

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2024/0993/P	D Tickell	21/04/2024 15:21:09	OBJ	<p>I submit representation against on the following grounds:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The new height has: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a) No compatibility with the proportions of the listed building below and is too high. The proposed brick work and windows are also not aesthetically complimentary or enhancing to the design of the listed part of the building exterior to the point they cause detriment. b.) Adverse impact on the rear garden, playground and church yard which can be considered as serving with a joined up and inter-linked amenity where impact details are not presented with the required clarity in terms of reduction of sunlight lost from the south-east location of the proposal site. This is a position from which the main part of sunlight casts over the interlinked communal green spaces this neighbourhood primarily consists of, so absolute clarity about impact is required but absent. 2. Any outdoor upper terrace space or access will increase noise disturbance, including windows which can open. Building user noise emanating from upper levels has ability to completely transform the character and amenity of the area from its current peaceful quality during both the day and night. For example, the external bridging floor between the bottom and top half of the building design is unworkable in its current design because of the external terrace access and the impact this imposes on the rear local amenity. It also creates unnecessary height, with little or adverse provision, primarily serving as a 'design break' between old and new proposal parts. This is contrary to the pressure to lower the height / number of floors suitable for the site which is the greater priority. 3. The entire outdoor area to the rear is primarily residential with notable quiet character, focused on outdoor local family and family worker amenity and child care provision. Housing also includes several social housing blocks including retirement units for the elderly and housing for the vulnerable. Within the West-End this outside area is the only quiet child friendly space which exists to serve local residents between Lincoln's Inn Fields much further to the east and Mount Street Gardens much further to the west and is unique in this respect. The development entirely ignores the integrative design opportunities which it could bring to preserve, increase and enhance further the unique dominant character of quiet, peaceful sanctity which defines the rear area not only local residents enjoy, but also residents from adjacent Soho, China Town, Covent Garden and St Martins in the Fields as well as visitors to the West End and so its vital role requires greater consideration in any design proposal. To this extent I do not agree this building has particularly engaged with the locale in its design process nor does it deserve the green credentials it attributes to itself. I would like to see conditions of further enhancement of the outdoor rear area mandatory to the council's submission conditions, alongside the creation of a civic space within the building because both are equally important to the future development of the site. 5. There is concern about the significant depth the lower levels intend to reach and the feasibility of this needs to be properly understood by planning process in terms of risk and suitability and this has not been presented, though the size of the intended space is impressive but might be more suited to being raised above ground by 1-2 floors. 6. No indication of the heritage which should be preserved or may be lost which exists in the interior is presented. I would have liked this to be fully made clearer at public consultation stage. There are other aspects of the interior of the proposal I would not be against, but given the impact of the points above and the lack of clear information I am unable to agree with this proposal in its current state.

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2024/0993/P	Brian Gil Ciro	20/04/2024 12:51:28	OBJ	<p>Hello,</p> <p>I'd like to express my concern for the new development at the Saville Theatre (current ODEON cinema) at 135 Shaftesbury Avenue.</p> <p>The devastating effects it will have on the local wildlife sanctuary and the community need to be seriously considered for long term community health. Lack of sunlight is essentially death, for local wildlife and mental health. This needs to seriously be challenged and cancelled as central London is already flooded with tall buildings blocking light. We do not need more hotel floors and there's been no consultation or communication and consideration. As a local and volunteer it would be devastating and would take away the last strip of hope of appreciation of life and locals as opposed to corporate profits and death of the last bit of actual local nature.</p>
