

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2024/0993/P	Dickon Robinson	28/04/2024 14:21:59	OBJ	<p>I write as a former local resident with links to Soho and Covent Garden for over 50 years. The Saville Theatre is a grade 2 listed building in a conservation area. These proposals are totally inconsistent with the conservation imperatives of such designation. No listed building in a conservation area will be safe from such gross overdevelopment if this scheme establishes a precedent.</p> <p>The West end of London is the greatest concentration of theatres and cinemas in the world, and this is arguably the most critical feature of London's worldwide appeal to visitors. Large auditoria, such as Savills Theatre, are particularly important and exceptionally difficult to recreate once they are lost. While the proposal contravenes a series of planning policies, for this reason alone this application should be refused.</p>
2024/0993/P	Matthew Bennett	27/04/2024 13:52:56	COMMNT	<p>I support the objections of many local people and the Covent Garden Community Association to this completely inappropriate and ugly scheme. Please refuse this application.</p>
2024/0993/P	Michiko Harris	28/04/2024 15:05:08	COMMNT	<p>I would like to lodge an opposition on the planning of the hotel being built on top of Odeon theatre. I live on New Compton Street and enjoy spending time in Phoenix Garden. I dread the building would literally shed dark shadows on the valuable wild life in the area. The planning would only bring an immense disturbance and not offer any benefit to the local residents. Please stop the hotel being built and the historical building being butchered.</p> <p>Kind regards,</p>
2024/0993/P	Joshua Blandford	28/04/2024 15:26:12	OBJ	<p>I am a resident of Bloomsbury having lived in the local area for several years and I would like to object to this planning application for many reasons.</p> <p>The proposal for the theatre is not sympathetic to the fabric, proportions and details of the existing building. Nor is it sympathetic to the character of the local area, adjacent open spaces and setting. It also proposes a significant amount of demolition of the existing fabric, to the extent that it could be considered a new build with part retention of the external facades. The bulky extension will constitute a more than doubling of height of the existing building which will be detrimental to the setting of the area and the adjacent conservation areas too.</p> <p>As a local resident, I enjoy the Phoenix Garden as it is a unique community garden in the local area where I can go to relax. I am concerned that the additional height and disruption during construction would have an irrevocable damaging effect on the gardens plants and nature, making the park undesirable, dark and dingy. Camden declared a climate and ecological emergency in 2019, and should protect key spaces in the city with this in mind.</p>
2024/0993/P	Odile Dicks-Mireaux	28/04/2024 16:47:32	OBJ	<p>I have lived in this area with my children for over 30 I am horrified at this proposal I agree with the very objection made above We use the Phoenix garden most weeks and more when my children were younger The extension is very ugly and too high We already have the appalling new building on the Foyles site We seem determined to change the precious character of the area for the benefit of money and not for the community Please do not agree to this think again</p>

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2024/0993/P	Nic Shore	26/04/2024 16:16:40	PETITNOBJ E	<p>Good grief, so much cheaper for them to demolish, ignore history and art deco, never mind the damage to the environment, plus so near Phoenix Gardens, an oasis of peace.</p> <p>I understand the need for change, but roof extension and even more excavation...</p> <p>We need to stop London losing its soul, just becoming like many other cities.</p> <p>People visit because of what we have, apart from living here, very lucky, I'm a tour guide, including St Giles, and speak to many.</p> <p>Dig and remove our past? Create more shade with higher buildings?</p> <p>Didn't work with Centrepont- still a virtual ghost tower- building not the charity(cheers Ken Leach)</p> <p>How about more places for the homeless?</p>
2024/0993/P	Tim Lord	26/04/2024 21:00:46	OBJNOT	<p>I regularly use this cinema having lived in the West End for over 30 years. The proposal is not appropriate for the area and would destroy much of the value of this well loved and important building. The application should be refused.</p>
2024/0993/P	Mrs Nicola Savage Hutchens	27/04/2024 16:07:28	OBJ	<p>We strongly object to the development and feel it is not in keeping with the character of the existing listed building or the conservation area the building is in. The existing building is a historical landmark and much loved cinema. The proposed work and 200 room addition will ruin the feel and look of the building and cause overcrowding in an already very busy street. Carrying out the work itself will be detrimental to the area (where we already had constant building work in the St Giles High Street/Shafesbury Avenue area for many, many years) and this large, unsightly proposed extension is unnecessary and the wrong site to be carrying out this work. Also the large extension will completely alter the appearance of the Grade II listed original building and the sky line/view for all local residents and those within the conservation area.</p> <p>We feel the building should remain as it was originally intended - a stunning landmark used for entertainment</p>
2024/0993/P	Sue Wilde	27/04/2024 17:20:35	APP	<p>I am writing in regards to the proposed changes to the Odeon Shafesbury Avenue.</p> <p>I fully support all the concerns and objections members of the CGCA have put forward . Again the local buildings and people are having to challenge another development (which I personally, seeing the mock up looks quite grotesque)</p> <p>We have to constantly have to live in a building site with all the developments in progress and visitors using our residential area as a playground, this proposal will only add to the mayhem we have to contend with Sue Wilde</p>
2024/0993/P	Peter Jones	27/04/2024 19:25:34	OBJ	<p>The proposed redevelopment for the Art Deco cinema is appalling. The architects' drawings show it would be one of the worst eyesores in central London. Not only is it totally unsympathetic to the existing building, as a piece of contemporary architecture it is entirely without merit and would disgrace even a first year student. This proposal is bad on so many grounds it's difficult to know where to begin. Your constituents trust you to cherish and protect the unique architecture, history and culture of the area you are fortunate to represent. Anyone considerate of the views of their electorate would reject this monstrosity forthwith.</p>

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2024/0993/P	Geoffrey Davies	27/04/2024 20:09:48	OBJ	<p>I fully support the CGCA's objections to this proposal.</p> <p>This is an important historic building of considerable Architectual importance. To add the proposed extention on top of the building will seriously damage the integrity of the building.</p> <p>The cinema is an important local amenity which will be lost. It is distinct form the super cinemas in Leicester Sq which tend to show block buster films, and not the more nuanced programme offered at this cinema, which is more local in its appeal.</p> <p>The proposal to include a small theatre is simply a half-hearted attempt to comply with planning rules. A theatre of that size is unlikely to be economic and will surely be transformed into another use very quickly</p>
2024/0993/P	James Tait	27/04/2024 22:15:51	COMMT	<p>I wish to OBJECT to this application, which will cause considerable harm to a listed building, and take light away from an important residential enclave in Covent Garden.</p> <p>The current building follows a clear style and design, which would be overwhelmed and ruined with this proposed massive expansion.</p> <p>I live in the Alcazar, one of a number of residential blocks that occupy the rear of this building. The 2020 Planning Inspectorate Report (re the earlier and smaller scheme) reported that their extension would be particularly bulky and dominant in views from Stacey Street & Phoenix Garden due to the lack of set back. This new scheme would be even more calamitous in this regard and from my window (in flat 7, The Alcazar) a significant proportion of the sky would be blocked out. The scheme would lead to a loss of light for myself and many of my neighbours, and would moreover loom as a darkening presence over the Phoenix Garden itself. The planning committee should protect the residents in this area, defend the amenity of the Phoenix Garden, preserve the historic character of the Saville Theatre and oppose this scheme.</p> <p>James Tait</p>
2024/0993/P	Matthew Paul	28/04/2024 13:37:01	OBJ	<p>Although I now live in Yorkshire, I have frequently visited Phoenix Garden over the years and have always enjoyed its quiet oasis of calm right in the very centre of London. This development would cast a huge shadow, both actual and metaphorical over the garden and ruin its beauty and appeal.</p> <p>I also object in principle to the idea of building - let alone to such an absurd height - on top of a lovely old Odeon cinema building, of which there are so few in such good condition remaining in London and nationally. To provide another unnecessary hotel does not justify the detriment that this proposal would clearly cause.</p> <p>I therefore ask the committee to refuse permission for this proposal.</p>

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2024/0993/P	Kester Robinson	28/04/2024 20:29:24	OBJ	

I write as a local resident who has been enjoying the cinema and the gardens behind it for over 40 years, to formally object to the proposal. It presents significant and irreparable harms to the heritage, character, and wellbeing of the area and of the building itself, contravening a series of Camden's core planning policies, specifically; DP22 Promoting sustainable design and construction, DP24 Securing high quality design, DP25 Conserving Camden's heritage, DP26 Managing the impact of development on occupiers and neighbours, DP27 Basements and lightwells, DP28 Noise and vibration, and DP31 which concerns provision of, and improvements to, public open space.

