

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2015/3406/P	Paul Cockle	Flat 3 13 Tavistock Place London WC1H 9SH	20/08/2015 15:39:26	INT	<p>These comments on the application are from 13 Tavistock Place Ltd. 13 Tavistock Place Ltd is the eponymous freeholder. All directors are also residents. Our property is next door to the proposed development.</p> <p>We are submitting our concerns about the proposed developments based upon the plan documents submitted on this web site and the information provided by the developer during their consultation period. It, therefore, touches on wider issues than might be deduced from the plans presented on this web site.</p> <p>Access</p> <p>Lorry access during construction will pass through a single entrance barely 10 metres from our own entrance. Lorry access to the property during the construction works is a primary concern. Given that the road is expected to remain open throughout the building works, and there is a (extremely busy) cycle lane directly outside the property, we are concerned for our own and wider public safety. Our building has elderly people and mothers who use push prams.</p> <p>We are particularly concerned by the implied level of lorry movements in and out of the construction site exit adjacent provided during the course of BRI's public consultation. From the discussions at the meeting it appeared that there could be an average of one movement per every six minutes, which is an extremely high figure and will cause great disruption to both road users (in terms of travel along Tavistock Place) and residents (because of the accompanying noise and increase in vehicle pollution). We expect the approved plan to restrict both the average and peak movements to a level that is safe and provides a reasonable enjoyment of our property.</p> <p>At the meeting BRI informed us that there would be no need for vehicles to reverse into the site, with the attendant warning noises, because there would be a site turntable (shown on plans). It remains unclear whether the turntable will remain for the whole of the construction period and whether it will accommodate all traffic or only a percentage. Beeping reversing signals on a frequent basis are unacceptable to our residents' enjoyment of their property.</p> <p>Officers will need to exact precise details on how these traffic movements will be marshaled safely for residents entering and leaving 13 Tavistock Place. They should only accede to those that are reasonable given the proximity of the site to residents windows.</p> <p>Adequate provision is required in the approved plan for daily cleaning routines of the entrance, including the short roadway over the pavement.</p> <p>Noise</p> <p>During the current building works in Cartwright Gardens there has been daily disruption to residents as a result of the digging of the foundations for the new halls of residence: as yet the published plans do not show how this will be minimized for 15-17 Tavistock Place? In this instance the University Halls Construction Plan failed to identify adequately the underground noise/vibration transmission. Even in 13 Tavistock Place this noise was very intrusive despite its straight line distance from the Halls – it felt</p>

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
					<p>like the noise was originating with the period. We expect Camden to press for a full noise transmission exercise and, if necessary, a restriction on the hours that digging noises are permitted.</p> <p>Some of our leaseholders and residents work from home during the day while others are at home with their children and this is an issue of considerable concern to them.</p> <p>In addition we expect reasonable assurances that: (a) site noise will be adequately monitored; (b) the results of such monitoring will be reported to all interested parties; and (c) that noise thresholds triggering work suspension while causes are investigated should be set at 'residential' rather than 'commercial' levels (see Garden Halls Noise reports for the distinction).</p> <p>We are also concerned that BRI plan to use the Genesis Housing Association car park during the construction period, whose wall is 1m from the living rooms and bedrooms of residents. Higher noise controls are required for this area.</p> <p>The development proposals include the installation of a large air-filtration unit on the roof. We are concerned that the undisclosed, permanent noise output of this system will lead to a serious deterioration in the quality of life for residents.</p> <p>Structural issues</p> <p>We are concerned that the digging of basements and site construction generally could threaten the foundations of our building and a vulnerable party wall with Genesis Housing Association. At the meeting in May we were told that there would be an opportunity for us to appoint our own, independent, surveyor at BRI's expense to advise us on the impact of construction work on 13 Tavistock Place and to monitor our property before, during and after the building works to ensure that there have been no adverse effects to the structure. We consider this reasonable and something that the Planning Department should insist upon prior to granting permission.</p> <p>A further aspect concerns a wall that runs along the back of both 15 and 13 Tavistock Place: from a comment made at the meeting, it seems that during construction work part of this wall may need to be removed. This is not mentioned in the plans. The Planning Department should clarify this so that we may sensible comment upon these plans. We think that a Planning Authority acting reasonably would accept this.</p> <p>Dust and pollution</p> <p>We are greatly concerned that dust from lorry movements and all aspects of the construction work generally will affect the quality of life of our residents during construction. We, therefore, seek adequate measures to minimize such pollution: at the very least, we expect BRI to pay for the regular cleaning of our windows during construction work. This should be a planning condition.</p> <p>Visual Intrusion</p> <p>We are disappointed that the sight lines adopted in the plans submitted take no account of views of residents from the apartments they occupy. While removal of the huts would be an improvement, the</p>

