

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2015/2688/P	Richard Henchley	Flat 13 Beckett House, Westking Place WC1H8AH WC1H8AH WC1H8AH	22/07/2015 14:26:31	COMMNT	<p>GILLIAN AND RICHARD HENCHLEY REVISED SUBMISSION FOLLIWING NEIGHBIOURS' SUGGESTIONS</p> <p>WESTMINSTER AND KINGSWAY COLLEGE MAY 2015 PLANNING APPLICATION FOR CONSTRUCTION AT WESTKING PLACE IN THE BICYCLE ENCLOSURE OF:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A REFUSE AND RECYCLING STORE AND</li> <li>• A SMOKING ENCLOSURE</li> </ul> <p>This May 2015 application follows hard on the heels of the December 2014 application to infill the Undercroft and cover the service yard. It is a great shame that the College has not explained why it wishes to make these changes or to consult us.</p> <p>It will come as no surprise that we oppose a refuse and recycling store and an anti-social smoking enclosure opposite the flats where we and other families live, some with young children.</p> <p><b>THE REFUSE AND RECYCLING STORE</b></p> <p>The December 2014 Design and Access Statement was at pains to emphasise (Context section 2.2):  “The service yard would continue to accommodate the buildings’ refuse provision.....Consideration to the proximity of adjacent residential development to the proposed infill and service yard and is one of the primary planning considerations.</p> <p>In its Physical Context (2.3):  The four storey residential properties ... have windows looking toward the College....At the southern end of Westking Place is the refuse storage area for the residential blocks noted above.”</p> <p>And in its Final Brief (4.2):  “Extending the cover across the remaining yard is seen as offering a significant improvement of handling deliveries and refuse”</p> <p>The application contains no explanation for the proposal and accordingly should be rejected. As others have suggested, if consideration to the proximity of the adjacent residential development is genuinely a primary planning consideration the College should locate the refuse and recycling store within its covered service yard at the southern end of Westking Place opposite the refuse storage area for the residential blocks.</p> <p><b>THE SMOKING ENCLOSURE</b></p> <p>The Council’s guidance on the subject is clear:  “Q How can I control noise created by people outside?  A We suggest that you try to keep people away from residential areas”  “The law prohibits smoking in any public space that is “enclosed or substantially enclosed”  How can it be right for an educational establishment to seek to replace cycle storage with a smoking area when it must be Council policy to encourage exercise and bicycle travel. Again there is no explanation. The proposal is to concentrate smokers opposite the flats in the only covered area in the College’s external amenity space. Neil Jarman of Cole Jarman acoustic consultant’s comments:  “In itself numbers of people within the shelter will not be significant in the context of the numbers using the adjoining amenity space. However as a place of shelter it will be used more than the open areas.... (the mitigation measures proposed) will provide some screening ....therefore noise should not be a reason for refusing the proposal.”</p> <p>Mr Jarman appears never to have been present in a social gathering in an enclosed space where noise level increases in exponential proportion to proximity. He is confident that the screening measures proposed by Gibberd will be adequate without any measured assessment when the space may not be</p>