1. Impact on Conservation Areas and Context

The development would detrimentally affect the Seven Dials and Denmark Street conservation areas, disrupting the historical and architectural context in which the Saville Theatre resides. The proposed extension would be visible from these areas, causing visual intrusion and undermining the cohesive character of the surrounding streetscape.

2. Loss of Cultural Facility and Community Amenity

Converting the theatre into a hotel, devoid of its internal theatre features, represents a significant loss of a valuable local cultural facility. The Odeon is loved, used and profitable. The scheme for a 200 room hotel cynically attempts to address the established requirement for a theatre use by inserting a "dinner theatre" way down in the basement. A basement restaurant with a stage at the edge, no matter the prestige of the international company due to take on the initial contract, is not in the spirit of the requirements placed on the site which envisages a "proper" theatre or cinema as we understood one to be here in the West End.

3. Environmental and Social Impacts

The development poses numerous environmental and social concerns, including damage to the Phoenix Garden and St. Giles playground, loss of daylight for neighboring residents, increased congestion and noise pollution from servicing a 10-floor hotel and restaurant, and potential drainage problems due to added strain on the wastewater system. The destructive work would be drawn out over years causing unacceptable levels of nuisance and disturbance from noise, dust and vehicular movements negatively impacting residential and commercial neighbours alike.

4. Unsustainable Approach Contrary to Planning Policies

The proposal's disregard for preserving the historic fabric of the Saville Theatre contradicts modern planning policies that prioritize the conservation and adaptive reuse of heritage assets. Façade retention schemes such as this represent a wholly unacceptable level of carbon emissions first associated with the embodied carbon within the existing structure and then those expended and embodied undertaking the new.

5. Access – Servicing / Emergency Services

The three streets bounding the back side of the site are extremely narrow making servicing and fire service access in the case of an emergency very difficult.

6. Serious Damage to Historic Landmark and Listed Building

The proposed demolition of the Saville Theatre, a celebrated historic landmark, and the retention of only parts of the facade severely compromises the integrity and significance of this Grade II listed building. The mass and height of the proposed vertical extension are wholly inappropriate and would fundamentally alter the

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
				<p>appearance and proportions of the theatre, detracting from its historical value. While a facade retention scheme paying paltry lip service to the heritage value of a historic building by retaining only the first 12 inches and obliterating all else that remains of value within the building is bad enough, this is worse. The bulk of the extension above, equal or greater in mass to the fine structure on which it squats malevolently, will weigh down upon it in perpetuity in a kind of unending vulgar offence to it, the community and all who pass by.</p> <p>That the scheme contravenes so many planning policies so profoundly means it cannot possibly be permitted for the dangerous precedent it would set.</p> <p>There will be arguments made that the marginal economic benefits that might eventuate in terms of jobs and tourism will outweigh the panoply of harms the scheme represents. Clearly such arguments have no merit, the harms massively outweigh any possible benefit and in light of these concerns, I urge the Planning Committee to reject the planning application and instead encourage alternative proposals that respect and enhance the heritage, character, and amenity of Covent Garden in accordance with Camden's planning policies.</p>
2024/0993/P	Marios Savvides	28/04/2024 22:10:55	OBJ	<p>The proposed scheme will be detrimental to the historical context of the local area. The additional bulk and height on top of the Saville Theatre will also negatively impact the proportions of the existing listed building. I enjoy visiting the community garden nearby and worry the height of the extension would cut out the amount of daylight the garden receives making it a less enjoyable space to visit.</p>
2024/0993/P	Andi	26/04/2024 17:11:04	COMMNT	<p>Please leave the phoenix garden alone!!!</p>
2024/0993/P	Ruth	28/04/2024 21:05:04	OBJ	<p>These plans are not consistent with a grade 2 listed building. I think the plans do not suit the building or the area.</p>

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2024/0993/P	Robert Ayton for SDT	28/04/2024 14:13:24	OBJ	<p>Objection from the Seven Dials Trust</p> <p>1. Proposal 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>2. Summary of Objections This letter is written on behalf of The Seven Dials Trust. The Trust works in partnership with local authorities, landowners, national agencies and local amenity groups to protect the historic fabric of Seven Dials and the surrounding conservation areas, and to promote and bring about exemplary environmental improvements in the area. The Seven Dials Trust objects in the strongest possible terms to the proposals to add seven storeys on the roof of this Grade II listed building. It considers that these proposals will cause:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. substantial harm to the significance of this listed building, and a high level of less than substantial harm to the setting of the Seven Dials Conservation Area. <p>3. The Proposals The proposals involve the addition of six floors of hotel accommodation and a large seventh floor roof top plant enclosure. This would transform the building into an 11 storey hotel (plus roof level plant), with a new theatre in the basement.</p> <p>4. The Significance of the Odeon Cinema The list description states that the Odeon Cinema, the former Saville Theatre, 135 Shaftesbury Avenue, is listed for the following principal reasons: Architectural interest: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • for the quality of the architectural composition, its restrained and carefully proportioned form specifically designed to integrate the purpose-designed sculptural work by Gilbert Bayes. • for the distinction of Bayes' integrated sculptural work, most notably the 'Drama through the Ages' frieze, which is an especially fine example of this leading sculptor's work that serves to clearly proclaim the building's designed purpose. Historic interest: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • as a major theatre built for the impresario A E Fournier during the inter-war West End revival, designed by T P Bennett & Son in collaboration with the veteran theatre architect Bertie Crewe. • for the lively historical pageant of theatrical performance displayed in Bayes' frieze, an important example of integrated public sculpture which is redolent of the period in its stylised composition and depiction of famous actors, celebrated plays and theatregoers of the inter-war era. <p>5. The Impacts of the Current Proposals 5.1 Impact on the Listed Building As the list description states the significance of the listed building lies partly in: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • the quality of the architectural composition, and • its restrained and carefully proportioned form specifically designed to integrate the purpose-designed sculptural work by Gilbert Bayes. The proposed extension is seven storeys high, including the large plant room on the top. The extension is taller than the existing listed building. Setting aside the design of the extension, its height and bulk would</p> </p>

Application No: Consultees Name: Received:

Comment: Response:

dominate and overwhelm the listed building and destroy its original 'restrained and carefully proportioned form'. The original architectural composition would be severely compromised by these proposals. As the list description makes clear the building was designed to integrate the sculptural work. By changing the height, proportions, scale and appearance of the listed building to such a radical degree the setting of the sculpture is fundamentally changed. The sculpture becomes a small part of a building twice the height of the original. Its prominence as part of the overall composition is very seriously diminished. Additional harm would be caused by the removal and loss of surviving original fabric internally, and also the demolition of the existing rear elevation.

5.2 The Level of Harm to the Listed Building

We consider that the level of harm caused to the listed building falls into the category of substantial harm. The NPPG states:

In general terms, substantial harm is a high test, so it may not arise in many cases. For example, in determining whether works to a listed building constitute substantial harm, an important consideration would be whether the adverse impact seriously affects a key element of its special architectural or historic interest. It is the degree of harm to the asset's significance rather than the scale of the development that is to be assessed. The harm may arise from works to the asset or from development within its setting. (Emphasis added)

However, even minor works have the potential to cause substantial harm, depending on the nature of their impact on the asset and its setting.¹

It is considered that in this case the proposals would seriously affect a key element of the special interest of the listed building. In which case the harm is substantial, and paragraph 207 of the NPPF has to be considered. This states:

Where a proposed development will lead to substantial harm to (or total loss of significance of) a designated heritage asset, local planning authorities should refuse consent, unless it can be demonstrated that the substantial harm or total loss is necessary to achieve substantial public benefits that outweigh that harm or loss, or all of the following apply:

- (a) the nature of the heritage asset prevents all reasonable uses of the site; and
- (b) no viable use of the heritage asset itself can be found in the medium term through appropriate marketing that will enable its conservation; and
- (c) conservation by grant-funding or some form of not for profit, charitable or public ownership is demonstrably not possible; and
- (d) the harm or loss is outweighed by the benefit of bringing the site back into use.