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
					<p>height of the building, taken at its highest point, including the flues is a negative and that the design should be reconsidered. We do not understand why the transient view of a passer-by should be privileged over the persistent view of a resident.</p> <p>According to the plans submitted the intention is to move the fire escape tower and place it somewhere else on site. We wish to express, in the strongest possible terms, that we would oppose it being stationed for 2 years in the car park behind our property in such a way that it overshadows our property, whether flats or garden. If there is no other on-site alternative then the tower should be dismantled and transported to one of UCL's or School of Hygiene and Tropical Medicine's properties.</p> <p>Community benefits</p> <p>In view of the considerable disruption and risks to our building and residents that we have highlighted above, we propose that BRI should address the following community benefits: (a) re-build or strengthen the party wall between 13 Tavistock Place and the Genesis Housing Association car park; (b) design and implement soft plantings along Tavistock Place from Marchmont Street to Woburn Place; (c) provide experimental 'silent tarmac' for the same stretch of road.</p>

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2015/3406/P	James Pender and Lisa Klazek	18b Burton Street London WC1H 9AQ	19/08/2015 20:07:58	OBJ	<p>We are opposed to the planning application as we consider it will have an adverse effect on residential amenity for the neighbourhood, an adverse visual impact and an unacceptably high density.</p> <p>The proposed development is closely flanked by listed buildings on Burton Street and Cartwright Gardens. The heritage statement supplied with the planning application states that "the site is not seen or experienced from these listed buildings" (para 1.4, p2) but this is incorrect; the proposed development would dominate the view from the rear of our home on Burton Street, as with most of these properties.</p> <p>The rear aspect is particularly important to all of the surrounding residential buildings, as it is these aspects that allow us to have our windows open for airflow and relative quiet and privacy in a high population density area, as opening the windows at the front of our residences often involves exposure to idling or passing car exhaust and much higher levels of noise pollution.</p> <p>At present, the rear (east) view from our home is predominantly of the Georgian buildings on Cartwright Gardens and the mainly pre-20th century buildings at the north end of Marchmont Street. The mews buildings to the north and existing sheds on the proposed site are partially visible but low-key and in keeping with the overall profile of the original mews buildings, allowing a relatively open aspect view across to the buildings on the far side of the mews area, so have a neutral or minimal impact on the overall conservation area setting.</p> <p>In contrast, however, the proposed development would dominate and overbear the original mews area, comprising an unacceptably high density and disproportionate scale. The existing shed buildings on the proposed site are single storey structures with a low-key, neutral effect on the character of the neighbourhood. In contrast, the proposed structure would rise considerably higher to the detriment of the setting (the description of the planning application refers to a three-storey building but the elevation plans suggest that the upper roof is approximately five storeys high, with an elevation equivalent to a further storey in height in relation to the existing four storey facade on Tavistock Place).</p> <p>The height and bulk of the proposed development would block and overshadow much of the existing view and restrict light available to the neighbouring buildings, and furthermore the design would feature visually unappealing plant on the roof which would be detrimental and out of character with the appearance of the surrounding conservation area. This is illustrated by the application document "West Elevation as Proposed" (PL(00)35) which is indicative of the visual impact the proposed development would have from our home and neighbouring properties on Burton Street.</p> <p>It is not clear from the planning application what function the plant on the roof of the proposed building will serve, but we are very concerned that this might have a negative impact in terms of air and noise pollution, in a residential area. It would be helpful to see the results of dispersion modelling as well as the content of the exhaust from the flues to better understand the potential impact this will have on local residents.</p>