2024/0993/P	Joan Curtis	20/04/2024 22:19:56	OBJ	<p>The plans would cause serious damage to the character, appearance and proportions of the listed building, due to the mass and height of the proposed roof extension which is essentially a completely new building plonked on top.</p> <p>The plans would adversely affect the Phoenix Community Garden, the only community green space within Covent Garden together with its neighbour St. Giles Churchyard and the playground. The garden already struggles with minimal light and the proposed height of the addition to the cinema would make it dark most of the time so the planting that has been lovingly nurtured by local people would suffer and the garden would cease to be a pleasant place for local residents and workers to sit.</p>
2024/0993/P	Catherine Harrison	21/04/2024 13:32:16	OBJ	<p>As a Londoner and now frequent visitor I get increasingly depressed at how developers are ruining buildings and views and sky space and contributing nothing of visual quality to the landscape. Please stop this indiscriminate ruination of our London landscape</p>
2024/0993/P	Susan Kyd	21/04/2024 13:37:05	OBJ	<p>This horrendous carbuncle would be a scar on the cultural and entertainment part of London. Residents right to light and the health of green spaces nearby would be severely damaged.</p> <p>A fixed circus does not constitute a theatre. It holds up any possibility of a lively repertory of acting or dance performance in an arts scene that is in need of work possibility for creatives.</p> <p>How can you allow another tower to blight our streets and ruin the architectural skyline of London? No money is worth that.</p>
2024/0993/P	Moya Bruce	22/04/2024 07:46:06	OBJ	<p>A beautiful art deco building will be destroyed.</p> <p>The new building will ruin the quality of life for all of us in the area.</p>
2024/0993/P	Finn Brandt	19/04/2024 14:02:46	OBJ	<p>I object to the extension of the building, it will restrict light to St Giles playground and the Phoenix Garden. This recreational space is much needed in the area. Soho Square is used to capacity in the summer and offers none if the tranquility Phoenix Garden does.</p> <p>Restricting the light (more than it already is) will further limit the little sunlight that finds its way between buildings now.</p> <p>I also object because the extension will change the nature of the area and skyline significantly and interfere with the listed status of the building.</p>
2024/0993/P	Isobel Harvey	20/04/2024 22:35:02	OBJ	<p>I strongly object to the proposal as the height will block light from the oasis that is phoenix community garden and will ruin the character of the building and the whole neighbourhood.</p>

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2024/0993/P	Isobel Harvey	20/04/2024 22:35:47	OBJ	I strongly object to the proposal as the height will block light from the oasis that is phoenix community garden and will ruin the character of the building and the whole neighbourhood.
2024/0993/P	J Amsden	21/04/2024 09:54:15	COMMNT	The frieze on the external is magnificent - a work of art! The art deco nature of the internal and external should be enhanced not overshadowed by too many floors plonked on top. Shaftesbury Ave at this point is a busy through road - rebuilding on the scale proposed will cause havoc and also if completed cause traffic problems too. Chiefly there will be the issue of loss of light to the surrounding buildings and phoenix garden. As a local resident I know what loss of light means I cannot enter my kitchen and front room without turning on the electricity to see what I am doing and I would hate for others to be in the same situation.
2024/0993/P	J Amsden	21/04/2024 09:54:15	COMMNT	The frieze on the external is magnificent - a work of art! The art deco nature of the internal and external should be enhanced not overshadowed by too many floors plonked on top. Shaftesbury Ave at this point is a busy through road - rebuilding on the scale proposed will cause havoc and also if completed cause traffic problems too. Chiefly there will be the issue of loss of light to the surrounding buildings and phoenix garden. As a local resident I know what loss of light means I cannot enter my kitchen and front room without turning on the electricity to see what I am doing and I would hate for others to be in the same situation.
2024/0993/P	Simon Grigg	21/04/2024 10:10:57	COMMNT	I object to this proposal. The roof extension is far too intrusive and gives the impression of 'squashing' the remainder of the Saville Theatre (lately Odeon cinema) below. It will also deprive local residents of a great deal of natural light. The Saville Theatre has a great place in London's theatre history. Recent research has shown that more of the original survived the conversion to cinema than was previously thought. As Rector of the Actors' Church, I consider that it would be tragic if these substantial parts of its theatrical past were to be destroyed. London, as one of the two most important theatre cities in the world, could definitely use another lyric theatre, and it might be possible (either now or in the future) to restore the Saville to full working operation as a theatre. If this proposal were to be allowed, that prospect would be lost forever. After the catastrophe of losing so many theatres post-WW2, governments and councils rightly decided to protect the theatres that were left. The Saville theatre is eminently saveable, and should be saved.