The applicants have not addressed these tests, because they do not identify the substantial harm which would be caused, and the proposals clearly fail to pass them.

Even if the proposals were considered to fall below the level of substantial harm, they would certainly result in a very high level of less than substantial harm to the significance of the listed building.

5.3 Impact on the Seven Dials Conservation Area

The "Seven Dials Renaissance Study", originally published in 1990, is the key document in the work of the Trust. It provides a detailed framework for the care and enhancement of the total environment of the Seven Dials area. The latest revised and updated web-edition from 2023 has been extended across the borough boundary down to Long Acre in Westminster, covers an enlarged area in Camden and has been renamed "The Seven Dials in Covent Garden Study".²

Although the Odeon Cinema falls just outside the area covered by the Study (as it is on the far side of

Application No: Consultees Name: Received:

Comment: Response:

Shaftesbury Avenue which forms the northern border of the Study's area), the site forms the backdrop to the Seven Dials Sundial Pillar (which was reinstated by the Trust in 1989 as the focal point of the Seven Dials area) and is visible behind the Sundial Pillar when seen from the south looking towards the junction of the northern end Mercer Street (one of the seven roads radiating out from around the Pillar) and Shaftesbury Avenue.

The proposals would place an overly large and architecturally overpowering addition on top of the listed building, greatly increasing its prominence in the local streetscape. The mass and height of the proposed extension are highly excessive, both in the context of the existing listed building and also in the context of the neighbouring buildings on Shaftesbury Avenue.

The proposed addition will tower above the neighbouring buildings, both those on the south side of Shaftesbury Avenue (which is within the Trust's Study area) which are all four or five floors. There is one exception where notably the two top floors are stepped and set back from the street facade preventing the type of gross intrusion currently proposed. On the north side of Shaftesbury Avenue the buildings are taller than the south, but even here the upper floors are set back from the street façade, again avoiding the type of over-massing exhibited by the current proposals.

The Trust considers that this extension would cause a high degree of less than substantial harm to the setting of the adjacent conservation areas, namely the Seven Dials Conservation Area and the Denmark Street Conservation Areas.

5.4 Impact on Amenity

The Seven Dials Trust notes that the height and bulk of the proposed extension will take away a significant portion of the sunlight reaching both the Phoenix Garden, the only community green space within Covent Garden, and its neighbour, the St Giles Churchyard and playground. These are important green spaces open to the public and extensively used by many residents and workers in the Trust's study area, and the Trust objects strongly to the loss of amenity that this would entail.

6. The 2021 Appeal Decision

The issue of a roof level extension on the listed building has already been tested at appeal. Following a public inquiry in 2020 the Planning Inspectorate refused planning permission and listed building consent for a scheme to add a two storey roof extension on top of the listed building. The Planning Inspector considered that this extension would cause significant harm to the listed building, and minor and moderate harm to the Seven Dials Conservation Area and the Denmark Street Conservation Area respectively.

With respect to the impacts on heritage assets the Inspector concluded:

33. None of the parties at the inquiry objected to the principle of a rooftop extension. The statement of common ground between the appellant and the Council states that an extension of the form and height proposed, if sympathetically executed, could be incorporated without significant harm to the listed building. Similar views were expressed by the Camden Design Review Panel. However, in my view, the height, mass, form and choice of materials in this proposal would compete with, rather than complement, the listed building. The extension would be overly dominant and detract from the existing form and composition. It would not be sympathetically executed. Thus, it would result in less than substantial but nevertheless significant harm to the listed building. (Emphasis added)

34. There would also be less than substantial harm to both conservation areas. For Seven Dials Conservation Area, due to the modest contribution the building makes to this heritage asset and the limited and restricted views of the extension, the harm would be minor. For Denmark Street Conservation Area, due to the greater contribution made by the building, the more open views, and the bulkier appearance of the extension at the

Application No: Consultees Name: Received:

Comment: Response:

rear, the harm would be moderate rather than minor.

7. Summary and Conclusion

7.1 Harm and Benefits

The applicant acknowledges that the proposals would cause a degree of harm to the listed building. The Seven Dials Trust considers that this assessment is flawed. It fails to assess properly the full significance of the listed building and grossly underestimates the degree of harm which would be caused to that significance. The applicant lists 'public benefits' which they consider to outweigh the low level harm they identify. These include the following:

- a. Much needed repair to the listed building, which is currently suffering from corrosion-related damage to the structure.
- b. Restoring the front elevation to its original appearance.
- c. Architectural lighting, long-term maintenance and the opportunity for interpretation.
- d. Reintroducing a theatre use for which the listed building was originally designed, bringing a 'world class theatre operator' (Cirque Du Soleil) to this part of Shaftesbury Avenue.
- e. Public realm improvements to surrounding streets.
- f. Enhanced activation to the frontage along Shaftesbury Avenue.

The Trust considers that these benefits are insubstantial and certainly do not outweigh the level of harm identified (and underestimated) by the applicant. These benefits are highly questionable.

1. The condition of the facades may be poor in places and may require treatment. However, this is a repair and maintenance issue which should not be regarded as a benefit which would outweigh the harm the proposed extensions would cause.
2. It cannot be said reasonably that the front facade is restored to its original appearance when it is proposed to add seven storeys above it. The appearance of the building will be altered radically.
3. Architectural lighting, long-term maintenance and the opportunity for interpretation are not serious or significant public benefits.
4. The scheme proposes a circus in the basement. This is more of a cabaret style operation than a standard theatre type.
5. We understand that discussions were held with other theatre operators who considered that the size of the proposed venue was unviable for a standard theatre operation.
6. The claimed benefit of a 'theatre' (a small specialist cabaret) does not outweigh the loss of a five screen cinema, one of the most successful in Central London, which offers a great variety of popular culture, and is very well used by residents from Bloomsbury, Fitzrovia, Soho, Seven Dials and Covent Garden.
7. Public realm and facade improvements could be provided by an alternative scheme which caused far less harm to heritage assets.

7.2 Local Plan Policies

The proposals are contrary to the policies of the Camden Local Plan dealing with design and heritage matters, which seek to protect the heritage assets of the borough.

The proposals fail to meet the requirements of Policy D1 'Design' which states:

The Council will seek to secure high quality design in development. The Council will require that development:

- a. respects local context and character;
- b. preserves or enhances the historic environment and heritage assets in accordance with Policy D2 Heritage;
- f. integrates well with the surrounding streets and open spaces, improving movement through the site and wider area with direct, accessible and easily recognisable routes and contributes positively to the street

Application No: Consultees Name: Received:

Comment: Response:

frontage;

m. preserves strategic and local views;

They also fail to meet the requirement for 'Excellence in design' which states:

The Council expects excellence in architecture and design. We will seek to ensure that the significant growth planned for under Policy G1 Delivery and location of growth will be provided through high quality contextual design.

The proposals are contrary to Policy D2 'Heritage' which states:

The Council will preserve and, where appropriate, enhance Camden's rich and diverse heritage assets and their settings, including conservation areas, listed buildings, archaeological remains, scheduled ancient monuments and historic parks and gardens and locally listed heritage assets.

Designated heritage assets

The Council will not permit the loss of or substantial harm to a designated heritage asset, including conservation areas and Listed Buildings, unless it can be demonstrated that the substantial harm or loss is necessary to achieve substantial public benefits that outweigh that harm or loss, or all of the following apply:

a. the nature of the heritage asset prevents all reasonable uses of the site;

b. no viable use of the heritage asset itself can be found in the medium term through appropriate marketing that will enable its conservation;

c. conservation by grant-funding or some form of charitable or public ownership is demonstrably not possible; and

d. the harm or loss is outweighed by the benefit of bringing the site back into use.

The Council will not permit development that results in harm that is less than substantial to the significance of a designated heritage asset unless the public benefits of the proposal convincingly outweigh that harm.

Conservation areas

In order to maintain the character of Camden's conservation areas, the Council will take account of conservation area statements, appraisals and management strategies when assessing applications within conservation areas.