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2015/3406/P	ROGER CLINE	FLAT 13 13 TAVISTOCK PLACE LONDON WC1H 9SH	19/08/2015 20:37:58	COMMNT	<p>I write as the owner and occupier of Flat 13, 13 Tavistock Place. I am also director of 13 Tavistock Pace Limited, which owns the freehold of 13 Tavistock Place.</p> <p>Sec 1.6 of the heritage Statement refers to ‘Minor alterations to its external elevation to facilitate access’. No details of such alterations can be found on the drawings accompanying the applications and hence no alterations to the external elevations should be allowed without a new planning application with its full-scale opportunity for neighbours to comment being given</p> <p>Sec 6.1 (the section appearing between the two sections numbered 6.8 on page 32) describes ‘glimpsed and transient views of the new buildings – from the street alongside listed buildings’. However the degradation of views of residents in non-listed buildings adjoining the site should also be taken into account.</p> <p>The storage sheds to be demolished, as stated in sec 2.17, adjoin the site of South Crescent Mews. Mews buildings were stables (later, garages) with living accommodation above usually of a total of two storeys (ground and first). They did not substantially obscure light and views from the back windows of the properties to which they were adjacent. The new buildings have a total height greater than any adjoining building, so the light and air enjoyed across the site by adjoining buildings will be lost. The mews character of the site should be maintained and the total height (including service apparatus and flues) should be at least one storey below the buildings on the adjacent streets.</p> <p>There is a precedent for this ruling, in that an application to build medical laboratories for the Jerwood Foundation/Royal College of Physicians in Peto Place behind St Andrews Place Regents Park in the borough of Camden was initially refused (in about 2000) and the development eventually allowed was limited to one storey below the St Andrews Place buildings.</p> <p>Although the roofline of the proposed Tavistock Place building is sloped to allow some light into the back windows of the Cartwright Gardens buildings, the residential accommodation in Marchmont Street, in Burton Street, in Woolf Mews and in 11 and 13 Tavistock Place (these latter two buildings are mentioned at section 2.22 as making a positive contribution to the character and appearance of the Conservation Area) and in the upper levels of Tavistock Place opposite the site will be seriously overshadowed by what can only be called the carbuncle of the services tower and flues of the new laboratory, reducing the amenities of the Conservation Area which are not just to be judged from the level of the local streets.</p> <p>There is mention in the application of the area being designated for medical use, but the School of Hygiene which arrived about five years ago was the first institution in that field for many years – a closed hospital on southern Judd Street being the only other such connection. In recent years the area is mostly used for residential purposes, hotels and student accommodation. The road outside the site contains a two-way cycle track. The road, the cycle track and the pavement are often overcrowded with their current users. To impose the number of lorry movements on a narrow and often congested two-way into and out of the site to excavate the proposed double basement will be impracticable and will seriously affect the utility of the hotels and the ability of local residents, temporary and permanent, and commuters to go about their usual activities without obstruction and to enjoy as much peace and</p>

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

quiet as is commensurate with the inner-city location.

I note that a turntable is proposed for the yard of the development. It is essential that any lorries which enter the site use this turntable and do not reverse to or from the road – the noise from the reversing warning signals would not be acceptable to local residents.

In summary, this application is to over-develop the site beyond its capacity to fit into the Bloomsbury Conservation Area, whose conservation is all-important.

