

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2024/0250/P	Isabel Montes de Orca	28/02/2024 16:44:41	OBJ	<p>Representation on behalf of Spaghetti House, 15-17 Goodge Street, London.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The planning application is misleading as the extension at roof level is not necessary to facilitate conversion of the upper floors to office use. The ground floor, basement and first floor are already actively in use as a very successful restaurant, Spaghetti House, which has been established at the site since 1955. Whilst the proposed conversion to office use does not require planning permission, a condition on any planning permission should restrict the use of the ground floor, basement and first floor to restaurant use Class E (b) to retain an active shopfront and to protect the existing established business from unnecessary closure. The existing restaurant operation employs 20 people. The restaurant cannot operate from a limited operation at ground floor and part basement. The applicant's objectives are stated as optimising employment floorspace potential as a prime commercial building, but the current employment generation use will be lost. Improvements to the quality of floorspace at ground floor, basement and first floor are not necessary for the existing, long established restaurant use to remain viable. The proposed layout excludes any staff and customer toilets for the restaurant operation. The current restaurant provides toilets at ground floor and first floor. The proposed layout excludes an accessible toilet and fails to meet standard DDA requirements, contrary to London Plan Policies D4 and D5 and Policy D1 of the Camden Local Plan. The proposed scheme provides insufficient cycle parking and does not meet the minimum adopted cycle parking standard, thereby conflicting with London Plan Policy T5 and Policy T1 of the Camden Local Plan. The proposed refuse storage appears insufficient for waste material related to restaurant and office uses, contrary to London Plan Policy S17. The proposed unnecessary increase in building height and roof mass are not responses to the site's context. The proposed location of the extraction enclosure is intrusive and raises the height of the building unnecessarily. The proposal includes only two condenser units to serve the whole building. However, this excludes any requisite mechanical ventilation and extraction equipment for the retained/proposed restaurant use. The addition of this essential equipment at roof level will further disrupt the roofscape and increase detrimental visual impact. The proposed roof design is an inappropriate and an unsightly addition, which is not in keeping with the roofscape of adjoining buildings, contrary to London Plan Policy D4 and Policy D1 of the Camden Local Plan. The proposed plant enclosure and lift overrun are unduly intrusive and unnecessarily increase the bulk of the proposed extension. The proposed design of new fenestration is alien and conflicts markedly with the design of retained fenestration. The scale and design of the roof works on this prominent corner building create an overbearing mass in the context of the site. The proposed hanging tiles will introduce an alien design feature to the host building and neighbouring buildings. The existing building contributes positively to the Charlotte Street Conservation Area, but the proposed extension at this prominent corner location will cause harm to the character and appearance of the conservation area. Whilst alterations to an existing building in a conservation area may be considered to be an enhancement, in this case the creation of a more imposing and functional roof extension with alien materials must be deemed harmful by definition, therefore assessment by para 208 of NPPF (2023) is required. The harm

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

Comment:

Response:

caused is less than substantial, therefore the applicant must demonstrate tangible public benefits from the proposed scheme, in accordance with paragraph 208 of NPPF 2023. There have been no public benefits identified and the proposed scheme does not secure the optimum viable use of the building, which includes the current restaurant operation at ground floor, basement and first floor.

- The Planning and Heritage Statements that support the planning application refer to an outdated NPPF and will need to be updated to address this.
- In the light of the above, the proposed development conflicts with the adopted development plan and should be refused planning permission.