The Council will:

e. require that development within conservation areas preserves or, where possible, enhances the character or appearance of the area;

g. resist development outside of a conservation area that causes harm to the character or appearance of that conservation area; and

Listed Buildings

To preserve or enhance the borough's listed buildings, the Council will:

i. resist the total or substantial demolition of a listed building;

j. resist proposals for a change of use or alterations and extensions to a listed building where this would cause harm to the special architectural and historic interest of the building.

The proposals fail to comply with the Council's approach to the design of extensions to existing buildings, as set out in paragraph 7.2 of the Local Plan. This states:

The Council will require all developments, including alterations and extensions to existing buildings, to be of the highest standard of design and will expect developments to consider:

- character, setting, context and the form and scale of neighbouring buildings;
- the character and proportions of the existing building, where alterations and extensions are proposed;
- the prevailing pattern, density and scale of surrounding development;
- the impact on existing rhythms, symmetries and uniformities in the townscape;
- the composition of elevations;

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2024/0993/P	Lawrence Blackmore	27/04/2024 14:45:32	OBJ	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • its contribution to public realm and its impact on views and vistas; and • the wider historic environment and buildings, spaces and features of local historic value. <p>More specifically, the proposals fail to meet the requirements of Draft Site Allocations Policy HCG4 – 134-149 Shaftesbury Avenue which states:</p> <p>Development must be in accordance with Policy HCG1 and in addition must:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Retain the Grade II listed building and ensure that its fabric and setting are protected, restored and enhanced, particularly the building's distinctive features. e. Ensure that any roof extension is of an exceptional architectural quality to complement and enhance the host building. <p>7.3 Conclusion</p> <p>The proposals do not accord with national policy or local policy with respect to the protection of heritage assets.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. The significance of the listed building is not protected, restored or enhanced. b. The roof extension is not of exceptional design quality and does not complement and enhance the listed building. c. The proposals would cause significant harm to local views and the setting of the Seven Dials Conservation Area. d. The proposals would cause substantial harm (or at the very least a high level of less than substantial harm) to the significance of the listed building. e. The proposed public benefits are insubstantial and are far outweighed by the harm which would be caused. f. The NPPF and Local Plan tests are not met. <p>Therefore planning permission and listed building consent should be refused.</p> <p>Yours sincerely Robert Ayton Seven Dials Trustee, on behalf of the Seven Dials Trust cc Tom Foxall, Historic England</p>

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2024/0993/P	Robin Julian Biellik	27/04/2024 15:42:37	INT	

Dear Sir/Madam,

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on this request for planning permission. There must be dozens of more suitable properties in central London where the construction of an 11-floor hotel and underground theatre space would not require gutting this rare Art Deco building. The current cinema is financially viable and residents of Covent Garden and Seven Dails like myself believe it would serve our community's needs better if the building continued in its current use. Furthermore, the proposed additional floors on the building would probably block out all light from the street, 24hours / 7days per week.

Thank you for your kind attention..

Many thanks,
Robin Biellik, DrPH

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2024/0993/P	Elizabeth Bax	28/04/2024 16:18:19	OBJ	<p>Covent Garden was saved from wholesale demolition in the 1970s and since that time whilst it has grown in popularity as a tourist area we still fight to keep some part of this unique area for ourselves – part of this is the Phoenix Gardens which was developed on waste ground and originally tended by local residents and has evolved into this wonderful green space that is enjoyed by all, but with the hard work of the locals at its core – surrounded already by large buildings it has fought its corner and is host to all sorts of wildlife and thriving plants and trees – a haven amongst the busy traffic and new development of Tottenham Court Road. The area is also home to residents who have lived in Covent Garden for generations. This is now at risk from an ambitious developer looking to vastly increase the height of an original Art Deco theatre then cinema (that has already seen off one plan a few years ago as being inappropriate) by an extra 4 floors upwards and extra 2 floors down increasing the overall volume by 3 and casting shadow on the very many residents that live in New Compton Street and Stacey Street taking vital sunlight from Phoenix Gardens which will change the environment as planting is now appropriate for the light it has so many plants will die or fail to flower and thrive – this can be said too for the residents who are also reliant on sunlight in their homes. Natural light is important for our wellbeing, for balancing circadian rhythm, Vitamin D, lowers stress levels and anxiety, we have seen from the reports in the application that many homes will suffer from greatly reduced light many at 40% loss due to this development and Phoenix Gardens will also be affected by light loss. With many people now working from home this loss will be felt.</p> <p>The Development site is surrounded by the conservation areas of 7 Dials, Bloomsbury and Denmark Street – being visible from the conservation area of 7 Dials and Denmark Street and it is also an important landmark building; special consideration must be given to this building to ensure that changes do not detract from these conservation areas and their significance is not diminished by an inappropriate building. This new development does not improve nor enhance the area and surrounding conservation area by its sheer bulk and height and the appreciation of the embellishment of the façade is lost due to the extended height for the proposed extra floors for the hotel that have little in common with the listed lower and original floors. The remaining original interior features of the theatre will also be removed and erased from history</p> <p>This development is not for this area – it proposes to be a theatre but in reality it is initially for a Circus. The area is ready for a new and modern theatre so it is a loss to the community and to traditional theatre goers. The area to the rear of this site is highly residential and they will suffer for a number of years from the excavation of the basement areas and rebuilding of the new floors with dirt and dust and noise – and once the development is complete they will then have to deal with the servicing of the building in the narrow streets plus, if successful, the hotel users and as it is proposed to be a low cost hotel likely stag and hen nights will be their trade plus Circus attendees as access is anticipated to be not from the main road but by side roads.</p>

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2024/0993/P	Wyndham Albery	28/04/2024 17:47:11	OBJ	<p>Dear Sir/Madam</p> <p>I have reviewed the planning application in detail and, as a local resident, object to the plans. The area is overloaded with people, and the infrastructure is at breaking point.</p> <p>I struggle to believe that the climate issues we are having will not be accentuated by this. See the issues from the British Geological Survey, which highlights that London Clay is being affected by Excessive buildings and then climate change, causing major issues.</p> <p>https://www.bgs.ac.uk/news/maps-show-the-real-threat-of-climate-related-subsidence-to-british-homes-and-properties/</p> <p>From the City of London, even with the superdrain, we have major capacity issues, and another hotel will potentially accelerate the one in 100 flooding events. Once the system is full, there is very little place for the water to go, and we have seen this phenomenon around the world.</p> <p>https://www.london.gov.uk/sites/default/files/lldap_final.pdf</p> <p>Not to mention, it is ugly, too high, and will ruin the Phoenix Garden sunlight, which is the only sanity for many locals.</p> <p>Thank you</p>
2024/0993/P	stephen furness	27/04/2024 23:12:47	OBJ	<p>I object to this development on the following grounds:</p> <p>We already have many bar and restaurant spaces in the west end and there are empty spaces in the same street showing that the market is saturated and it does not fit with the area. The same applies to the theatre space. it should be noted that there are 2 theatre spaces less then 2 minutes walk from the development. Again a space that will not be taken and the applicant will then want to use it as a club with the attendant noise and street problems associated with it.</p> <p>In terms of the hotel development the panel should not that we have a approved 700 person capacity hostel in great newport street currently being developed. This fact alone shows that they have not done due diligence. The same developer in Gt Newport street is also developing a similar space in Soho. The market will not support all these rooms and this will lead to issues. The hotel will also cause issues with deliveries and noise. The proposed work will cause major traffic problems and disruption for local residents and business alike. This proposal should be rejected and a more suitable one provided by the applicant.</p>
2024/0993/P	Aphrodite Ioannidou	28/04/2024 19:09:16	COMMNT	<p>I object to the proposed planning permission. The final height is too high and the resulting final building does not integrate with the character of the neighbourhood.</p>

