

Mohammed Ahmed

From: Kathy Doyle
Sent: 15 May 2024 14:50
To: Planning
Subject: Fwd: OBJECTION - 24-28 Bloomsbury Way - 2023/5351/P

[EXTERNAL EMAIL] Beware – This email originated outside Camden Council and may be malicious Please take extra care with any links, attachments, requests to take action or for you to verify your password etc.

Dear Ms Quigley,

While checking the status of two planning applications which relate to my building, Russell Chambers, Bury Place, today, I was somewhat disconcerted to note that my objection to the application, which was sent on Feb 19th, 2024 at 11.02 AM was not recorded, nor were many other objections, which I know have been submitted by my neighbours.

You can see a copy of my objection below and I should be grateful if this could be uploaded to the planning portal as an objection. I should also be grateful if you would investigate to try to ascertain why objections have gone missing in this way.

Best wishes,

Kathy Doyle

Feb 19, 2024, 11:02 AM

----- Forwarded message -----

From: Kathy Doyle
Date: Mon, Feb 19, 2024 at 11:02 AM
Subject: OBJECTION - 24-28 Bloomsbury Way - 2023/5351/P
To: planning

I wish to OBJECT, in the strongest possible terms to the application for the development of the roof at 24-28 Bloomsbury Way into a roof terrace ancillary to the serviced office accommodation.

This development is wholly inappropriate for a residential location. The flats in Russell Chambers are designed so that the bedrooms are at the rear adjoining the lightwell to ensure relatively quiet surroundings for the occupants. All noise in the lightwell is magnified enormously as it reverberates round the confined space. There are 36 households affected by this proposal. The households include elderly people, children and some night-workers, all of whom may want to use their bedrooms for their intended purpose, rest and sleep, during the day. Are their rights to the quiet enjoyment of their homes to be superseded by one property owner's commercial interests? These are homes and there is no escape for us from noise emanating from a neighbouring property. Despite the urban location, the Russell Chambers flats are extremely peaceful.

The applicant states that the roof terrace will only operate during office hours. However, we are unable to attach much credence to this promise, recalling how during the refurbishment their workmen started noisy operations before 7.00am, flouting the council's restrictions, until complaints were made. Also for many months the bedrooms at Russell Chambers were bathed in bright light from all the lights in the building remaining illuminated throughout the night because the applicant found it too much of a challenge to ensure that they were switched off at the close of business for the day. We doubt whether the applicant will be able to ensure that the roof terrace is not used in the evenings, especially during the summer and this will encroach even further into the Russell Chambers residents' lives. In the summer residents are likely to have their windows open because of the heat and this will result in serious noise disturbance. The roof terrace will operate as a fire escape, which means that access is always available.

The fence that is proposed to reduce noise disturbance will cause loss of daylight and will block the view of the sky, especially for those flats lower down the building, which only catch a small glimpse of the sky as it is.

The noise-reducing fence will be less effective for flats on the upper stories. I don't believe that this has been taken into account in the acoustic report. If the applicant genuinely wished to minimise the impact of the proposed roof terrace on the occupants of Russell Chambers, instead of maximising the size of the terrace with a T-shaped configuration, they would have opted for an oblong design which would have the effect of placing the boundary much further away from the lightwell.

I consider that this is an inappropriate development for the location. It is unneighbourly and overbearing with regard to adjoining properties. It will cause noise and intrusion for neighbouring properties and loss of daylight. I would question the necessity for this development as according to the Design and Access Statement, Bloomsbury Square is a mere 30 metres from the applicant's property and tenants would be able to avail themselves of open space in that convenient near-by location.

Kathy Doyle