
From: [REDACTED]
Sent: 07 August 2015 12:31
To: Planning; McDougall, Alex; Harrison, Adam (Councillor); Madlani, Rishi (Councillor); Francis, Sabrina (Councillor); Vincent, Sue (Councillor); keir.starmer.mp@parliament.uk; andrew@andrewdismore.org.uk
Cc: Jim Murray; Stephen Heath; Chris Gardener; Chrissie Ganjou; Kaori O'Connor; Maureen Stroud; Paul Spyker
Subject: planning application No: 2015/3605/P - objection

Dear Planning

I am writing to object to the planning application No: 2015/3605/P in its entirety

112A Great Russell Street, London WC1B 3NP

Bedford Court Mansions is a substantial Residential block of some 114 apartments facing onto Adeline Place and Bedford Avenue. This block of flats was built around the 1880-90's. There is also another Bedford Court Mansions directly opposite the entrance to the St Giles Hotel, part of the Bedford Estate - again on Bedford Avenue. Across the road is Bedford Square, one of the best-preserved set pieces of Georgian architecture in London and at the centre of the this stunning architecture are the beautiful Bedford Square gardens. We are also within the Bloomsbury Conservation area. Some residents in Bedford Court Mansions have lived here longer than the St Giles hotel, so this is an established residential area with long term residents.

Conservation Areas are areas that include important examples of social, cultural and aesthetic history must be safeguarded from indiscriminate or ill-considered change. These areas often contain listed buildings. However, it is not always enough to protect these buildings in isolation. Their surroundings and general environment are of equal importance and conservation areas are intended to protect that environment. Camden council has a responsibility therefore to make sure that the character of these areas is not diminished. They must identify and protect areas which have remained relatively undisturbed and are prized for this reason

The designation of a conservation area indicates Camden Council's positive commitment to these areas and its obligation to preserve and enhance the quality of the environment.

This proposal therefore needs to be thrown out. The submission neither enhances the local area, nor does it provide amenities or opportunities to support the local area.

- The St Giles was built in the 1970's and conditions that were stipulated at that time, are there to protect the local residents, and to ensure that the local area and environment are not impacted by

over development. Also to ensure that the day to day workings of the hotel and site don't have any adverse impact on residents.

- Over development: Im sure that if the St Giles had applied for a 800+ room hotel back in 1970s it would have been denied. It needs to be denied now. This site was not developed in the 70's to accommodate such a large number of rooms for a reason. All applications need to be looked at in terms of the site as a whole - not just as separate entities.
- Traffic: Plans are in process for the rerouting of traffic on Adeline Place, Great Russell Street, Bedford Square, Tottenham Court Road, Gower Street and other adjoining streets. Not only will congestion be increased, so too will disturbance to residents living along these streets. Deliveries of any sort will have a major impact on street movement and noise pollution and disturbance. Tour buses now cause major disruption, motors running, parking in resident parking bays. With the proposed new traffic routes, any increase in hotel rooms could only cause more congestion because more buses are needed to bring people into town. Not to mention any increase in taxi traffic, and more recently rickshaws at all hours of the night.
- Need for Parking facilities in London: The need for parking facilities in London will never decrease. With the improvements being made to the area, notably this end of Oxford Street, out of towners, or even Londoners wanting to drive to the centre will continue to need parking facilities. It is wrong to assume therefore that just because the tube facilities are being improved that less people will drive into town. There may be parking facilities in other areas, but like any parking facility, people want to park closest to their destination, not have to walk a mile or so. The loss of 140 parking spaces is significant.
- Deliveries: We have over the years, and continue to have, issues with deliveries on Adeline Place. It is well documented in my submission of about 5 years ago to the council, of a breach of the conditions of the planning permission granted in Sept 1975 for this site. There were a number of conditions attached to this planning permission, one of them being that no loading or unloading of goods be from any other place other than the loading bay on Bedford Avenue. This applied to any business on this site back then and should also apply to any business on this site in the future. The proposal is to have a refuse area on Adeline Place side of the site as well as a lift which I assume is for deliveries to the lower levels. This would be a clear breach of this condition. Only last week I emailed about the trucks unloading at 5am on Adeline Place and going through the "fire exit" of the St Giles. The owners have no mechanism to control this, nor monitor it, and these rules are being blatantly flouted. The task of monitoring and reporting always lies with the people most affected, which are the residents who live opposite which includes me. It is not the responsibility of residents to be the monitor and its a waste of council time and money to continually have to enforce it. The council should charge the offender for each time a complaint is made/upheld. That makes more sense.
- Pollution: The air quality will be impacted more with the proposed air extraction/intake vents and condenser units. Their location and size and the fact that they will be running 24/7 can only exasperate the problem. Already the pollution from the existing restaurants has caused major