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2024/0993/P	Orlando Robinson	28/04/2024 21:17:39	OBJ	<p>As a resident who grew up and continues to live in the area, using the cinema regularly, I oppose these proposals - they are totally inconsistent with the conservation principles of the area. As we've seen from so many I</p> <p>Previous developments like the proposed one - this design sets a precedent of gross overdevelopment.</p> <p>Theatres like this one are rare. The main auditorium is a gem. And the issue is once they go, they never come back. And for what? What's replacing it will never have the kind of community value that this theatre provides.</p> <p>The destruction of legacy buildings will see be replaced with something that will see little to no benefit for lifelong residents is a shame to even be considered. For this reason I oppose the development and it's application should be refused.</p> <p>It has also been pointed out to me that the development contravenes many of The council's stated development policy including;</p> <p>DP22 Promoting sustainable design and construction, DP24 Securing high quality design, DP25 Conserving Camden's heritage, DP26 Managing the impact of development on occupiers and neighbours, DP27 Basements and lightwells, DP28 Noise and vibration, and DP31 which concerns provision of, and improvements to, public open space.</p>
2024/0993/P	Richard Anthony Knight	28/04/2024 22:37:34	INT	<p>This proposal is simply dreadful. To add those floors on the top of the existing building looks very wrong. It'll take away light from the Phoenix Garden. The building should be returned to a functioning theatre, in the same art deco style as it was when it opened in 1931. Surely, another hotel isn't needed? Not in this area. I object to these plans. Local resident.</p>
2024/0993/P	Terence Doyle	29/04/2024 08:21:44	INT	<p>I am stunned to read of this proposal. Not only does I make a mockery of a wonderful building in a quiet, tree-lined location but it aims to destroy my personal environment by taking away the last bit of sunlight I enjoy from the east, as I live virtually next door. It will also block sunlight for the wonderful neighbourhood Phoenix Gardens behind the building.</p> <p>Even from a practical point of view, it makes no sense. This area is always congested except for that little patch in front of the proposed development. The streets around the existing building are narrow and tight. There is no room for parking let alone for the picking up and dropping that are the essence of the hotel trade. Even if it was a practical design, the disruptions and chaos caused by the construction would be mayhem for months, maybe years. Enough is enough.</p>

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2024/0993/P	Wendy Charlton	28/04/2024 17:50:35	OBJ	I object to this planned development as it will steal away essential light from the Phoenix Community Garden behind. The garden is an oasis of nature located in central urbanised area, a place of peace and quiet, a space for physical and mental wellbeing. I see elderly people, young people hanging out chatting, couples sharing a private moment, families having a picnic. It is a place of safety, I volunteer in the garden, have made new friends and acquaintances, feel part of a community. Taking away 60% of light from the garden will be forever destructive to the biodiversity within this space, the plants and trees which require light to grow, to provide oxygen and clean the air of this polluted city. Please do not go ahead and instead come and spend some time in the garden to see for yourself how it feels, you would be very welcome.
2024/0993/P	Angela	28/04/2024 19:26:48	COMMT	Worried about the distress it will cause us residents living directly opposite. Also the digging underground will have a devastating impact on our building ie: subsidence cracks in the walls and of most concern the vibration. Scares me so very much. I'm a 70 year old pensioner and am scared.
2024/0993/P	Charlotte Robinson	28/04/2024 21:34:03	OBJ	<p>I wish to object to the above planning application. I lived in Long Acre for over 40 years and brought up four children in the area, and thus have a very intimate knowledge of the area and its buildings. I am appalled at the current proposal which is frankly vandalism.</p> <p>The proposal completely disrespects the Listed Building status of the Saville Theatre. Some buildings are listed for their design alone but the buildings which are listed for both their design and their history are in many ways even more important because they contribute both to the heritage and life of the country.</p> <p>The Saville Theatre as a venue has made an incredible contribution to 20 th Century Theatrical and popular musical history and deserves to be preserved for this aspect alone. In addition it is a restrained building of significant design, illustrating some of the best of commercial design for that decade. It makes a substantial contribution to the streetscape of Shaftesbury Avenue which still encompasses a pleasing collection of very individual buildings which have aged into a coherent whole which makes the West End such an important part of living and visiting London.</p> <p>The loss of such important individual buildings need to be avoided at all costs, otherwise London will become an anodyne city of windswept plazas echoing the worst of modern townscape across the world. We have a history which you as Councillors have a duty to preserve for future generations.</p> <p>The proposed design completely destroys the value the design of the existing building and will have negative impact on the streetscape. Shaftesbury Avenue provides an elegant tree lined curve which is pleasure to walk along despite the traffic. The scale of the streets to the rear is much smaller and typifies the variety of London. The Phoenix Garden represents an enduring, and much loved community win when Covent Garden was last assaulted by the short term policies of development at all costs. It makes a good foil to the venerable historic setting of St Giles Church. The proposed development is clumsy and gross and will loom over this area and destroys its context.</p>

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2024/0993/P	Eric Stuart	28/04/2024 21:46:19	OBJ	

I am a long-term local resident and I object to the proposal for 135-149 Shaftesbury Avenue. The mass and height of the proposed addition are excessive both in the context of the existing listed building below and also in the context of the neighbouring area.

The height and mass of the proposed addition will take away a significant portion of the sunlight reaching both the Phoenix Garden, the only community green space within Covent Garden, and its neighbour, the St Giles Churchyard and playground. These are important green spaces open to the public and extensively used by local residents. It also will lead to a serious loss of daylight to neighbouring residential properties.

The addition is essentially a completely new building placed on top of the existing building. This throws off the proportions of the existing listed building, which will appear too top heavy with the new addition, and in particular diminishes the impact of the bold stonework arch on the existing listed building's facade.

The proposed addition will also tower above its neighbouring buildings, both those on the other side of Shaftesbury Avenue which are all 4 or 5 floors with only one exception (where notably the 2 top floors are stepped and set back from the street facade which prevents the type of overmassing exhibited by the proposed addition), as well as those on the north side of Shaftesbury Avenue with any floors higher than, in all cases, the 6th to 8th floor level stepped and set back from the street facade (again to prevent the type of overmassing exhibited by the proposed addition).

The existing listed building already rises to the level of the 5th floor of its immediate neighbours to the east and west. The addition of another 6 or 7 floors on top of that as planned for the proposed addition without being stepped and set back from the street facade will create the appearance of towering over its neighbours. This will also cause damage to the wider context of the building, located in the space between both the Seven Dials and Denmark Street Conservation Areas and from which the addition would be visible.

The proposed addition is architecturally very bold. In form and style it is not sympathetic to the listed building below. Its brickwork forms complicated patterns and shapes. It forms a stark contrast to the brickwork of the listed building, in which the brickwork is done in simple horizontal bands. This simplicity serves to draw attention to the contrasting stonework detailing of the listing building, particularly the stonework frieze and arch which contribute greatly to the character and appearance of the listed building but which will compete for attention with an overbearing contrasting addition above. The brickwork of the proposed addition also appears as it will be darker in colour than the brickwork of the listed building below further emphasising the difference. This darker complicated brickwork of the proposed addition, together with its fenestration, only serves to highlight the additional and excessive verticality of the proposed addition.

Finally, the proposal would mean the loss of the Odeon Cinema which functions as the local cinema for the surrounding community. The proposed replacement seems more designed to cater to tourists rather than being something the local community will use - the goal seems to be the permanent residency of a performance troupe in a smaller venue which is not likely to entice multiple visits by local residents and is not even a theatre venue that would have a constantly changing offering of attractions.

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2024/0993/P	Erwan Toulemonde	27/04/2024 16:03:36	OBJ	<p>Good afternoon,</p> <p>I would like to object to this application.</p> <p>1- I visit as a resident on a regular basis the Phoenix 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 this would make its main area dark most of the time. This is a heaven for me and contributes to my mental health. This development will severely impact the garden forever. The height of it is far too much.</p> <p>2- I also know of residents living near this proposed development; they will lose light and become overlooked. This is not acceptable.</p> <p>3- I think the appearance and proportions of the listed building will be seriously damaged, due to the mass and height of the proposed roof.</p> <p>4- Finally, the Seven Dials and Denmark Street conservation areas will be negatively impacted as it is totally out of proportion.</p> <p>On the basis on the above I strongly object to this scheme and call for this building to be preserve in its glory, and its heritage, and only allow minimal roof extension.</p> <p>Thank you for your consideration. Kind regards</p> <p>Erwan</p>

2024/0993/P	Bahi Ghubril	28/04/2024 04:36:29	OBJ	<p>No, absolutely not. This will create a huge amount of disruption to the area and damage to the architecture at a very little gain. There is no reason for the tourists to the area to actually stay in this proposed hotel location when transport links and pedestrian walkways are so thoughtfully provided. We need to spread out the time/space that each visitor utilises much more efficiently across the west end, not compact or even more into the Covent Garden's area</p>
-------------	--------------	---------------------	-----	---