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
					<p>“substantially enclosed”. His assessment is uncalibrated and basically flawed.</p> <p>Again, the application should be rejected in the absence of both any explanation for the change and any proper assessment of the likely noise and social effects of concentrating a number of young people together in a small enclosed space in close proximity to a residential area.</p>
2015/2688/P	Liam O'Sullivan	5 Becket House Westking Place WC1H 8AH	22/07/2015 13:08:50 INT		<p>I object to having a refuse and recycling store and a smoking area opposite the flats where we and other families. Consideration to the proximity of the adjacent residential development where we live has to be treated as a primary planning concern. The effects of having people congregating in a small place are exclusively detrimental from a noise perspective. Furthermore, there is no rationale for these proposals and accordingly they should be rejected.</p>
2015/2688/P	yisha xue	3 Fairfield Road N8 9HG N8 9HG N8 9HG	22/07/2015 16:01:06 COMMNT		<p>It is disgusting idea for the college to think to put a smoking area and rubbish area in front of 45 private owned flats and some of them with young children and old people live there, not to mention smoking has to be banned completely and it also affect the peace of the area and path of the residence and students.</p>
2015/2688/P	yisha xue	3 Fairfield Road N8 9HG N8 9HG N8 9HG	22/07/2015 16:00:45 COMMNT		
2015/2688/P	yisha xue	3 Fairfield Road N8 9HG N8 9HG N8 9HG	22/07/2015 16:00:33 COMMNT		
2015/2688/P	Dominic Clark	11 Burleigh House Westking Place London WC1H 8AQ	22/07/2015 15:16:47 OBJ		<p>As representative of the owners of 11 Burleigh House I would like to object to the proposals of planning application 2015/2688/P.</p> <p>Refuse and recycling store - This is directly opposite our property and will have a negative impact on the quite enjoyment of our residents and property value. The area is likely to smell, attract pests and there will be noise and disruption from refuse collections.</p> <p>Enclosed smoking enclosure - We have a balcony overlooking this area. We object on the grounds that there will be cigarette smoke and noise from the students gathering there. Many families live in the block and this is not a good example to set. In addition to our direct concerns it is clearly not promoting healthy lifestyle choices to replace cycle storage with a smoking area.</p>

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2015/2688/P	Xiaopeng li	18 burleigh house Westking place London Wc1h 8aq	22/07/2015 17:15:58	OBJ	<p>Adverse effect on the residential amenity of Burleigh House and Beckett House residential building. Should there be a rubbish store and smoking area, there will likely to be extraordinary noise due to constant flow of people, and partial loss of privacy as ground floor flats and lower ground floor flats maybe overlooked.</p> <p>- The open aspect of Burleigh and Beckett house will be adversely affected due to high density associated with people gathering at smoking area. The visual impact of rubbish bin is likely to reduce to amenity of the open space from the balconies of burleigh house. The residential amenity of neighbouring owners are severely affected.</p> <p>-</p>
2015/2688/P	Conor Kehoe	Flat 12 Burleigh House Westking Place London WC1H 8AQ	22/07/2015 11:18:39	COMMEM AIL	<p>Dear Sir/Madam,</p> <p>I wish vigorously to object to the construction of an enclosed smoking area and the corresponding reduction in bicycle parking space proposed by Westminster College. The additional noise will be detrimental to the residents opposite. The screening proposed to mitigate the noise is designed on the assumption that the (I quote from the Cole Jarman letter) "numbers of people within the shelter will not be significant", I see absolutely no reason why this might be true - rather I anticipate a high concentration of people gathering in this space. Moreover, I understand that it is illegal to smoke in enclosed public spaces - further enclosure may mitigate noise but defeat the College's purpose of facilitating smoking. I also object to the reduction in amenity caused by the concentration of noxious tobacco fumes that will emanate from this smoking space. I understand that secondary inhalation of tobacco fumes is detrimental to health and am surprised that the planning permission application declares (q 23) that no hazardous waste is involved in this application - when its principal effect will be to facilitate and concentrate the production of tobacco fumes - very close to our residences I would therefore ask you to reject this application . I look forward to your favorable consideration of my request</p> <p>Yours Faithfully Conor</p>
2015/2688/P	yisha xue	3 Fairfield Road N8 9HG N8 9HG N8 9HG	22/07/2015 16:00:56	COMMNT	<p>It is disgusting idea for the college to think to put a smoking area and rubbish area in front of 45 private owned flats and some of them with young children and old people live there, not to mention smoking has to be banned completely and it also affect the peace of the area and path of the residence and students.</p>
2015/2688/P	yisha xue	3 Fairfield Road N8 9HG N8 9HG N8 9HG	22/07/2015 16:00:45	COMMNT	

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2015/2688/P	Mr and Mrs Greenbank	28 Hodwell Ashwell Baldock Herts SG7 5QQ	22/07/2015 16:43:45	COMNOT	Dear Sirs,  Application No: 2015/2688/P July 22, 2015

