| Application No: | Consultees Name: | Consultees Addr: | Received: | Comment: | Printed on: 30/09/2014 09:05:21 Response: |
|-----------------|------------------|--|---------------------|----------|---|
| 2014/4709/P | Diana Scarrott | 6 Tavistock Place London WC1H 9RD | 10/09/2014 23:38:23 | | I live on the ground floor of the same block, underneath flat 23. I was not on the list of neighbours to be told of these proposals. But if there is a need for scaffolding to take materials up to the top of the building then it will be in front of my windows so I hope it could be there for as short a time as possible. |
| | | | | | On the plans for this flat generally, my only comment is on the proposed extra floor. Although it will not be visible from the pavement across the road it will be seen from the building behind us and higher up across the road. This is quite an elegant block and it seems a pity to make the roof line untidy. |
| | | | | | I remember that 2010/5429/L (about air conditioning units on the roof of 4 Tavistock Place) was turned down with this comment: 'The proposed air conditioning unit, by reason of its position and appearance would be detrimental to the setting and historic interest of the Grade II listed building, contrary to policy CS14 of the Local Development Framework Camden Core Strategy etc etc. |
| | | | | | I don't think there is much difference between an extra floor for a bedroom and an extra room for air conditioning and decisions ought to be consistent. Having said that I have to admit to wanting the air conditioning units on the roof at the time because the alternative (putting them in the garden of number 4) ruined a very pleasant garden and gardens are precious in central London. |
| 2014/4709/P | Diana Scarrott | 6 Tavistock Place London WC1H 9RD | 10/09/2014 23:38:46 | COMMNT | |
| 2014/4709/P | Louis Stein | 14A Tavistock House 12 Tavistock Place London WC1H 9RD | 03/09/2014 09:24:58 | OBJ | I object to the application on the following grounds: 1. Tamar House facade is listed and the proposed works and alterations are not in keeping with the built environment of the building. The extension at third floor level will be the highest point of the building and may set a precedent for future unsympathetic alterations which are not in keeping with the layout and design of the building. |
| | | | | | 2. The glazed extension at third floor level can be seen from the South facing gardens and flats opposite and is not in keeping with the layout and design rest of the building. |
| | | | | | 3. The works proposed are major and I am concerned about how the building materials etc will be lifted to the top story of the building. There is a single resident lift which is not suitable for the carrying of such materials. |
| | | | | | 4. The works proposed are major can be a major noise nuisance throughout the building (30 flats). |

| | | | | | Printed on: 30/09/2014 09:05 | 5:21 |
|-----------------|---------------------------|--|---------------------|----------|--|------|
| Application No: | Consultees Name: | Consultees Addr: | Received: | Comment: | Response: | |
| 2014/4709/P | Zygmunt Nowak-Solinski | Flat 18 Tamar House 12 Tavistock Place London WC1H 9RD | 06/09/2014 13:27:49 | COMMNT | Comments also apply to both 2014/4708/P & 2014/4709/P | |
| | | | | | I live in Flat 18, which is directly below Flat 23. My concerns are as follows: | |
| | | | | | - Vibration damage to my ceiling during the demolition works and building works in Flat 23. Owner of Flat 23 will have to provide monitoring of my ceiling from start to finish to ensure no damage or make better any damage. | |
| | | | | | - Noise concern (Our lease with the freeholder entitles us to have "quite enjoyment" of the premises at any time. Proposed work will be noisy and likely to be in terms of months rather than days, which will be in breach of the lease.) | |
| | | | | | - Works will involve using common areas (staircase, lift etc.) and will make dirty, damage and disrupt these areas. The use of the lift to transport building materials will damage the already faulty lift mechanism. | |
| | | | | | - Any works should not be permitted on common areas regardless of them being used or not. | |
| | | | | | - Any use of scaffolding will compromise security of my flat, other flats and the building. | |
| | | | | | - The addition of a storey indicates a change in structural loading. The current structure, from top floor to foundation level, must be confirmed (calculations) to have enough capacity for the additional storey according to at least the building standard of when Tamar House was built. Any new structure needs to be designed to the latest standards (at least BS 8110 for concrete design). A report, including structural calculations, should be issued to all owners as the structural integrity affects the whole building. | |
| | | | | | - Tamar house was built in the '70s, during which ASBESTOS was widely used in the construction industry and therefore likely in the construction of Tamar House. Irritation to any ASBESTOS will make it airborne and will travel down the risers through the building, which serves many other flats in the building. This will put the residents' health in danger of future respiratory problems. Seeing as this is a real risk to personal health, a full ASBESTOS survey must be undertaken and reports should be provided to anybody who could be affected before any works are to begin. Nothing less than a 100% guarantee of no future health risks should be allowed. The HSE should also be involved in this. | |
| | | | | | Please feel free to contact me to discuss any of the above. | |
| | | | | | Thanks | |

| Application No: | Consultees Name: | Consultees Addr: | Received: | Comment: | Response: |
|-----------------|--------------------|---|---------------------|----------|---|
| 2014/4709/P | Jocelyn Chatterton | 9 Tamar House 12 Tavistock Place London WC1H 9RD | 09/09/2014 20:00:30 | OBJ | Tamar House is a Grade II listed building, extensive alteration to the exterior is against the ethos of listed buildings. The exterior of the building would be modified and the balance of the design compromised. |
| | | | | | Do the leaseholders own the roof? Are the walls not party walls which presumably includes the roof and roof space? Do the applicants have authority to invade the roof space when as leaseholders we all pay for the upkeep of the building which includes keeping the building (and roof) in good repair? |
| | | | | | How will the work be carried out? How will building materials be carried up to the work? Our lift is old and not very big, the staircases are narrow and I can foresee a tremendous amount of disruption if materials required for a roof extension are carried within the lift or up the stairs. This is not a small project, it is a large building project wholly unsuited to a residential building. |
| | | | | | The fabric of the building is such that drills etc reverberate as vibration throughout the building passing along the internal structure causing much noise and disturbance. The building is occupied by residents, including retired people, who are there all day, it is not an office block with vacant periods. |
| | | | | | What about the disruption to tenants close by and the matter of their light? |
| | | | | | I would like to stress that I am wholly opposed to this extensive roof development proposed by flat 23 on the grounds of distorting the fabric of the building, the noise and nuisance it would cause to residents, and on health and safety grounds. Regarding the latter I include not only problems with the actual build but also the problem of noise and dust that be the result of such a project. |

Printed on: 30/09/2014

09:05:21