1. There is only one arcade access route into the Brunswick shopping centre, not two. It is about 30 ft wide [sorry, haven't measured it] and is lined on lined on both side by food shops -- apart from unit 38a/52 itself, which is the centre's only hairdressing salon. Therefore statements such as

"Land Use

7.10. The retail unit to be converted is also located in one of the side passages of the retail arcade,  ..." are simply incorrect.

THERE ARE NO SIDE PASSAGES TO THIS ARCADE

The rest of the sentence descends into gobbledekook

"....which would have a lower footfall and has a lesser contribution as an active frontage compared to the units with shopfronts located on the perimeter of of the Brunswick Centre or fronting onto the courtyard or main passageways in the Brunswick Centre. ... "

Actually this narrow, echoing arcade is very busy as it the main access point for people entering the shopping centre from Marchmont Street, Herbrand Street, etc. Why would removing a hair salon lower the footfall? The hotel, with its proposed 200+ short-stay rooms, some of them double, will increase footfall just inside the arcade, perhaps blocking locals' access to the shopping centre. I happen to know this unit quite well, it is a long narrow single unit, barely wide enough for a few lifts and perhaps a security guard. Admittedly this unit's basement spreads underneath two or three neighbouring units, so there should be no danger of congestion in the basement reception area. Unfortunately one cannot claim that at ground level.

The shops on the perimeter of the building are reached by a path going from the Marchmont Street pavement to the stair and ramp by the Hunter Street zebra crossing and for the life of me I do not understand why these units are up for discussion at all. There is a rear entrance to Waitrose. The development does not go as far as Waitrose ... This is flim flam. Other access points to the Brunswick Centre are open steps and ramps in Bernard Street and by the Renoir. None of these is covered and so far as I can see have little bearing on access to the hub. Whichever way people approach the hub they will have to go down the building's single arcade, which is narrow and has a nasty echo.

And again:

8.21 Shopfront - less than substantial harm

"The hotel’s reception arrangements are proposed to occupy a shop unit in northern pedestrian arcade ..."

THERE IS NO SOUTHERN ARCADE.

"An opening in the ground floor slab would be created to form a double-height space through to the basement, allowing access (via a lift and staircase) and visibility."

Well, yes, an opening in the ground floor slab would be needed to house the lifts and stairs. The double height basement already exists, though it will need to be lowered to match the floor level of the hub.

++++++++++++++++

Then there are conflicting comments about taxis

"Car parking

2.15 Taxi pick-up and drop-off is proposed to be accommodated within the existing taxi rank on Coram Street nearby to the site"

THERE IS NO TAXI RANK IN CORAM STREET. It does look like one, but I can assure you it is not.

"Proposed Hotel Use

7.16. Whilst the site would be easily accessible by public transport, the scheme would not be able to accommodate pickup and set down points for taxis ...."

MAKE UP YOUR MINDS. I take taxis a lot because I cannot walk as far as, say, the Euston Road to catch a bus to UCH or Moorfields, so I can tell you for nothing that it is very easy to get a taxi to drop you off around the Marchmont Street / Coram Street junction. Getting taxis from Marchmont Street or Coram Street is much more difficult thanks to the restrictions imposed on local roads. The hub's guests may well prefer an Uber over a taxi and they will park wherever they can, possibly causing congestion in our narrow streets.

++++++++++++++++++++

Two paragraphs down, there is mention of the food and beverages facility in the hotel, which we have been told is open to the public. Unless this changed,

"7.18: ... the proposed F&B area would not harm the balance and mix of uses within the Brunswick Centre through providing undue competition with the existing established F&B businesses at the centre, and as such the inclusion of the ancillary F&B area is considered acceptable."

Yes we do have a chemists, a GP surgery, Robert Dyas, Superdrug, a card shop, and a games  and slots venue, but other than that we have lots of food shops and eateries of various kinds. So this claim seems bizarre.

++++++++++++++++++++++

Finally, disabled access. I don't think the architects understand this one at all. For the life of me I do not see how anyone is going to be able to store a wheelchair in their hotel room. Nor do I see any plans for disabled access to the loo and shower. Maybe they exist. I hope so.