2024/0993/P	Penelope Ebrahim-Riley	21/04/2024 15:34:33	COMMNT	I live close to this building. We do not need another hotel or any height extension to buildings. Please think about people who live in this area.
2024/0993/P	Tracy smith	21/04/2024 20:16:54	COMMNT	I am particularly concern that the part demolition will cause serious damage to the appearance and proportions of the listed building, due to the mass and height of the proposed roof extension which is essentially a completely new building plonked on top.

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2024/0993/P	Kate Rich	21/04/2024 16:18:06	APP	<p>When will property developers finally make enough money for themselves. Not anytime soon it seems... As yet another monstrous building is being planned.. Do we really need another hotel or a even a cabaret theatre in Covent Garden... when there are two already 5 minutes away in Soho... Developers have nobodies interest at heart in anyone but their own bank accounts, they have no interest on how it will affect the local community, they have no interest in whether we actually need another hotel.. Just see how communities around the world are fighting against the onslaught of tourism on their lives - planning officers need to take time, to walk around Soho and Covent Garden now, it is absolutely rammed, chock a block, with tourists, and these are not tourists with shopping bags - oh dear me no.. Our new brand of tourists now have iPhones and are either taking selfies of cakes through shop windows or just themselves, and their friends.. blocking the pavements, and as residents we have to struggle to get through them with our dogs or bags of shopping from Tesco's.. we've recently lost most of our residence parking spaces to local coffee houses need for outside tables and chairs... residents had no say in that decision.. You can drive around most days/nights for half an hour looking for a free res park... And now you want us to roll over and clap excitedly because yet another developer has a "brilliant idea to make themselves even more money by turning a perfectly good and regularly used cinema into yet another "development" which is no good to man nor beast in Covent Garden or St Giles to fight for sky space against Enzo Piano's ridiculous Lego building opposite St Giles Church.. Great job you did there Camden.. And if you're wondering why I still live here well, my family go back over 150 years of living here as do my relatives and some school friends who I grew up with locally... My dad went to Macklin St school as did my siblings, and my daughter, and her three sons... So we feel slightly somewhat invested in CG and its environs now..</p> <p>So Camden just do the right thing and turn this proposal down and do something for this community for once.. and leave a perfectly nice art deco cinema alone... And point them in the direction of Canary Wharf or the City, they'll be happy to have another hotel and cabaret theatre dumped on them..</p>

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2024/0993/P	Margaret Crowe	21/04/2024 16:00:09	OBJ	<p>Part demolition, restoration and refurbishment of the existing Grade II listed building, roof extension, and excavation of basement space, to provide a theatre at lower levels, with ancillary restaurant / bar space (Sui Generis) at ground floor level; and hotel (Class C1) at upper levels; provision of ancillary cycle parking, servicing and rooftop plant, and other associated works.</p> <p>I am writing to express my and the residents of Odhams Walk Resident Management Ltd strong objections to the proposed high-rise development in Covent Garden. As residents of this historic and culturally significant neighborhood, I am deeply concerned about the negative impact such a development would have on the character, heritage, and livability of the area.</p> <p>First and foremost, Covent Garden is renowned for its unique charm and architectural beauty, characterized by its low-rise, historic buildings and bustling streets. Introducing a high-rise development would disrupt this harmonious aesthetic, detracting from the area's distinct identity and sense of place. The towering presence of a high-rise structure would overshadow neighboring buildings, Phoenix Gardens whilst casting long shadows and diminishing natural light, thereby altering the ambiance and atmosphere of Covent Garden this area. Furthermore, the proposed development poses significant challenges in terms of infrastructure and amenities. Covent Garden is already a densely populated area with limited space for additional amenities such as parks, green spaces, and recreational facilities. Introducing a high-rise development would exacerbate issues related to overcrowding, traffic congestion, and strain on local services such as schools, healthcare facilities, and public transportation.