Roger Cline

2015/3406/P	ROGER CLINE	FLAT 13 13 TAVISTOCK PLACE LONDON WC1H 9SH	19/08/2015 20:37:35	COMMNT
-------------	-------------	--	---------------------	--------

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2015/3406/P	Christopher Donovan	Flat 1 87-89 Marchmont Street London WC1N1AL	20/08/2015 13:30:24	OBJ	<p>Based on a review of Camden's Development Policies (in brackets below), I have several further objections to this development:</p> <p>1. Protecting the quality of life of residents and businesses (DP24):</p> <p>a. The proposed development doesn't respect the character, setting, context and the form and scale of the neighbouring buildings, which are by and large residential or hotels: the proposed building will dominate (in terms of bulk and mass) and extend to the outer limit of the owner's land and adjoining property boundaries (thereby eliminating the distance between the development and adjoining properties) and extend to effectively four storeys and roofs. The existing buildings are single storey sheds, so low-scale and incongruous leaving a clear view across the roofline of those units to the surrounding Victorian houses/hotels, giving a sense of space and air in an otherwise dense urban area.</p> <p>b. The building services are proposed to be located on the roofs of the building, which is considered to be inappropriate in a conservation area with surrounding mixed use/residential buildings;</p> <p>c. There appears to be no amenity provision in terms of soft landscaping.</p> <p>2. Impact of development (DP26, DP28 and DP32)</p> <p>a. The proposed development will significantly impact upon the quality of life and amenity of occupiers of adjoining buildings, particularly, for those occupiers (such as ourselves) who have a roof terrace. There will be significant overlooking and loss of daylight, sunlight and privacy. The outlook will be a dominant mass of building blocking out the general view and light giving an overwhelming sense of enclosure.</p> <p>b. This building may also have an impact on the local microclimate, given that it will encompass the airspace within this confined site.</p> <p>c. There is concern, too, that the levels of noise and vibration will increase substantially, particularly from the extensive plant that will necessarily be required for the development, and that the large flues shown on the plans will lead to an unacceptable increase in odour and fumes, where the air quality and noise levels are considered to be reasonable at the moment (bearing in mind the present uses and the urban setting).</p> <p>d. It also a concern that outdoor space may involve occupiers of the proposed development looking out / down onto roof terraces and balconies of local residents and that would impact on privacy at such close quarters.</p> <p>e. The proposed use of the development must necessarily involve the use of artificial light and this is likely to create disturbance to local residents and occupiers.</p> <p>f. The concerns expressed under point 1(a) apply to these development policies, too.</p> <p>g. The proposal includes a medical research laboratory, although there are no details as to the type and nature of the research: it is of concern that such a facility might attract public protests or similar activities, which will impact upon adjoining owners and occupiers.</p> <p>h. It is surprising to note that the application does not appear to include any <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. Daylight and Sunlight report ii. Noise and vibration impact / acoustic report or iii. Flood risk assessment. </p> <p>3. Basements (DP27)</p>

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
					<p>a. It is noted that the development includes a double-storey basement excavation: we can see no assessment of the impact of the creation of this double-basement on local groundwater, drainage and structural conditions, and such an assessment is critical.</p> <p>b. We would expect to see appropriate measures implemented to protect the structural stability of adjoining properties and to protect existing groundwater and drainage facilities.</p> <p>c. The development is to be undertaken in a conservation area and adjoining Grade II listed building; it is considered that the bulk and size of the development is out of character with the remaining buildings surrounding the development site and would be detrimental to the setting of the adjoining listed buildings.</p> <p>In the event the Council is minded to grant planning permission for the proposed development, we would ask that appropriately stringent mitigation measures are required to be implemented (and which are to be subject to the Council's prior approval, ie as a condition precedent to the implementation of any planning permission) to protect neighbouring occupiers from the effects of</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">- loss of privacy,- artificial lighting levels,- noise and vibration,- odours, fumes and dust,- security and amenity of residents in relation to the proposed use for medical research laboratory- demolition and construction to ensure structural stability of adjoining properties, <p>and to include appropriate planning conditions relating to</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">- construction traffic management and- hours of site operation.
