

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2024/1267/P	Diana Scarrott	31/05/2024 21:29:12	OBJ	<p>I sent a brief comment earlier to echo what Debbie Radcliffe of BRAG has said about this application and the lack of community involvement. I confirmed that there had been no discussion with residents in this block, Tamar House, 6-14 Tavistock Place, just across the road from Tavis House.</p> <p>Although the 2021 application claimed thorough local consultation, it described 6-14 Tavistock Place as 'student accommodation' (DAS 2.1). Our 31 flats are plainly residential and always have been. I also noted, in the covering letter of March 28 2024 with the current application, that only Burton Street residents were consulted. I am surprised that missing other nearby residents was not picked up in the applicant's discussions with the planning department. As it is, consultation with local residents has been seriously inadequate.</p> <p>Turning to the new application, it is described as a 'minor material amendment' to the 2023 decision. But the amended DAS actually says: 'This section 73 application has been submitted to allow Tavis House to accommodate life science uses and become part of the growing knowledge sector for this locale'. This very significant change of use is proposed without any community discussion. The 2021 application proposed an office refurbishment and said: 'Conversations, correspondence and meetings with neighbours and stakeholders will continue to inform the Applicant's approach to the proposals'. But this has not happened. Of all things, surely proposed laboratory use so close to residents should have been shared and discussed. We have all read about what may or may not have leaked out of the Wuhan laboratory. What sort of life science laboratories are proposed here? What are the risks? What will be the protections? Is there a planned tenant? Far too little is known about what this building will be used for under this new application.</p> <p>I am also concerned about the impact on Mary Ward House. This building is not just an architectural gem. It is part of the knowledge sector itself, providing meeting and conference space for universities and hospitals, especially. I know this as a trustee of a UCLH charity (reg no 266669). We recently funded a meeting at Mary Ward House for a team of hospital staff whose normal workplace is underground. They chose Mary Ward House for an awayday because of its daylight. The proposed rear infill at Tavis House will reduce light in rooms at the west end of the building. But the April 2024 heritage and townscape statement makes no mention of this. The building is said to be 'somewhat overshadowed' but the statement does not mention that the rear infill will overshadow it even more. I could find no measurement of light impact in the application. The noise impact from proposed demolition also needs to be quantified. How long will it last? How necessary is it?</p> <p>The concerns about this development in Mary Ward House are therefore very understandable. A speculative development for the knowledge sector should not be allowed at the expense of a functioning educational resource next door.</p> <p>I therefore object to this application.</p> <p>I also ask that the applicants are instructed – whatever happens next - to set up a process for discussing plans with people living or working near to Tavis House, in order to minimise nuisance.</p>