

Jim Monahan
Flat 5 Goldsmith Court, Stukeley Street London WC2B 5LF
E: monahanjim04@gmail.com

2nd April 2025

By email

Dear David Fowler,

Planning Application 2023/2510/P

Application concerning the Condition Servicing Strategy 2024/4662/P

I objected to this application on 19 December 2024, and requested that the matter be referred to the full planning committee as the proposals represented a worsening of the original servicing arrangements. My representation and those of many others, fell on deaf ears at the planning department, who true to form, showed their customary disregard of public comment on large scale development proposals and determined to deal with with revised application at officer level using delegated powers. Thankfully due to the intervention of one Member on the planning committee, the matter is to be considered by the full planning committee this Thursday 3 April. Please can you make this email/letter available to all members of the committee before the matter is considered.

Your report to committee recommends that deliveries to the office block would be significantly reduced by way of the adoption of a consolidated deliveries plan in accordance with Transport for London guidance. The report also acknowledges that this would also reduce traffic congestion and the negative environmental impact of servicing the massive development on the locality.

The applicant does not want to have this constraint placed on their future leaseholders so, as is the norm with Camden's Planning department, the report makes no such firm requirement. As a consequence there is no recommendation that revised planning permission will only be granted if a consolidated delivery plan is adopted.

Instead the planning report relies on making unachievable demands on existing service bays which it turns out are already inadequate for 'servicing' the existing businesses in the vicinity of the new massive office development. What is more the planning committee has not even got the powers to delineate new on street service bays so the officers report is making recommendations with regard to the Grape Street parking bay over which they have no powers and have no secure foundations.

The matter as always is quite simple. Will the Planning Committee make a stand against the developer, in line with local knowledgeable representations and the officer 'preferred' solution, namely a consolidated delivery plan must accompany the development approval or not?

It will be entirely predictable if the Committee, once again, acquiesce to the developer's narrative and do not adopt a consolidated plan. The Committee has already granted approval to this scheme despite it providing an inadequate quantity of housing, and what accommodation is to be provided will be woefully below all environmental and amenity standards not least in that 89% of all habitable rooms will require artificial light all day, and will have dreadful overlooking problems. In addition the development entails the desecration of the Bloomsbury Conservation Area - the most significant in London - as a result of the construction of a massive tower block and the complete irradiation of the of buildings that the Camden Plan states should not be demolished.

It occurs to me that applicants for a vacancy in Camden's planning department would be likely to be appointed senior roles if they can demonstrate no regard to the meaning of public consultation, no regard to planning policies contained in the statutory Local Plan and be utterly subservient to large scale developers's 'requirements'. The same could also be said of the majority of members of the planning committee.

But maybe just this time it might be different?

Yours sincerely
Jim Monahan