

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2015/3605/P	Linus Rees	Fitzrovia Neighbourhood Association 39 Tottenham Street London W1T 4RX	14/10/2015 09:58:18	OBJEMAIL	<p>Our association strongly objects to this application.</p> <p>Whilst the London Plan calls for additional hotel space it does not support intensification of this use class. Specifically Policy 4.5 states:</p> <p>"Further intensification of provision in areas of existing concentration should be resisted, except where this will not compromise local amenity or the balance of local land uses."</p> <p>There is already a large hotel on this site and Great Russell Street already has at least two other hotels within 100 metres of the site.</p> <p>This recognised in the Fitzrovia Area Action Plan (p58) which states: "There are hotels and other visitor accommodation throughout Fitzrovia, including concentrations around the southern ends of Tottenham Court Road at Great Russell Street and Gower Street/ Bloomsbury Street."</p> <p>There is a large number of neighbouring residents whose amenity would be harmed by additional hotel use.</p>

---

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2015/3605/P	Dr K. O'Connor	Flat 118 Bedford Court Mansions Bedford Avenue London WC1B 3AG	18/10/2015 17:14:35	OBJ	<p>I objected to the original application in the strongest terms, and I am objecting to this one also. I am a long term resident, living across the street from the proposed development and will be directly affected.</p> <p>Let me add something I left out of my original proposal: Great Russell St is already a traffic bottleneck, it cannot accommodate the additional traffic that this development will cause, both in the road, and on the public footpath,</p> <p>As for the so-called amended application, there are no fundamental changes, what is proposed is purely "cosmetic", and continue to ignore the rights and quality of life to which the neighbouring residents are entitled and which Camden must protect.</p> <p>The proposed change of use represents over development of the site for a single hotel use and the impact of such an intensification of use cannot be effectively managed - and that is what I understand to be what differentiates appropriate development from over development, where it results in more damage than benefit. The applicant has attempted to explain how concerns expressed on this and previous applications, that were either refused or withdrawn, have now been overcome. This is a shallow justification that seems to be more to do with preparing the ground for a future appeal rather than resolving the very real technical issues to do with the life support and service systems needed to make underground habitation work, and with their major impact in terms of noise and air quality when positioned at street level, directly opposite existing homes. I have reviewed the revised documents recently submitted and I am not convinced they are sufficiently robust to demonstrate that the proposed development would not give rise to harmful environmental impacts on the area and the residents. It ignores law and established planning regulations, and is entirely in violation of the principles of the Bloomsbury Conservation Area. ~THIS APPLICATION SHOULD BE REJECTED. I wish to be kept informed of this matter, and notified of the hearing date.</p>

---

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2015/3605/P	Peter Dayan	117 Bedford Avenue London WC1B 3AG	21/10/2015 08:42:00	OBJ	<p>I am re-objecting to this application on the grounds of loss of my amenity. I live opposite the hotel - and already suffer from many aspects of their squeezing of the estate with restaurants, bars (with their illegal canopies and changes of use) and horrendous amounts of noise. This development would make things very much worse.</p> <p>The applicants are attempting to dramatically over-develop this site - the main St Giles hotel has already spiralled from less than 300 beds to something closer to 700, and the applicants now want to launch an environmentally unsustainable extra assault on the local population, without regard for the Bloomsbury Conservation Area.</p> <p>First, the existing hotel already can't cope with entry and exit of people without filling the local roads with polluting buses; the thought of an extra hotel with extra people needing to come in and out, and to leave their subterranean quarters for air and to smoke, is to harm my peace of mind and life.</p> <p>Second, the underground cave needs huge amounts of ventilation - which leads to noisy and unpleasant plant. The hotel has a track record of installing air conditioners without planning permission on Adeline Place; they now plan to create an extremely ugly box along that frontage - that will ruin my view - and, given their previous prestidigitation, will doubtless make more noise (particularly low frequency rumbling) than pretended.</p> <p>I have looked at the 'responses' to comments in this long-running miserable saga. It is my impression that the applicants are merely paying lip-service to this process - this location is simply over-developed for where it is - the applicants should be stopped from their harmful and damaging plans - not only the underground hotel, but also the other unreaosnable developments with which they are continually threatening the local residents.</p>

---

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2015/3605/P	horatia stern	113 bedford court mansions bedford avenue london wc1b3ag	20/10/2015 18:46:57	OBJ	I live opposite the proposed development. This site is ALREADY overdeveloped. I have witnessed the degradation of quality of life in this street due to the over development of the site . 24 hour casino, 24 hour restaurant/bar , bar, refrigerated delivery lorries, laundry lorries, motor cycle bays, coaches with running engines parked outside my window , constant noise generated by hotel /staff. heating/cooling/ air extractor noise to such a degree that i am obliged to wear ear plugs constantly despite double glazing . and it is still too noisy. The proposed scheme would seriously impact the environment through increased levels of noise and pollution . It would have such a negative impact on the area that i would be obliged to leave the neighbourhood. I have examined the recently submitted documents and i am completely against the scheme for the above reasons as well as having an appalling visual impact on a conservation area, and shows a total disregard for both the residents and the borough.

---