</p> <p>Additionally, there are concerns about the potential impact on the local economy and small businesses. Covent Garden thrives on its vibrant street life, diverse retail shops, and artisanal markets, which contribute to its appeal as a destination for both residents and tourists alike. The construction and operation of a high-rise development could disrupt the livelihoods of local businesses, leading to increased rents, displacement of independent retailers, and a loss of community cohesion.</p> <p>Moreover, there are important heritage considerations that must be taken into account. Covent Garden boasts a rich history dating back centuries, with many buildings of architectural and historical significance. Any development in the area must be sensitive to this heritage, preserving the unique character and heritage assets that make Covent Garden a cherished part of London's cultural landscape.</p> <p>In conclusion, I urge the relevant authorities to reconsider the proposed high-rise development in Covent Garden and instead focus on preserving and enhancing the area's historic character, cultural vibrancy, and quality of life for current and future generations.</p>
2024/0993/P	Tracy smith	21/04/2024 20:18:17	COMMT	<p>I am particularly concern that the part demolition will cause serious damage to the appearance and proportions of the listed building, due to the mass and height of the proposed roof extension which is essentially a completely new building plonked on top.</p> <p>We should preserving listed buildings not destroying them.</p>
2024/0993/P	J T McWilliams	21/04/2024 09:38:48	COMMT	<p>This proposal, if allowed to go ahead, will destroy an architectural gem. It should be refused.</p>

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2024/0993/P	Jemima Hoadley	21/04/2024 11:34:51	OBJ	As a very local resident of the Seven Dials area I absolutely oppose this planning application on the basis that it would cause huge distribution and disturbance to local residents, would be a grossly disproportionate development on top of what is a beautiful local landmark and public service. Myself and my family use the Odeon cinema regularly. The proposed development would block light, site of the sky, overlook existing residential and business properties and would increase footfall and pedestrian traffic in an area with inadequate footpaths to accommodate this.
2024/0993/P	Beverley	21/04/2024 11:53:53	OBJNOT	Strongly object to proposed development. Will damage leafy through-fare. Cause much disturbance to residents and users of this area during building schedule. Will reduce light to precious gardens and homes. No need for another low rent hotel that contribute nothing to the community.
2024/0993/P	Hilary King	21/04/2024 11:54:08	APP	As a long time Covent Garden resident I strongly oppose this development. The construction alone will be an environmental disaster and the end result will rob the beloved Phoenix Garden of the light necessary to sustain the paradise that is both unique and much valued by residents and tourists alike. We plead that that application is denied - do not need another hotel in Covent Garden!
2024/0993/P	Mally Scrutton	21/04/2024 12:02:26	OBJ	I am strongly objecting to this massive extension and change of use of a characterful art deco cinema. This potential development is completely out of scale with the surroundings, will block light from a park and play area and be visible from the conservation area. The proposed basement could cause subsidence to neighbouring buildings and the services required for a hotel of this size will have a detrimental impact on traffic flow and neighbouring residents. Planning applications in this area do not take account of the many residents whose enjoyment of their properties is diminished by these out of scale developments.'
2024/0993/P	Susi Gorbey	21/04/2024 16:59:45	OBJ	I must object to this oversized development. There is a long list of serious problems with this development. The key ones for me are: - Harm to Phoenix Garden. It is an incredibly valuable space. You must protect green space, both for wellbeing reasons but also to help cool the environment (being in an urban heat island) and absorb rain water. This is your job. The garden already struggles with having enough light and the development would compromise it further. It is an oasis of green in an intense urban setting. It must be protected. - The development is just too big. It will have detrimental impact on the street scape and the adjoining conservation area. It will take too much valuable light from local properties and the street level. - And the design is a shocker. This is a listed building - please protect it. - And why a hotel when the city needs housing!! The owner has likely paid too much for this property with the prospect of a huge development. Please don't pander to this and do the right thing. I ask you to deny this application.

