Application No: 2014/6804/P	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr: 70	Received: 26/05/2015 20:27:55	Comment:	Printed on: 28/05/2015 09:05:19 Response: hhhhhhhhh
2014/0804/P	mr	marchmont st	20/03/2013 20.27.35	COMMINI	
2014/6804/P	Colin Flint	Flat 2 82 Marchmont Street Camden London WC1N 1AG	27/05/2015 11:29:30	COMMEMP ER	This revised application does nothing to deal with the objections of residents in Marchmont Street. The line of sight data provided does not deal with noise pollution from the proposed "amenity" area (which is in fact a drinking terrace). Noise in a restricted area does not travel in straight lines!. The proposed fire escape will impede the escape of residents in the event of a major fire on Marchmont Street
2014/6804/P	Stephen Izatt	Thinkfarm 84 Marchmont St London WC1N 1AG	27/05/2015 14:41:39	OBJEMPER	Whilst I appreciate that there has been some adjustment to the application, there is still interference with our light as a result of the planned development. The windows at that end of our building are south facing and as such are our most constant source of natural light, year round. We have no windows on the Easterly elevation and there are buildings already in close proximity to our west. We are an established business specialising in design. The natural light in our studio has always been an important factor in our location here as it was with the design business that existed here before we arrived. The nature of work here has been consistent for decades and this planned development takes away a key benefit and right to natural light from a business that brings jobs and visitors to the area. We strongly object to the application on the basis of the natural light that we will lose.
					We also strongly object to the application due to the additional noise that we expect to be raised by people using the proposed balcony. The area is relatively enclosed and if people are out on the balcony and at best talking and at worst holding social functions with music or larger crowds etc it will interfere with our business day to day. Sound will be amplified given a 'sound box' effect where noise will reflect from walls around the balcony area.
					Overall I hope that this second application will be rejected as it does not go far enough to allay the reasons for our fears. Again, I strongly object to the application.

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Printed on: 28/05/2015 09:05 Response:	5:19
2014/6804/P	Patricia Howse	82 Marchmont Street	27/05/2015 15:48:08	INT	Some new material has been submitted since the Camden site visit. It is not clear how the new drawings address the concerns of residents with properties facing the crowded, cramped space that is the right angle between 23 Tavistock Place and 76-84 Marchmont Street. There is a drawing headed "overlooking diagrams". Overlooking is not our concern. It is light, noise, air (including smokers exhalations) and further crowding of this space that we are worried about. This is not Belgravia. Residents do not have trees and open gardens around their properties. It is a rabbit warren of offices, domestic flats and shops which has developed over a hundred or so years and quite frankly it is now full. Modern building regulations would not allow such close proximity and modern planners should not upset the delicate balance of light, air, noise and building clutter (including anti burglar bars, some though not many fire escapes) flat roofs and passageways that exist. With respect, this is a vanity project which merely serves to enhance the perceived value of 23B. It does not add much needed housing to the area, nor is it necessary for any purpose of safety or access. I am extremely concerned, as a fairly elderly (65) resident of number 82, that further blocking of the circulating air at the back of my flat, and the addition of a high level outdoor reception area will severely affect air quality and the quiet enjoyment of my property. Neighbours have already commented that vent pipes from the launderette will be impeded. I would refer you to the 2010 Camden Policy DP26 which undertakes only to grant permission for development that does not cause harm to [neighbours] amenity. Every one of factors a) to f) are engaged here; though the principal ones are b), c) d) and e). Camden"s air quality is already poor. In built up Victorian streets such as these even small changes in the microclimate have a disproportionate effect on residents. When those resident are elderly, as many of us are, this is magnified again. I urge you to refu	
2014/6804/P	Stephen Izatt	Thinkfarm 84 Marchmont St London WC1N 1AG	27/05/2015 14:44:26	OBJEMAIL	Whilst I appreciate that there has been some adjustment to the application, there is still interference with our light as a result of the planned development. The windows at that end of our building are south facing and as such are our most constant source of natural light, year round. We have no windows on the Easterly elevation and there are buildings already in close proximity to our west. We are an established business specialising in design. The natural light in our studio has always been an important factor in our location here as it was with the design business that existed here before we arrived. The nature of work here has been consistent for decades and this planned development takes away a key benefit and right to natural light from a business that brings jobs and visitors to the area. We strongly object to the application on the basis of the natural light that we will lose. We also strongly object to the application due to the additional noise that we expect to be raised by people using the proposed balcony. The area is relatively enclosed and if people are out on the balcony and at best talking and at worst holding social functions with music or larger crowds etc it will interfere with our business day to day. Sound will be amplified given a 'sound box' effect where noise will reflect from walls around the balcony area. Overall I hope that this second application will be rejected as it does not go far enough to allay the reasons for our fears. Again, I strongly object to the application.	