Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Printed on: 16/11/2023 09:10:10 Response:
2023/3884/P	David John Price	15/11/2023 09:31:02	OBJ	I am the leaseholder of Apartment 3.12 at Pulse apartments which is one of the apartments immediately above the relevant commercial unit. I object to the proposal for a change of use from retail use (Class E(a) to a place of worship (Class F1) on the basis that noise and disturbance from the proposed development or any future development if the change of use is permitted will be detrimental to the peaceful enjoyment of life in my apartment and other apartments in the residential building above the commercial unit. I have read the report from KP Acoustics Ltd but I am not able to take any comfort from it. The disclaimer means the writer of the report does not take any responsibility to myself or other leaseholders. The report states that "any sound transfer would be considered unlikely to cause noise nuisance to the residential occupiers above". The word "unlikely" does not give assurance and, in any event, I do not understand how speech and music occurring through an amplified system can do anything other than harm the quality of life and health of residents living in apartments directly above through intolerable noise burden. Later the report actually admits that the proposal would result in "very limited break out noise to neighbouring residential occupiers located above the premises" - this is not defined but this actually confirms a worse position for residents than under existing retail use. I am concerned that "very limited" could in practice mean very significant. I am not able to rely upon the report. The proposed hours of opening and therefore potential intolerable noise nuisance are very extensive. I object to this application
2023/3884/P	Chadi Iskandar	15/11/2023 20:12:15	OBJ	As a leaseholder in Pulse Apartments I cannot support this. This intersection is already becoming very congested, with cars and trucks blocking Lymington Road, all parking spaces being used, let alone crime incidents that have also occurred. We're very concerned that this would add even more traffic to the area, which is exactly what happened in the past. We would rather encourage keeping its retail / commercial designation to contribute to further economic opportunities which would be in line with the wider regeneration of the nearby area on Finchley Road.
2023/3884/P	Daniel	15/11/2023 21:45:41	SUPPRT	I am writing in support of this application. I am a resident of Pulse Apartments and am never going to attend the proposed Church. The site is currently vacant. It has been a target for graffiti for well over a year. Many of the objections correctly identify that the church will lead to more visitors to the area, with consequential pressure on local parking and the potential for noise. This will be true wherever the church is located. I would urge the council to consider whether, by denying planning permission on these grounds, it is simply putting a barrier to the community's legitimate right to congregate and pray as they see fit. I cannot see what the public benefit will be in refusing consent to the change of usage license