

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2015/7269/P	Paul Bates	18a Bristol House Southampton Row London WC1B 4BA	29/02/2016 13:29:19	COMMNT	I think that the proposal could well increase the noise from the Hotel equipment as perceived in the residential apartments of Bristol House (next door). I would therefore like to object to the proposal.
2015/7269/P	Barbara Ferfecka-Jones	24 Bristol House 80a Southampton Row WC1B4BA	29/02/2016 14:31:13	OBJ	Noise, invasion of privacy and potential devaluation of properties in Bristol House outweigh reasons to support this application. Residents were put through Hell when parts of the building the hotel plans to demolish were put up in the first place. It will be unfair to put them through this again. As the hotel admits in its planning statement, it wants to do the the work to increase its income. This is not justifiable when it is at the cost of long-suffering neighbours. A lot of plant on the roof close to Bristol House is another big worry. There have already been many prolonged problems with the hotel about noise.
2015/7269/P	M Jones	24 Bristol House WC1B 4BA	29/02/2016 14:13:23	OBJ	I object to the proposed works on several grounds. It is not so long ago that parts of the building the hotel wants to demolish and rebuild were put up in the first place. It caused tremendous noise and discomfort to residents in Bristol House who should not have to endure the same again. There will also be the invasion of privacy to Bristol House flats facing the proposed works. The hotel claims there would be "virtually no loss" of light to Bristol House. "Virtually no loss" is too much considering the light and views already lost due to the previous works. Plans showing an extensive area of plant on the roof close to Bristol House is another huge concern. There have been major problems before about noise from the hotel. Apart from the disturbance, invasion of privacy and loss of light the proposed works would devalue Bristol House properties. All this is unacceptable and I urge the council to reject the planning application.

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2015/7269/P	Hannah Vowles	1 Bristol House 80a Southampton Row London WC1B 4BA	29/02/2016 12:10:50	OBJNOT	<p>I object to this development as I consider it to be detrimental to the quality of life of its residential neighbours in terms of overshadowing, loss of light, construction noise, increased noise from hotel guests and noise from plant.</p> <p>I live at 1 Bristol House which is the basement flat at the back of the building facing Gloucester Street.</p> <p>Light: The available daylight and sunlight light to my flat is reasonably good given its position. According to the spot heights on the drawings the height of the proposed development would be raised considerably in relation to the existing, in particular the eaves height will be raised to a level even higher than the existing ridge and will therefore would have a considerable adverse effect on the available sunlight and daylight to my living room, bedroom and and kitchen.</p> <p>The figures in the appendices for the effects on particular windows for the various factors (VSC, ADF, DDA) in Bristol House do not appear to consider the effect on my flat if I am correctly interpreting the figures. If R01/F09 refers to Room 1 in Flat 9 then there are no figures for Flat 1. Considering that my flat is probably the most adversely affected in the block this is a critical oversight. I have three windows affected, one to the kitchen, one to the living room and one to the bedroom. The loss of light is highly likely to provide less than 0.8% of its current value which would amount to a material breach. The applicant should be required to make calculations of all the factors for these windows and any others that have been left out of the exercise.</p> <p>Furthermore there is no consideration given to the area of permanent shadow with respect to the external courtyard to my flat, where the loss of daylight and sunlight is very likely to provide less than 0.8 times its current value, another material breach. Again, the applicant should be required to give calculations for this area.</p> <p>There are no calculations at all given for the Annual Probable Sunlight Hours for Bristol House. This is an oversight and the applicant needs to be required to carry out the assessment for all affected rooms and windows in Bristol House.</p> <p>There are several windows in Ormonde Mansions that will receive a very large reduction in APSH ranging from 100% to 20% which is well over the recommended acceptable level of loss of 4%. This is another material breach.</p> <p>In short the applicant has not considered all of the existing surrounding residences. Also the reports are of a very general nature and do not consider the detail of the figures produced, and they dismiss the figures that demonstrate a breach.</p> <p>Noise: There has been a long history of noise problems with this hotel, regarding noise from hotel guests, plant, maintenance works contracts, etc. The built up area tends to amplify any noise produced and any potential noise source needs careful consideration. Bristol House itself and the other surrounding buildings shield the area within the block from most traffic noise so that any other noise is very intrusive. Hence the long history of problems with the hotel.</p> <p>These new plans show an extensive area of plant on the roof close to Bristol House. This plant is not specified, other than "Existing Plant to be relocated (layout to follow)"</p> <p>There is no noise assessment for this planning application. Given it's sensitive position, in close proximity to at least one hundred or more bedrooms both in the hotel and in the surrounding residences, as well as living rooms, I believe there should be. The applicant should be required to provide detailed</p>

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
					<p data-bbox="1099 132 2096 536">specifications of all of the plant to be used and the expected noise that will be produced by it. Any existing plant should be replaced with new technology that meets current legislation, particularly with regard to noise attenuation. Older plant will tend to produce more noise. If the old plant is used it should be subject to the same requirements as new, but it should be required to be replaced. There should also be specified noise limits and carefully considered time restrictions on when this plant can be used in accordance with DP28 Noise and Vibration. A condition should be imposed to require that the plant and equipment which will be a source of noise pollution is kept working efficiently and within the required noise limits and time restrictions. Conditions should also be imposed to ensure that attenuation measures are kept in place and effective throughout the life of the development. There should also be an acoustic report to ensure compliance with PPG24: Planning and noise. Accordingly there should also be specified and strictly observed restrictions on the timing and implementation of any demolition and construction, with particular attention to noise, dust, vibration, in accordance with the Planning Policy.</p> <p data-bbox="1099 576 2074 632">The applicant's Planning Report deals with all the above issues in the most superficial and dismissive manner. I object to the proposal in the strongest terms.</p>