2024/0993/P	Linda Opher	28/04/2024 15:47:28	OBJ	<p>I strongly object to the part demolition restoration and refurbishment of the existing Grade II listed building. This is part of the heritage of residents like myself and hundreds more who have lived in this part of central London all their life.</p> <p>I can remember seeing concerts in the mid to late 1960's then named the Saville theatre, and still use it as my local cinema.</p> <p>There's enough hotels in the area struggling to survive. All you would be doing is bringing more crime to this area, that is already rife with it.</p> <p>We don't need another development of this size in what is a part residential area. Planners have absolutely no consideration of noise, pollution and disturbance this would cause.</p>
-------------	-------------	---------------------	-----	--

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2024/0993/P	Francesca Savvides	28/04/2024 15:16:16	OBJ	<p>I am a local resident of Bloomsbury having lived in the local area for over a decade, and I am a volunteer at the adjacent Phoenix Community Garden. I would like to object to this planning application on several grounds.</p> <p>The proposed scheme is not in-keeping with the character of the surrounding area nor sympathetic to the materials, proportions and detailing of the existing building. The scheme will result in significant demolition of the existing building's fabric which is unacceptable given that the Saville Theatre is a locally cherished building with Grade II listed status and it should be protected accordingly. The application proposes demolition of the "existing internal superstructure, including roof, internal floors" – this will essentially be a new build merely with the front and side external elevations retained. The proposed extension will result in a more than doubling of height which is excessive. This will be damaging to the local townscape views and the setting of the theatre and wider local area. It will also be disruptive to the charming character of Shaftesbury Avenue.</p> <p>Camden declared a Climate and Ecological Emergency in 2019, and this scheme would not align with these goals. The scheme will undoubtedly be heavy in embodied carbon due to the several floors of basement which will need masses of concrete reinforcement and the extension is proposed to be built with a steel frame. This is not a sustainable form of construction. Also, the bulky mass atop the existing building will create overshadowing to the Locally Listed Phoenix Garden, which will create damage to the flora and fauna of the garden. Camden's new Local Plan 2024 states that on the Saville Theatre site development must "work with the local community to protect and enhance the setting of the Phoenix Gardens." This scheme does not do that. Approval of this scheme would make the garden less desirable and frequented, which is important because it is a key community space which fosters well-being.</p> <p>The garden is unique in that it is the last community garden in the local area and it is a much needed open space for nature in the heart of the West End. The area is deficient in access to nature and the garden therefore provides an important stepping stone habitat. This is acknowledged in Camden's own document 'Creating Space for Nature in Camden'. For these reasons and more, I implore Camden Council to reject this application.</p>

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2024/0993/P	Maureen Beryl McLaren	28/04/2024 15:43:07	OBJ	<p>What I don't understand is, why Camden Planning, when presented with a development scheme for a much loved iconic building; within a couple of years of turning down one of similar ilk, is that they even give this one consideration. Furthermore, this latest plan is considerably worse than the former. It is absolutely outrageous, that a building given Grade 11 Listed Building status, should even be considered for such.</p> <p>Other countries preserve their beautiful historic buildings. What is wrong with Britain and in particular our capital city, that they've always been, and still are, hell bent on destroying our heritage? The very thought of digging down far enough to accommodate 4 below ground level floors (God only knows the knock on problems that will undoubtedly cause) plus more than doubling the height from ground level upwards, is beyond belief. AND, the proposed development, bears no correlation to the existing Art Deco building ie., they just don't fit together.</p> <p>The overall damage this would cause to this beautiful building and the knock on affect is incomprehensible. The impact on local residents and businesses is unacceptable. Taking the Phoenix Garden as a typical example, such a building would completely overshadow the garden, plunging it into perpetual hours of darkness and subsequently destroying it.</p> <p>This beautiful iconic heritage must be protected from vandals like this current developer, whose only interest is money. The people of our capital city and the people of our country have a right to have our heritage protected from such.</p>
2024/0993/P	Jane Savvides	28/04/2024 22:06:02	OBJ	<p>I would like to object to this planning application because the proposal is not in keeping with the character of the local area and would have a negative impact on the surrounding context. The scheme is not sympathetic to the existing Saville Theatre which is an iconic building in the area. It will also have a detrimental affect on the neighbouring community garden by reducing the amount of light the garden receives.</p>
2024/0993/P	Damon Smyth	27/04/2024 19:09:08	COMMNT	<p>The planning application to build 7 stories on top of the building currently known as the Odeon Cinema, Shaftesbury Ave. If the application is successful, the Phoenix Garden will lose up to 60% of sunlight. This will cause the destruction of many plant and bird species currently thriving in its micro climate.</p> <p>We have often visited those garden, and it's a joyous place to be away from the hustle and bustle. As with residential, surely there's some kind of right to light. Please reconsider this development, and leave the Phoenix Garden to thrive.</p>

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2024/0993/P	David North	27/04/2024 19:30:43	OBJ	<p>This application encompasses everything that is wrong with the current planning system. Developers are proposing plans which are completely unsympathetic to the surrounding and with zero aesthetic merit confident the provision of a cultural space somewhere in the building will grant them carte blanche to design as they please.</p> <p>Let's call these plans out for what they are - an eyesore that will leave future generations wondering how on earth it was ever granted permission; no doubt by that stage the existence of the cabaret venue squeezed into the basement will be long gone.</p> <p>If a building is Stage II listed then provide it with the protection it needs and don't permit this monstrosity to be constructed over the top.</p> <p>This type of design will always arise out of seeking the greatest financial gain for the least outlay. Let's ensure that developers seeking to build in this prime location show some respect for the surroundings and propose something which inspires future generations and remains respectful of the protected status of the existing building.</p> <p>I object to this proposal in the strongest terms.</p>

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2024/0993/P	W. Williams	27/04/2024 22:10:39	OBJ	Re; application reference 2024/0993/P

I am a 30-year resident of Neal Street, and I object very strongly to the development proposed in this application. This is for many reasons, all of which I submitted during the last round of applications for this site, and this range of proposals is even more inappropriate than the last.

This is an iconic Art Deco building. The idea of doubling its height is simply preposterous and will destroy the perfect proportions of the current structure. A building at the proposed height would kill the sunlight on the community garden immediately to the north. There is nothing of any benefit to local residents in this scheme and the proposed structure would be enormously detrimental to this local public outdoor space.

The building has a rich cultural history having hosted concerts during the '60s from some of the biggest names in rock music, including The Beatles, The Rolling Stones & Jimi Hendrix. Buildings like this should be being protected, not gutted. The token gesture of a basement club would do nothing to compensate for the loss of a cultural icon.

The proposed structure would be out of character for this area and will set a precedent for future similar building applications.

The Princes Circus development is now, finally, complete after years of noise, disruption and pollution. It is completely unacceptable to propose further years of the same at a location so close. The inevitable impact on traffic flow, with the associated congestion and disruption, would be simply inhuman for residents and we ask that Camden supports us in this, rather than maximising profits for builders.

I objected to the previous planning application for this site and this new application is vastly worse, so I would be very grateful if you would reject this application in its entirety to save us all from having to go through this again.

