

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	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">-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 & 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>Design:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">-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>Aesthetics and setting: (Please refer to already shared photos of the area)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">-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>Conditions of Use:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">-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>Applicants current planning breaches:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">-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 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.

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 & 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 & 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	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.

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 & 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	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: -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 & 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 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.</p>

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">-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 & 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>Design:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">-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>Aesthetics and setting: (Please refer to already shared photos of the area)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">-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>Conditions of Use:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">-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>Applicants current planning breaches:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">-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 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.

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">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 o2.2. 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.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 defective4. 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.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 pollution6. 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.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 street8. Finally being in the conservation area the addition of another restaurant/cafe will do harm to the street, as

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

Printed on: 24/10/2023 09:11:24

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	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 Beisize 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.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>I have sent a further objection to the proposed basement construction on a separate objection. michael collins.</p> <p>[REDACTED]</p>
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>

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2023/3621/P	Choong Chu	23/10/2023 09:41:11	OBJ	<p>Dear Sir/Madam,</p> <p>As an owner occupier in Downing Court, a fully residential block next door to the aforementioned property, I object to this application, and further, would like to draw your attention to another issue with the aforementioned property.</p> <p>A) The 'enlargement of window to the rear (west) elevation' is a set of full sized clear glass double doors, with a small set of rails on its lower half, that has already been built without planning permission.</p> <p>The applicant has also fail to mention this 'variation' looks over not just our fire exit, but also our garden area. I believe this is a gross infringement of our privacy, and asks that the applicant returns the window to its original size, as approved in previous plans.</p> <p>B) Further, I draw your attention to the 'commercial unit extractor fan and condensers' on the roof. This is, in reality, five extractor fans that has already been installed. It is meant to replace one/two extractor fan(s) previously located at the ground floor rear of the commercial unit. I am concerned that this large increase in extractor units will create unacceptable levels of noise and vibration to our residents when in operation. I ask that the applicant limits the number of extractor fans to two, set away our adjoining wall.</p> <p>Many thanks for your attention and support</p>

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2023/3870/P	Sandra Neary	23/10/2023 12:05:27	OBJ	<p>This is a listed building but all of a sudden you can have a Premier Inn Built but we as residence cannot put a nail in the wall. Also there is concern with mice and rats within the block which are already entering our premises this will disturb them more the place needs fumigating. Concern with the increase of foot traffic with a 207 room hotel as there is already a vast amount of people in the area and we already have a number of hotels in the area.</p> <p>There is also concern with generators etc., going on roof this will cause constant noise that we are expected to live when your work is done. There is also concern of the quality of work as already the small amount of work that has been carried out recently on walkways is a trip hazard as they have not been levelled off. Once again all about money not about residents that have resided here for decades.</p>
2023/3870/P	Julia Loftus	24/10/2023 08:15:45	COMMNT	<p>I have been a resident of Foundling Court since October 1972.</p> <p>I wish to protest in the strongest possible terms against this proposal.</p> <p>It offers nothing but noise, dirt and disruption to us and I would suggest it is highly dangerous in structural terms.</p> <p>Foundling Court has many maintenance needs but definitely does not need this ridiculous project.</p> <p>NO NO NO</p>