problems. Noise upon noise upon noise = unacceptable. No louvers are going to stop this noise, they don't now! Given also that a lot of the proposed hotel space is given to services, indicates the level of air extraction required to service the proposed hotel. This can't be good for local residents. I've lost count of the times I have contacted the council concerning extractor units from this site. Enough is enough. The residents living opposite have had enough. Our building has not changed nor will it, but this site seems to think it has the free reign to do whatever it likes despite a community of residents living opposite.

- **Precedence:** I understand the Criterion have proposed or are proposing a pod style hotel in the Trocadero which is a completely different location than the site at St Giles. Piccadilly Circus is smack bang in the middle of London, commercial businesses are all around the area is open 24/7 and therefore it is right that Piccadilly Circus have this sort of development. This site is nearly surrounded on all sides by residents and in the evening is quiet. Criterion Capital are just trying to squeeze every penny out of this site at the expense of residents who live opposite. This can't happen - this site was not built for such over development. Does London really need hotel rooms underground? There are planned 15000 hotel rooms in London in the next few years, we also have the competition by the likes of Airbnb providing further accommodation services to visitors to London. Rampant overdevelopment of sites like this especially in this location can't be allowed
- **Location:** Tottenham Court road is undergoing a significant makeover, and the council has gone to great efforts to listen to residents, about their concerns and paint a picture of harmonious integration with the local community. Camden Council also needs to protect existing areas especially high density residential areas. Residents don't want Leicester Square, Soho, or Piccadilly Circus, we want a decent standard of living and environment and expect Camden Council to protect and uphold this. We were here first!
- **Jobs for local people:** Most of the workers are foreigners, where English is their second language and considering the rents in the area, can't afford to live locally. Jobs for locals therefore is nonsense.
- **Noise:** It's not enough to publish noise limits as examples for specific items as Hawkins Environmental has done. What this doesn't show is the impact of all these machines/plants working at the same time. Add these proposals to the existing units currently in use at the St Giles hotel and restaurants and we have a problem. I think "Houston we have a problem" is more appropriate.
- **Workers who gather on Adeline Place** for coffee breaks early in the morning can be heard very audibly from inside my apartment. At times I can't keep my windows open because their cigarette smoke comes across the road and in through the windows. This proposal is for a non smoking hotel, guests are going to congregate and smoke where? It won't be in front of the YMCA but more likely they will congregate on Adeline Place to smoke. There are no communal facilities in this proposal. The constant noise from any electric substation, plus ventilation, extraction and the list continues will only compound the problem. Outdoor condensing units for this size of development on 24/7 will be very audible, and this is unacceptable. This is outrageous that the developers are

even considering this. Noise travels and unfortunately it is usually heard most opposite where the noise waves slam into opposite flats.

- Water services: the proposal has not provided any information concerning this as Thames Water was unable to give responses. The Council therefore should not allow any further development to proceed on this site without it and no "Grampian Style" condition should be agreed as part of any agreement to proceed from Criterion or anyone else. What will be the impact on local residents water supply?
- Criterion spokesman: When concerns about this application were raised nearly 3 years ago, in a Evening Standard story, it was reported that a spokesman for Criterion in a rebuff to concerns about this development from local residents, said that their weren't any residents within at least 500 meters - did he not look across the road? Sorry Criterion, but either youre trying to hoodwink the public to gain support, or you are not concerned about your neighbours - and it appears you are doing both. They also say that the development is for the "discerning traveller" (same article) - nonsense, What does a discerning traveller look like I ask? They will take money from whomever comes in the door be that backpacker, tourist, drug dealer or business man.

Conclusion: I am against this proposal in its entirety. The proposal does not provide any positive elements to the surrounding residential buildings, but will cause disruption to residents lives and health. This proposal far exceeds the original intention of the site and Camden Council has an obligation to protect the area, given its conservation status. The continual constant encroachment of business on this site is not wanted, nor desired. This is a large established significant residential area, and should be protected at the utmost.

Regards

David Judd
104a Bedford Court Mansions
London WC1B 3AG