

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2015/7079/P	Robert Ziegler	18 Glisson Road CB1 2HD	03/03/2016 12:14:26	OBJ	<p>I'm writing to let you know of my objection to the above planning application. The work outlined in the application involves a substantial underground excavation which would unreasonably affect the use of Air Studios, the world class recording facility next door to the proposed extension. The work of the Studios is affected by the months of sustained noise and probable structural damage to the fabric of the Victorian era building as a result of this excavation. The studios are a vital recording facility for use by orchestras and ensembles working at the highest level of the British music industry, creating sound tracks for film and songs for the recording industry. The artists and technicians who depend on the Studios should not be prevented from earning their livings and practicing their crafts for the sake of a private home owner's re-development.</p> <p>Although the original plans never went to committee as the proposed plans were revised, despite the change to the application, the applicants have not addressed the issues raised by Air Studio's experts so all previous written objections still stand.</p> <p>Please deny permission for this develop and support this indispensable local business and all of the musicians, composers, engineers who use it as well as the many and varied local businesses who benefit from their patronage and presence.</p>
2015/7079/P	Carmen von Rohr	48B St. Alban's Road London NW5 1RH	03/03/2016 17:40:51	OBJ	<p>Again, I am writing to strongly object to this planning application. This project will have a devastating effect on the community as it will force the closure of Air Studios next door, which employees hundreds of musicians, technicians, administrators, and related service-industry personnel. All for what? For yet another obscenely rich couple to treat a working London neighbourhood as their personal playground of excess? The people who have made this application show no respect for or interest in being part of the community to which they belong, as evidenced by this sneaky attempt to get around objections by resubmitting their application with superficial changes, thus forcing protestors to remake all of their protests. Why should Camden Council cater to their whims at the enormous cost of the community? This residential conversion with extension will put *hundreds of people out of work* and will devastate the world-renowned London film music industry, all so a couple of people can have an even more grandiose home. I object vehemently to this planning application on the grounds that it will destroy the livelihoods of hundreds of people in the community, which is a cost that Camden Council cannot possibly bear.</p>

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2015/7079/P	Patrick Williams	Archway House 21 Clapham Common Nside London SW4 0RQ	03/03/2016 15:34:18	OBJLETTE R	<p>Dear Mr Tulloch</p> <p>Reference Planning Application 2015/7079/P</p> <p>I return to the above planning application which follows Application 21015/2089 last year, but now under renewed circumstances . A letter, co-signed by a significant number of leading players associated with work undertaken by Air studios, and highlighting the risks posed to the Studio by this development, was published in the Daily Telegraph on Jan 13th this year: the paper reported the story of this development at considerable length on page 3 the same day. The Jeffreys refused to make comment, but their architect obliged, and claimed that their client " have no desire to cause any needless disruption " while blithely insisting that " they can find ways around any concerns- so that building works can take place while the studios remain open". It is a matter of record that Croft Architects have acted with flagrant dishonesty since it emerged in January this year that the Jeffreys/Croft Axis had submitted an apparently "New " Application for 11 Rosslyn Hill ( no 7079 submitted on New Year"s Eve, which like Maundy Thursday, is a peculiar day for this type of activity. So this submission has to begin by asking for an explanation for this activity by the Jeffreys/Frost Axis.</p> <p>To claim that Application 7079 is New, when compared to 2089 (2015) is dishonest . Submitted on 21.12.16, it was supported by documentation dated from 2014/2015. These include: ColeJarman noise reports (6.1.14/31.12.15)Arboricultural statements )March 2015) DonaldInsall Assoc reports(5.1.15)Alan Baxter BIA (March 2015) PriceMyers" Code for sustainable homes (27.3.15) Clearwater Pool details (2.2.15)new drawings of plans (March 2015) PaulMew Assoc (Outline CLP, March 2015) and other documentation from 2015.Here was a tactic to render the over 900 written and 10,000 petitioned objections raised to the Jeffreys first application in April ,2015, and such a tactic has deserved to fail at the first hurdle.Though correct in procedure and legality, this attempt to manipulate the Planning Process is truly revolting, given the claim made by Croft Architects in the Daily Telegraph (Jan 13th), that " they can find ways around Air Studio"s concerns ", having slid through an alternative Application without any consultation .</p> <p>When considering the Application of 31.1.15 ( the first,2089 having a longer narrative and documentation than 7079) we must centre on what Thomas Croft labels as the "concerns" of Air Studio. Camden"s commission of the Independent Audit of the BIA by ReithCampbell is most indicative. In section 2.12, RC admit that " objections raised on the MBC portal are almost exclusively with respect to noise vibration and loss of business which, although very important matters, are subjects lying outside the remit of this audit and therefore have not been addressed " . The impact of noise vibration and consequent loss of business ARE the CORE ISSUES central to Air Studio"s case. Acting for the Jeffreys, ColeJarman, replying with an inadequate, misleading and, at times, nonsensical report in answer to Vanguardia"s (for Air) submission, displayed similar Kafka-esque tendencies. CJ"s report completely overlook Air Studios as a potential noise receptor. Vanguardia, in turn, replied to CJ with significant and cogent detail. CJ"s submission was absurd as it principally centred on the assumption that Air ( a 24/7 operation) might be able to to record (using microphone engineering of extreme sensitivity), somehow sidestepping differing levels of ~Low Frequency Noise caused by excavation/other works ( for which CJ also presume a short time span of building work- now measured as 7-8 months according to documents supporting Application 7079 )</p> <p>More importantly, in consideration of these applications (2089/7079), I would direct your attention to</p>