We write as leaseholders of a flat in Beckett House to object to the above proposals for the following reasons:

**Bin Store:**

The new bin store may be covered, but it is not clear with what material. The bin store is described as being enclosed by a timber fence, itself behind the existing railings. This is an unattractive solution. If the new bin store is permitted, we would ask the council to stipulate that it must be a quality brick structure, more in keeping with the current enclosed yard, and with a solid roof, (not opaque glass or similar) to conceal the bin store contents. That way it will be fully enclosed and inconspicuous, similar to the bin store to the north of Beckett House, opposite the proposed site.

**Noise:**

Noise is already an issue, exacerbated by the lack of soft landscaping generally in this area. The bins, the entrance gates etc, are frequently clanked and banged about from 6.00am in readiness for the 7.00am collection. Collections in the area also occur frequently each week. Regardless of this application not occurring, we would have been in touch with the college to ask whether they could take steps to minimise this.

**Standby generator noise:**

This equipment can generate considerable noise. The Coleman Jarman report does not mention the generator which will be across the road from the residents' bedrooms. Please do not permit this so close to residential accommodation.

**Metal rolling shutter:**

See earlier comments about about existing noise. The applicants say that the shutter will only be used during college opening hours, and not while power tools are in operation. The applicant confirmed to us today that opening hours are 9.00 - 5.00 on Monday to Thursday, and 9.00 - 3.00 on Fridays. A planning condition should therefore be added:

- limiting use within those hours, and
  - requiring that the metal shutter is never open when power tools are in use, and
  - requiring the college to use rubber stops on all new and existing doors and gates to minimise noise.
- This would be consistent with guidance in paragraph 123 of the NPPF that one should "mitigate and reduce to a minimum other adverse impacts on health and quality of life arising from noise from new development".

**Soft landscaping reduced:**

The proposal to remove about 4/5ths of the only significant soft landscaped area facing Westking Place is another blow. The additional hard landscaping will add to the noise and surface water run-off. The

**Application No:**    **Consultees Name:**    **Consultees Addr:**    **Received:**

**Comment:**    **Response:**

small remaining strip of soft landscaping is minimal and will be concealed from the neighbourhood by the proposed timber fencing. Perhaps the 6 ft. high fencing could be replaced with 3 ft. evergreen hedging visible from both side of the railings. A requirement to add more evergreen low hedging and other soft landscaping outside the existing brick walls (not just street trees) would reduce noise, absorb pollution and add amenity value.

New timber fencing:

The proposal to close off the college"s open spaces by adding a six foot wooden fence inside the existing metal railings is unwelcome. The current openness is attractive and ensures that Westking Place, as a pedestrian route without regular vehicular traffic, remains overlooked and "occupied" by those in the adjoining premises. This makes the road feel safe for pedestrians. The existing social space behind the college near Sidmouth Street is an important contributor to this atmosphere. The addition of the timber fence, cutting off the view of the street from the college grounds and in effect segregating the college and the residents would be a retrograde step. Encouraging good neighbour relations, good visibility and footfall are key elements in crime reduction.

The existing boundary combination of railings and brickwork is in keeping with the adjoining buildings. If the college could use brickwork to conceal the bin store, but retain a more open aspect and soft landscaping elsewhere, this would be beneficial arrangement for the neighbourhood as a whole.

Smoking:

We question the need for a smoking in a college designed for 16-19 year olds. Though it may be legal, smoking should not be encouraged. An isolated smoking area on Grays Inn Road, away from the residents and non-smoking students, would act as a general disincentive. We are concerned about the odour and debris which may result. We disagree with the analysis offered by Cole Jarman regarding the noise likely to emanate from the shelter. The enclosure will draw other non-smoking students into it during inclement weather.

Please ensure that our email address, phone number and residential address are not published.

Yours faithfully,  
Mr and Mrs Greenbank

---