Best regards,

W.W

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2024/0993/P	Spencer	26/04/2024 12:55:51	OBJ	<p>The aesthetic of the proposed extension is completely out of keeping with the character of the building, creating an obtrusive eyesore in a conservation area of unique character.</p> <p>Loss of the original theatre infra-structure, restricting any future theatre use to small scale, cabaret type performances and therefore severely limiting the cultural potential of restoring the building as a live performance venue.</p> <p>The loss of light would catastrophically impact The Phoenix Garden and it's ability to provide a diverse habitat that sustains rare urban wildlife for the enjoyment and betterment of the local community and visitors. This is a highly residential area and experiences green poverty. Residents do not have access to their own gardens or wildlife spaces. The Phoenix Garden is a truly unique jewel in Camden's crown- The only space of it's kind in the area. The extensive building works would completely destroy not only the peace and calm that people come to the garden to enjoy, but would decimate the ability of the garden to raise essential income through commercial hires.</p> <p>The additional services required for a hotel of this size would completely destroy the tranquil character of the St Giles Area and that experienced whilst enjoying the garden.</p> <p>An extension of this kind can simply not be considered seriously when any positive contributions of restoring a theatre are weighed against the devastation to the unique character and quality the area currently provides for both the local community and the thousands of visitors and animals the area attracts every year.</p>

2024/0993/P	luke peppard	26/04/2024 19:12:40	OBJ	<p>hello i am a local resident who objects to this so called redevelopment of the Odeon , my main issues will be the permanent loss of light (ancient lights) to the whole area which will be in shadow for most of the summer , any building works would be for years create noise and dust pollution which will affect the many species of nesting birds in the nearby Phoenix Garden , construction vehicles and heavy machines will add to the noise, pollute air and cause vibration (please note we have had over ten years of local works from crossrail/outernet and it is never ending) . there will be an increase in footfall if the plans go ahead with 100s of rooms, needing many supply vehicles to deliver products to a hotel thereby an increase of dust waste collection vehicles, already a bane of my life with 330am collections often. extra taxis dropping off tourists (more noise, congestion) . there area has a large number of hotels already and this plan has no interest in the local community and will not benefit any of us . any long term works may involve hoardings and scaffolds etc which are usually dark and have no security, this will attract the high volume of "junkies" and homeless to loiter and try and make camps thereby causing extra nuisance, noise and urine and excrement everywhere . late night fights and shouting are common too and this would increase . the plans are proposed are far to complex for most to understand or have time to study and consider without having ages to do so and likely a law degree. i myself work shifts and work nights and as a london underground station manager my job is defined as safety critical and deemed to need rest periods , which nearby works would not allow.</p> <p>re nearby nesting birds the phoenix garden has many types of tit, finch , blue jays visit and the off kestel , wagtails, european goldfinches which thrived during "lockdown" and long term works may drive them away, this is a conservation area too.</p>
-------------	--------------	---------------------	-----	--

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2024/0993/P	Jack Wilkinson	26/04/2024 20:29:00	COMMNT	I support the proposed development plans for the regeneration of the Saville Theatre for the permanent residency for the Cirque Du Soleil. The project represents a significant economic opportunity for local traders in the hospitality sector and I strongly encourage Councillors to approve the planning application without delay.
2024/0993/P	Andrew Mackay	27/04/2024 11:51:45	OBJ	<p>I am a West End resident living in Dean St -Soho .In Westminster but less than half a mile from the site.</p> <p>I oppose this development on the following ; loss of an amenity;I have regularly used the cinema for many years.</p> <p>Loss of one of the most beautiful and historic building in Shaftesbury Avenue/Covent Garden .The retention of some external features in noway justifies the destruction of an important building and loses the historic interior</p> <p>Blight of the light and amenity space of St Giles churchyard and community gardens ,which I use and enjoy frequently</p> <p>Further loss of the historic history of the area for theatre and film</p>
2024/0993/P	David Murray	27/04/2024 12:06:29	APP	<p>I strongly object to this proposal. Other buildings in London built in the inter war years have had changes of use but retained most of exterior and where possible interiors. My main objection is the additional building work on the top of the cinema. It is dreadful!!</p> <p>I sincerely hope Camden Council refuse planning permission.</p>

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2024/0993/P	Angel Daden	27/04/2024 16:41:22	OBJ	<p>The latest proposal to create an extra 6 story hotel building above the Odeon, whilst pushing the idea through with an impressive re enlivening of the historical theatrical past of the building by proposing to build further down. Thus creating a lot of problems for the local area, not least:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Years of disruption, noise and dust pollution to all the very close by neighbourhood and those further down the road also, since large vehicles will need to reach the site. 2. Taking away valuable light. 3. The loss of light will affect the immediate housing blocks and our enclave of residential peace that can be found in the community gardens, St Giles Churchyard and the well used playground. 4. The loss of light will mean the trees, flowers and greenery will have problems to flourish. 5. The loss of light means the local residences will have their home cast into dimness, which may even make it necessary for people to no longer live in their own homes due to the darkness. 6. My family home will be one of those worse affected, as my living room is directly opposite the odeon. 7. Any works that go in the back of the Odeon, creates severe noise disruption due to the echo chamber affect of the area. The odd roadworks that happen or big window cleaning vehicles create unbearable noise into the residential buildings. This only happens on rare occasions, but this proposal would be creating unrelenting noise, dust and disruption for not days, not months, but years. 8. The area behind the Odeon apart from the big brown building which goes onto Charing Cross Road is a rare residential enclave for residents living in the heart of of an extremely busy part of London. The community gardens is part of the rare remaining gardens in Covent Garden and is extra cherished due to the scarcity of such spaces in Central London for our residents. 9. The playground is beloved and used by all the families that are raising their children in the area and need to have nearby and local spaces to allow the children to play whilst many of us live in small dwelling without gardens and vehicles to get our children out. Nearby is then extremely necessary in these circumstances where children need to play and enjoy the outsides whilst the parents need to conduct the business of running a home. The option of children playing in their own back garden whilst the parents organise dinner, cleaning, washing and all the functions of a running home in not available to most Central London families. In the life of Central London, there needs to be places to get to quickly and often to allow children to have a balanced healthy life. St Giles playground and the community gardens are one such very important resource in the heart of this area for local family and residents to enjoy. 10. The extreme impact this proposal would have on the area and the fact this has already been fought off before with many residents and local organisations having to put work into this, is a sorry indication of how dismissive the planning department is towards the residents. We have been here before and yet again we face yet another threat to the local area. There should be laws protecting residents from putting up with a constant onslaught of development proposal. There should also be laws stopping the developers from using legal loopholes to take away residents "Right to Light" by serving notices on residences on some nominal structure that does not exist but is a way to take away the local rights to light. How is it our council allows this blatant misuse of law? That is a question I have had since I saw this sneaky and nefarious tactic used upon this area. As you will be aware this proposal would not even have a legal grounding if that nefarious groundwork had not been laid by developers in the last decade as they circle the area trying to make as much money as possible for themselves. 11. Central London has plenty of options for visitors as far as hotel accommodation is concerned. I ask you this one question. What does this development bring to the area that is positive? The destruction of the area speaks loudly for itself, so I would be interested to know how you would respond to the question, what are the positives?

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2024/0993/P	Lynn	28/04/2024 16:23:30	OBJ	If developers have their way, there will be fewer reasons to visit London - and surely hotels want these visitors. I strongly object to turning a landmark into yet one more "design" hotel with barely a nod to its deco style and its origins as a place of entertainment
2024/0993/P	Rick Fisher	28/04/2024 15:49:57	OBJ	This is a terrible proposal and will gut a local landmark and crown it with a very ugly and completely unsympathetic extension. It will deprive the West End of one of the last remaining stage theatres that could be brought back relatively easily into live theatre use. Furthering Shaftesbury Ave. into the theatre destination it always has been. The replacement of a show room in the basement is not a like for like replacement. Keeping the existing cinema and not ruining the building for the future restoration to a live theatre. The success of @SohoPlace proves the West End needs more live theatres and there have been many proposals to restore this building, one of which will be viable. Whereas this hotel development could happen at any number of sites.
2024/0993/P	Laura	27/04/2024 14:50:11	OBJ	I object to this application. It would be a shame for this lovely building to be demolished and to lose more of the area's character and a budget-friendly entertainment venue in place of yet another soulless hotel. This would be one less place residents can enjoy, and if they do go with a dining theatre experience venue, it is unlikely to be as budget friendly or offer the same value/diversity. I fail to see any benefit for residents.
2024/0993/P	Kate Arnold	27/04/2024 15:15:14	OBJ	When I first looked at the proposal I assumed it was an April Fools Joke. It is SO out of kilter with the existing building. This can not be allowed to go ahead. I strongly object to the proposal. This is a beautiful listed building. They can't just drop another building on top of it. It will look completely out of place. This is a conservation area. It would completely destroy the aesthetics of the building and is totally out of proportion. It will monopolise the skyline and block the light to the playground and be a permanent blot on the skyline.
2024/0993/P	Tyron Stephens-Smith	27/04/2024 00:37:50	COMMNT	As a business owner in the hospitality industry, I support the proposed development because of the potential economic benefit it presents to the local traders in the hospitality sector.
2024/0993/P	Pam Smith	27/04/2024 15:06:27	COMMNT	The proposed development is totally unsuitable for this Art Deco Grade 11 listed building. The huge increase in the height would seriously damage its appearance and proportion and the demolition of the interior would result in the loss of historic theatrical features. There are enough hotels in the West End already. This building should be maintained as a cultural site which serves the local community as well as visitors to the area. The loss of light would have a huge impact on both neighbouring buildings and the lovely community Phoenix Garden, the only green space in the area. The demolition work would cause noise and pollution and add to the rising carbon emission.
2024/0993/P	robert mccracken	27/04/2024 15:34:25	OBJ	I object to this grotesque proposal. It would do enormous and unacceptable damage to (i) the existing beautiful Art Deco building (ii) the Phoenix Garden which would both (a) lose much sunlight and (b) be harmed by the dominance of the additional storeys over the trees of the garden (iii) the setting of St Giles Church and (iv) the St Giles churchyard

