit.</p> <p>2) Please consider the embodied carbon of this building. It seems to be providing a suitable space for a business to run. We should not be knocking down buildings unless they are derelict or beyond repair. The carbon cost of building new is huge.</p>

---

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2023/4355/P	Kathryn Gemmell	21/10/2023 10:04:24	SUPC	<p>We note that this application is for change of use to accommodate the running of an immersive cinema experience. The applicant has not suggested any conditions regarding the hours of operation although they have indicated that they will operate with staff and then the public from 08:00-00:00hrs each day.</p> <p>This premises /venue is a large capacity space (c.2500) within the cumulative impact area. The applicant has not stated a specific capacity.</p> <p>We would like to ask Council to apply conditions that protect the surrounding residential areas from operational issues and the potential future use as a late-night venue via planning conditions.</p> <p>Residents concerns are regarding dispersal of a large number of customers when a ticketed event has taken place &amp; we assume this is how it will operate? We would like to be consulted in detail on this issue.</p> <p>Should this immersive cinema fail as a business we would want to have conditions in place that prevent the use of the premises as a night-club or other late-night music/drink led venue. IE we would like the hours of operation limited to those stated by the applicant (08:00-00:00hrs) by a planning condition. We would also like any future tenants to be required to have their operating plan agreed by the council prior to commencement of commercial activities.</p> <p>We anticipate that the council will be seeking conditions regarding noise break-out and crowd management.</p> <p>Deliveries and bottling out / waste collection should be limited to after 08:00hrs Mon-Sat and after 09:00hrs Sun and before 21:00hrs Mon-Sun.</p> <p>Others may have suggestions to add. We would be grateful to have your thoughts on how we can proceed with the applicant and the council.</p>

---

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2023/4355/P	Kathryn Gemmell	21/10/2023 10:04:06	SUPC	<p>We note that this application is for change of use to accommodate the running of an immersive cinema experience. The applicant has not suggested any conditions regarding the hours of operation although they have indicated that they will operate with staff and then the public from 08:00-00:00hrs each day.</p> <p>This premises /venue is a large capacity space (c.2500) within the cumulative impact area. The applicant has not stated a specific capacity.</p> <p>We would like to ask Council to apply conditions that protect the surrounding residential areas from operational issues and the potential future use as a late-night venue via planning conditions.</p> <p>Residents concerns are regarding dispersal of a large number of customers when a ticketed event has taken place &amp; we assume this is how it will operate? We would like to be consulted in detail on this issue.</p> <p>Should this immersive cinema fail as a business we would want to have conditions in place that prevent the use of the premises as a night-club or other late-night music/drink led venue. IE we would like the hours of operation limited to those stated by the applicant (08:00-00:00hrs) by a planning condition. We would also like any future tenants to be required to have their operating plan agreed by the council prior to commencement of commercial activities.</p> <p>We anticipate that the council will be seeking conditions regarding noise break-out and crowd management.</p> <p>Deliveries and bottling out / waste collection should be limited to after 08:00hrs Mon-Sat and after 09:00hrs Sun and before 21:00hrs Mon-Sun.</p> <p>Others may have suggestions to add. We would be grateful to have your thoughts on how we can proceed with the applicant and the council.</p>

---

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2023/4415/T	CRASH	20/10/2023 11:41:08	OBJ	<p>CRASH would like to object again to the application by Sedgwick on behalf of the neighbouring property 128 Greencroft to fell 2 mature lime trees protected by TPOs at 130 Greencroft. CRASH trusts that Camden will uphold its decision in 2021 when the same application was submitted to refuse permission to fell these two trees. It is noted that nearly all applications to fell trees in the CRASH area are made by Sedgwick with proforma reports. The case is again attempted to establish that the trees are causing damage to the front steps to the neighbouring property but the damage is minimal and CRASH requests that Camden tree officers look very closely at the evidence reports to see whether the trees are a significant factor and whether damage to the stairs is significant or whether this is not surprising given the underlying soil and water conditions in this area and the overall changing weather/climate patterns. CRASH notes that Sedgwick attempt to make a case that the CO2 value of the trees is minimal compared with the CO2 release if underpinning or remedial works are undertaken and that they have planted thousands of trees to offset the felling of trees in residential areas. CRASH notes that none of this offset replanting has taken place in the CRASH area and the biodiversity loss, public realm value and status of the conservation area as being green would not be addressed if the trees are removed. The trees are regularly maintained and form an important part of the streetscape in Greencroft where many front trees have already been removed. CRASH notes that one of the Sedgwick report also suggests all vegetation is removed from the front garden of no. 128 - this underlines an approach which seems to indicate all vegetation is bad because it may cause damage to buildings while not mentioning that changing to hard landscaping which is the usual alternative can cause flooding in an area known for flooding. CRASH objects to the felling of these trees. Planting replacement trees will be insufficient for decades to address the loss of these lime trees which were deemed healthy and of value only two years ago and CRASH is concerned that Camden will be unable to track/enforce any replanting which may be required anyway.</p>

---

Total: 9