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2024/0993/P	Dr. Jo McKay	21/04/2024 18:43:32	OBJ	<p>This building survived the Blitz. Please DO NOT give planning permission for this iconic 1931 (former Saville Theatre) building to be altered in any way, for an act of commercial vandalism! I beg you to completely reject Application 2024/0993/P Your's in disbelief that it would be given consideration. Thank you. Jo McKay</p>
2024/0993/P	Tracy smith	21/04/2024 20:02:40	COMMNT	I am totally against destroying part demolition Of this grade II listed building and natural landscape.
2024/0993/P	John Moulton	21/04/2024 15:30:41	OBJ	I object to this proposal. The very significant vertical over-development being proposed would ravage views, much enjoyed by West End visitors, along both the front and the side of the site. This significant building deserves much more sympathetic treatment.
2024/0993/P	Penny deans	21/04/2024 11:01:53	OBJ	<p>This proposal raises many key issues:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Serious damage to the appearance and proportions of the listed building, due to the mass and height of the proposed roof extension which is essentially a completely new building plonked on top. - Damage to the context of the building, being the Seven Dials and Denmark Street conservation areas, between which it sits and from which the extension would be visible. - Serious damage to the character of the listed building

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2024/0993/P	D Tickell	21/04/2024 15:20:49	OBJ	<p>I submit representation against on the following grounds:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The new height has: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a) No compatibility with the proportions of the listed building below and is too high. The proposed brick work and windows are also not aesthetically complimentary or enhancing to the design of the listed part of the building exterior to the point they cause detriment. b.) Adverse impact on the rear garden, playground and church yard which can be considered as serving with a joined up and inter-linked amenity where impact details are not presented with the required clarity in terms of reduction of sunlight lost from the south-east location of the proposal site. This is a position from which the main part of sunlight casts over the interlinked communal green spaces this neighbourhood primarily consists of, so absolute clarity about impact is required but absent. 2. Any outdoor upper terrace space or access will increase noise disturbance, including windows which can open. Building user noise emanating from upper levels has ability to completely transform the character and amenity of the area from its current peaceful quality during both the day and night. For example, the external bridging floor between the bottom and top half of the building design is unworkable in its current design because of the external terrace access and the impact this imposes on the rear local amenity. It also creates unnecessary height, with little or adverse provision, primarily serving as a 'design break' between old and new proposal parts. This is contrary to the pressure to lower the height / number of floors suitable for the site which is the greater priority. 3. The entire outdoor area to the rear is primarily residential with notable quiet character, focused on outdoor local family and family worker amenity and child care provision. Housing also includes several social housing blocks including retirement units for the elderly and housing for the vulnerable. Within the West-End this outside area is the only quiet child friendly space which exists to serve local residents between Lincoln's Inn Fields much further to the east and Mount Street Gardens much further to the west and is unique in this respect. The development entirely ignores the integrative design opportunities which it could bring to preserve, increase and enhance further the unique dominant character of quiet, peaceful sanctity which defines the rear area not only local residents enjoy, but also residents from adjacent Soho, China Town, Covent Garden and St Martins in the Fields as well as visitors to the West End and so its vital role requires greater consideration in any design proposal. To this extent I do not agree this building has particularly engaged with the locale in its design process nor does it deserve the green credentials it attributes to itself. I would like to see conditions of further enhancement of the outdoor rear area mandatory to the council's submission conditions, alongside the creation of a civic space within the building because both are equally important to the future development of the site. 5. There is concern about the significant depth the lower levels intend to reach and the feasibility of this needs to be properly understood by planning process in terms of risk and suitability and this has not been presented, though the size of the intended space is impressive but might be more suited to being raised above ground by 1-2 floors. 6. No indication of the heritage which should be preserved or may be lost which exists in the interior is presented. I would have liked this to be fully made clearer at public consultation stage. There are other aspects of the interior of the proposal in theory I would not be against, but given the impact of the points above and the lack of clear information I am unable to agree with this proposal in its current state.