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2023/3870/P	Maryrose Storey	23/10/2023 16:18:13	OBJ	<p>I am a resident of The Brunswick. I strongly object to the building of a hotel underneath our flats. The area does not need another hotel. There are already a vast amount of hotels around this location, with a large Holiday Inn directly opposite Founding Court (where Lazan Investments plan their hotel to be) Another hotel would have a negative impact on neighbouring residents and the local environment. A residential block is entirely unsuitable for an underground hotel in the basement. The residents did not choose to live above a hotel.</p> <p>The noise and disturbance that will occur during the estimated 18 months building of a hotel will be unbearable for the residents, who will not be able to go about their normal daily lives, let alone work from home as many people do now. If the hotel is built, there will also be noise and disturbance for the residents from hotel guests arriving and departing at all times of the day and night. This will negatively affect the quality of life of the residents.</p> <p>There are about 120 Sheltered Housing tenants living at The Brunswick. Many of these are very elderly and disabled. These residents are already becoming very anxious and distressed about this building plan. They often have to spend a lot of time in their flats, and will not be able to go out to escape the construction and drilling noise. This will be very detrimental to their health and well-being. In fact, all the residents will suffer from the noise and vibration. This will affect our physical and mental health. Will there be compensation for damage to our health if the building of a hotel goes ahead? Will there be compensation for the lack of earnings due to not being able to work from home?</p> <p>Building a hotel under the flats at The Brunswick will bring no benefit whatsoever to residents or local people. It will only be detrimental.</p> <p>These quotes are from a reputable Scientific Study:</p> <p>Construction noise effects on human health: Evidence from physiological measures:</p> <p>'Construction noise can induce chronic stress, leading to various mental health problems such as anxiety, irritability, and reduced concentration. Continuous exposure to loud noise can heighten stress levels, affecting overall emotional well-being and quality of life.'</p> <p>'Studies have shown a correlation between high levels of environmental noise, including construction noise, and an increased risk of cardiovascular diseases. The constant exposure to loud noise can elevate blood pressure, cause vasoconstriction, and contribute to heart-related problems.'</p>
2023/3870/P	Margaret Duffy	24/10/2023 00:58:50	OBJ	<p>WHERE IS MY OBJECTION TO THIS PLANNING APPLICATION? I DOWNLOADED THE CONFIRMATION FROM YOU TWICE. PLEASE POST MY OBJECTION.</p>

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2023/3870/P	Margaret Duffy	23/10/2023 23:32:27	OBJ	<p>WHERE IS MY PLANNING OBJECTION SUBMITTED 18/10/23? I have a download and printout confirming the submission but the e-mails from you are not in my account any longer. You utterly disgust me.</p> <p>My Objection attached and copied below: Planning Application Reference: 2023/3870/P</p> <p>Address: Basement Car Park, Brunswick Centre, London, WC1N 1AE, 38A Brunswick Centre, London, WC1N 1AE</p> <p>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:</p> <p>† Noise</p> <p>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 wheelie 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.</p> <p>...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.</p> <p>† Pollution</p> <p>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.</p> <p>† Traffic / pressures on local infrastructure</p> <p>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.</p> <p>† Vulnerable tenants</p> <p>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.</p>

Application No: Consultees Name: Received:

Comment: Response:

✦ 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.

✦ 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 Founding Court

The Brunswick

London WC1N 1AN

You WILL register this objection.

Margaret Duffy

Flat 153

Founding Court

The Brunswick

London

WC1N 1AN

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2023/3870P	Mary Sutherland	23/10/2023 19:11:24	OBJ	<p>I wish to object to plans for this hotel for the following reasons:</p> <p>The Application does not fully detail how noise, vibration, etc. will be kept to acceptable levels so as not to interfere with the daily lives of the residential occupiers of the building. There are no proposals for independent noise and vibration monitoring during the construction or any detailed proposals for liaison and communication with the residents.</p> <p>I also think that photovoltaic panels (for the hotel exclusively, I understand) will be ugly and visible on the roofs of both Foundling and O'Donnell.</p> <p>And I understand that the air source heat pumps (for the hotel exclusively, I understand) are large and noisy, and the plantrooms are also to be situated on the roofs.</p> <p>I can't believe that this is permitted with a Listed building.</p> <p>Points such as these were raised at a public meeting on July 2023 and the Applicant reassured residents that they are doing everything they can to ensure that the construction process is transparent, proactive and mitigates any potential impact on neighbours.</p> <p>I cannot agree that this has been done.</p> <p>And no mention has been made of any recompense to residents for literally having to live in a building site for 18 months.</p> <p>Painting the inside to match the outside? Fibre broadband? Extension of the photovoltaic panels to benefit the buildings, not just the hotel? Etc. Etc.</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:
2023/4301/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 & 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 & 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>

Total: 8