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2024/0993/P	Julian Date	28/04/2024 23:22:19	OBJ	<p>I object to this proposal vehemently. Putting this massive structure on top of The Odeon looks ludicrous and grotesque - what is the point of having listed buildings if their aesthetic is destroyed so comprehensively? The height of the building is in any event unacceptable. I live round the corner at the top of Monmouth Street and regularly use Phoenix Gardens for relaxation and St Giles' churchyard for walking the dog. Both will be put in shade for much of the day if this proposal goes ahead. There is then the wider issue that developers naturally want to go as high as possible to maximise profits, whereas one of the charms of Covent Garden/Soho/China Town is that they are generally low rise, and the numerous churches and historic buildings are not dwarfed by tower blocks. Every time another new building raises the skyline (and sets a precedent for other such buildings) a bit more of this is lost. I urge Camden to refuse this application.</p>

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2024/0993/P	Nancy Hearn	27/04/2024 22:04:37	OBJ	<p>Re: Application no. 2024/0993/p Odeon Covent Garden cinema - 135 - 149 Shaftesbury Avenue, London, WC2H 8AH</p> <p>Objection to development</p> <p>I would like to strongly object to the above proposed development on the following grounds:</p> <p>1) Impact on my life: This proposed development will have a massive detrimental impact on my life, as I suffer with really bad depression and have agoraphobia and stay in most of the time in my flat - I am under the doctor for this condition. Therefore this proposed new building would impact my life greatly and make me feel worse. I would feel like I was living on top of a building site, which in reality I will be.</p> <p>2) Loss of light to our building: I live on the second floor of Pendrell House, New Compton Street, diagonally opposite the Odeon cinema site, on the corner of my social housing block. I am literally 47 feet (14.3m) away from the footprint of the existing building. The proposed height of the new development would massively impact light entering my property on all sides but particularly along the side of Pendrell House facing onto New Compton Street. My right to light has existed in this block for almost 30 years. This development would massively overshadow my property, towering over my flat. All the rooms in my property would have a loss of light from the extreme height of the new building. It is just too big and too high and I would be overlooked by many hotel rooms and the hotel guests.</p> <p>3) Impact on our neighbourhood: The building stage of this proposed development would turn our neighbourhood into a building site for many years to come. The noise and dust and dirt will be absolutely intolerable for all residents living in New Compton Street and Stacey Street also. New Compton Street is a very narrow road and noise has nowhere to go apart from upwards and is funnelled along the street by the high buildings. At the construction/digging out stage, many heavy tipper trucks will be turning up very early in the morning - normally from 6am onwards, as has happened with other developments over the years here. These will be coming and going for many hours during the day to remove the rubble dug out from the site. The daily noise from this will make my life and the lives of all the local residents hell for years.</p> <p>4) Impact on our homes and housing block: Myself and other residents are extremely worried about damage to our homes and our block due to the very close proximity of the construction and building site. Other developments over the years have caused damage to our roof garden and to the facing of St. Giles-in-the-Fields church - and this construction (Central Saint Giles construction) was much further away to us than this proposed huge hotel. We are very concerned about damage to the foundations of our building and the facing of our block, from the vibration of the digging out process.</p> <p>5) Loss of light to nature and the Phoenix Garden: I am extremely concerned about the great loss of light - particularly during the winter months - to the multi-award winning Phoenix Garden. The garden is an important eco and wildlife-friendly space used by many residents and locals, the business community and tourists. The proposed sheer size of the development would tower over the garden and the extreme height would massively overshadow and block out light to the southern end of the garden and impact Winter planting and growing conditions, nature, planting and wildlife. The sun comes over the top of the cinema daily but in winter, is much lower in the sky and so we have very little of it. The garden is the only green space locally dedicated to nature and is cherished by many, over very many years (since 1984).</p> <p>6) Impact to Grade II listed building: I feel that the proposed design of the hotel with a tiny supper club cabaret venue underneath it in the basement, is completely unacceptable. We know from the previous development planning procedure (a 94 room hotel) was rejected by Camden Council because they wanted a theatre back on the site similar to the original historic Saville Theatre which seated over 1400 people. However, this</p>

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
				<p>development does not fulfil this objective - it is a large, 200 room hotel and the art venue within this in the basement is inconsequential and of no merit, with a tiny proportion of seating compared to the existing auditorium and the old historic Saville Theatre.</p> <p>I would like Camden Council planning department to refuse this monstrous development.</p> <p>Nancy Hearn 6 Pendrell House, New Compton Street WC2H 8DF</p>
2024/0993/P	J .Healey	29/04/2024 08:34:52	APP	<p>We are a social housing block of flats of 102 residents every day we have to fight with planning on beautiful old building being changed into monstrous looking new sites.We fully agree with CGCA commitment on this and hope that this plan doesn't get approved.</p>
2024/0993/P	MARTIN VANDER WEYER	27/04/2024 12:18:24	OBJ	<p>This proposal to add a large multi-storey hotel block on top of the handsome and distinctive Odeon cinema is grotesquely out of scale with and insensitive to the surrounding area. In particular it would take light from, and loom over, the Phoenix Garden and adjacent playground and churchyard. The design elevations are peculiarly ugly. As a near neighbour (Earlham St) who will pass this building every day — and will experience the disruption caused by the building works, no doubt lasting for years — I strongly object to the proposal.</p>

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2024/0993/P	SAMANTHA HARRIE	27/04/2024 12:18:42	OBJ	<p>I am writing to strongly object to the development of the Saville Theatre / Odeon. Please see points of objection below, and can I add that the damage to the local community surrounding the building, in particular the Phoenix Garden, the local residents and the community playground will be huge. No only will the development overlook them, block light and not contribute the many years of noise and construction work will be a terrible blow to the community, many of which are elderly / have young families.</p> <p>Other Points of objection are:</p> <p>Serious damage to the appearance and proportions of the listed building, due to the mass and height of the proposed roof extension which looks like an alien 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.</p> <p>Serious damage to the character of the listed building, which would no longer primarily be a place of entertainment but yet another anodyne hotel (proposed operator Citizen M). It would lose all the internal theatre features that it still has, including the stage house and the scenery systems.</p> <p>Damage to the integrity of the listed building, retaining only the front façade and parts of the external walls – essentially creating a completely new building with parts of the old as window-dressing. Loss of a valuable local cultural facility, the successful and profitable Odeon – the only reasonably priced and accessible mainstream movie cinema for the community in the West End.</p> <p>Damage to the Phoenix 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 this would make its main area dark most of the time.</p> <p>Damage to the St. Giles playground, which would lose sunlight. Harm to the amenity of neighbouring residents in New Compton Street, Stacey Street and Phoenix Street. They will be badly overlooked and lose sunlight.</p> <p>Nuisance from servicing a 10 floor hotel and restaurant; the back streets already suffer from congestion and delivery noise. There may also be drainage problems when 200 bathrooms are added to our strained waste water system.</p> <p>Huge disruption from building an unnecessarily massive development, including the painful noise of demolition and basement excavation.</p> <p>Danger of subsidence from digging out far below other buildings' basements in the area. From old maps, we also believe that an underground river or water course is there.</p> <p>A massively destructive and unsustainable approach, going against all modern planning policies that favour preservation of as much fabric as possible.</p>