

[REDACTED]

From: H. Stern [REDACTED]
Sent: 21 August 2014 16:25
To: Planning
Subject: Planning application 2014/4639/P & 2014/ /3894/A

To whom it may concern, I strongly object to the following planning applications: 2014/4639/P & 2014/3894/A. My address is 113, Bedford Court Mansions, Bedford Avenue, WC1B3AG. Horatia Stern.

 This email is free from viruses and malware because [avast! Antivirus](#) protection is active.

From: Mark de Rivaz [redacted]
Sent: 20 August 2014 09:38
To: Planning
Cc: Planning, Bloomsbury Association
Subject: FW: RESEND: APPLICATION FOR PLANNING PERMISSION 2014/4639/P -
Attachments: 2014-4639-P_BloomsburyAssoc_170814.pdf

Dear Sirs

On behalf of The Bedford Estates I write to support The Bloomsbury Association's objection to this application and am in agreement with all that is said in their representations (attached)

Mark de Rivaz
Steward



London Office

[redacted]
www.bedfordestates.com

29a Montague Street, London WC1B 5BL



For the latest information updates go to www.bedfordestates.com

Bedford Estates London Estates LLP is a limited liability partnership registered in England and Wales with registered number OC383002. Its registered office is at 29a Montague Street, London WC1V 5BL

From: Stephen Heath [mailto:[redacted]]
Sent: 20 August 2014 08:37
To: planning@camden.gov.uk
Cc: olivier.nelson@camden.gov.uk; Adam Harrison; Rishi Madlani; Sabrina Francis; Hannah Parker; [redacted]
Subject: RESEND: APPLICATION FOR PLANNING PERMISSION 2014/4639/P

ST GILES HOTEL
12 BEDFORD AVENUE, LONDON WC1B 3GH

INSTALLATION OF TIMBER CLADDING TO GROUND FLOOR ENTRANCE IN CONNECTION WITH HOTEL USE
Application for planning permission: 2014/4639/P
Application for advertisement consent: 2014/3894/A

The Bloomsbury Association's comments on this application are attached.

Stephen Heath
On behalf of The Bloomsbury Association

This is an email from Bedford Estates. This email and any attached files are intended for the recipient only. If you are not the intended recipient you must not use, disclose, distribute, copy, print or rely upon this email. If you have received this email in error please notify the author by replying to this email. Any views presented in this email are the author's and do not necessarily represent those of the company. Please check this email and any attachments for the presence of viruses. Bedford Estates accepts no liability for any damage caused by any virus transmitted by this email.

From: Salwa Heath [REDACTED]
Sent: 20 August 2014 08:15
To: Planning
Cc: Nelson, Olivier
Subject: ST GILES HOTEL - APPLICATION FOR PLANNING PERMISSION 2014/4639/P

ST GILES HOTEL
12 BEDFORD AVENUE, LONDON WC1B 3GH

INSTALLATION OF TIMBER CLADDING TO GROUND FLOOR ENTRANCE IN CONNECTION WITH HOTEL USE
Application for planning permission: 2014/4639/P
Application for advertisement consent: 2014/3894/A

I object to this application for the following reasons:

- a) This application for planning permission is for the "Installation of timber cladding to ground floor entrance in connection with hotel use". There is an existing canopy structure but it is illegal development. The applications are to replace it not with a new awning but another fixed, structural canopy of the same dimensions utilising parts of the existing, illegal canopy and to which illuminated signage is fixed. Neither this application or the associated application for Advertisement Consent are described as seeking planning permission for this new canopy structure. They should.
- b) The reason why the Hudson's House bar requires a fully open frontage and a weatherproof, structural canopy that extends well over the footway is not explained. A tables and chairs licence proposed utilising the space beneath the illegal canopy last year and was refused. In a review of the hotel's Premises Licence, under the Licensing Act, use of the public highway as an extension to the bar's business was also refused. Both refusals were because of concerns for obstruction of the public right of way, public safety, and the impact on public and residential amenity. These concerns still stand and this canopy must be seen as being intended for the same purpose: a devious way of effecting a previously unauthorised use. The Council should stand by its principles and refuse this application.
- c) If this proposal is approved, there would be three structural canopies on the Bedford Avenue frontage to the St Giles Hotel, each would be of a different design and the timber cladding proposed to be retained would add to this visual incoherence. This would adversely impact on the architectural expression of the original building, the streetscape of Bedford Avenue and on the adjacent Bloomsbury Conservation Area.
- d) Timber cladding is entirely the wrong material for this classic 'brutalist' building and detracts from its architectural integrity - it looks ridiculous - and has already been deemed unacceptable.
- e) The proposed lighting is unsuitable for a residential area. The current illuminated sign was briefly on the outside of the building and enforcement action was immediately taken to have it removed. It has since reappeared inside the bar and is clearly damaging to residential amenity as well as to the Bloomsbury Conservation Area opposite. This proposal seeks to bring the lighting outside again and extend it to all three sides of the canopy which will be even more damaging.
- f) The pavement there is not wide, and is already encroached upon by ugly and bulky furniture that the bar has permission to use on its 'forecourt' up to a fixed time in the evening. This structural canopy would provide a new line, 3 metres out into the pavement, that we can expect the bar users to encroach upon, further reducing the pavement space for the rest of us. Changes to pedestrian traffic arising from the West End Project are likely to make this more important. In addition to the obstruction, there are issues of visual and aural amenity for residents in Bedford Court Mansions opposite.
- g) The applicant claims that no new ventilation will be included. A powerful new fan blowing out cooking smells into Adeline Place was recently installed external to the bar and is visible from the street. It was done without planning permission and has been the subject of substantial complaints from local residents. This should be included in the application and not considered as 'existing'.

Salwa Heath
102 Bedford Court Mansions, Bedford Avenue, London WC1B 3AG

[REDACTED]

From: Lailan Young [REDACTED]
Sent: 19 August 2014 16:26
To: Planning
Cc: Nelson, Olivier
Subject: St Giles Hotel - Application for planning permission 2014/4639/P

To: planning@camden.gov.uk
Copy to: olivier.nelson@camden.gov.uk

From: [REDACTED]

Subject: St Giles Hotel - Application for planning permission 2014/4639/P

I object to this application for the following reasons:

a) The application for planning permission is for "Installation of timber cladding to ground floor entrance in connection with hotel use". There is an existing canopy structure but it is illegal development. The application is to replace it not with a new awning but another fixed canopy of the same dimensions utilising parts of the existing, illegal canopy and to which illuminated signage is fixed. Neither this application or the associated application for Advertisement Consent seek planning permission for this new canopy structure. They should.

b) Should the proposal be approved, there would be three structural canopies on the Bedford Avenue frontage to the St Giles Hotel, each of a different design and the timber cladding proposed to be retained in the recess would add to this visual incoherence. This would adversely impact on the architectural expression of the original building, the streetscape of Bedford Avenue and on the adjacent Bloomsbury Conservation Area

c) The timber cladding is the wrong material for the building and detracts from its architectural integrity - it looks ridiculous - and has already been deemed unacceptable.

d) The proposed lighting is unsuitable for a residential area. The current illuminated sign was briefly on the outside of the building and enforcement action was immediately taken to have it removed. It has since reappeared inside the bar and is clearly damaging to residential amenity as well as to the Bloomsbury Conservation Area opposite. This proposal seeks to bring the lighting outside again and extend it to all three sides of the canopy which will be even more damaging.

e) The pavement there is not wide, and is encroached upon by the ugly and bulky furniture that the bar has permission for up to a time in the evening. This canopy would provide a new line, 3 metres out into the pavement, that we can expect the bar users to encroach upon, further reducing the pavement space for the rest of us. Changes to road use from the West End Project are likely to make this more important. In addition to the obstruction, there are issues of visual and aural amenity for residents in Bedford Court Mansions opposite.

f) On point 22 of the application, the applicant claims that no new ventilation will be included. In fact, a powerful new fan blowing out cooking smells into Adeline Place was recently installed external to the building and visible from the street, without planning permission. It has been the subject of substantial complaints from local residents. This should be considered as part of the application - and should certainly not be regarded as 'existing'.

L YOUNG

e: 