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
					<p>Camden"s Draft Local Plan (215). Submitted to " make Camden a better Borough, and create conditions for growth (p165-5.4) this plan aims to " encourage creative industries in the Borough ", with (5.g) "safeguarding employment sites " and (5.6) "supporting businesses of all sizes ". The LDP wishes to make Camden " the best place to business in London (Camden Business Charter 5.21).as for Creative industries (5.23), accounting for 40,000 jobs, with £1Billion turnover , Camden claims " to recognise the importance of creative industries , especially the contribution they make to the unique character and vitality of the Borough " .</p> <p>As important, Section 6 of the LDP concerns the PROTECTION OF AMENITY. Page 181- " developments are allowed UNLESS they cause UNACCEPTABLE HARM to Amenity " Section 6.3. states: Aspects of construction phase MUST avoid HARMFUL EFFECTS, or take measures to minimise potential negative impacts".</p> <p>ColeJarmans proposals for mitigating measures are completely inadequate, " not fit for purpose", as the cliché might state . Low Frequency Noise, the greatest threat to Air Studios" ability to produce its work needs to be prevented, not minimised. Your Policy A4 (Noise) states that the council " will not give permission for development likely to generate UNACCEPTABLE noise/vibration impacts ", and " permission swill only be granted if noise generating development can be operated WITHOUT CAUSING HARM TO AMENITY " .</p> <p>ColeJarman"s report for the Jeffreys sidestepped all issues relating to the Acoustic harm crucially threatening Air Studios ability to record/produce their work. Cole Jarman"s reports predicate absurd operating conditions, and assume that this world important recording Studio might compromise its production schedules to adjust for their neighbours"s Leisure driven ambitions. As the letter to the Telegraph (Jan 13th) argues, Camden"s 8 month long indulgence of the Jeffreys" application, leaving aside their renewed Application, creates already destructive uncertainties for Air"s already substantial timetable of bookings. Your Planning department needs to be aware of a present public mood which views, and so often suffers from, a detached elite drifting away from the general population. Furthermore, the Planning Application for 11 Rosslyn Hill cannot be reconciled with the declared aims of Camden Council"s Draft Local Plan. I have written twice, last year , urging you reject planning application 2015/2089. I now urge you to reject this so-called ~New Application, 7079, or whichever numbered vessel Thomas Croft Architects choose to steer their clients, Andrew and Elizabeth Jeffreys.</p> <p>yours sincerely Patrick Williams</p> <p>patrickskitchen53@gmail.com 078 434 909 44</p>

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2015/7079/P	Patrick Williams	Archway House 21 Clapham Common Nside London SW4 0RQ	03/03/2016 15:33:55	OBJLETTE R	<p>Dear Mr Tulloch</p> <p>Reference Planning Application 2015/7079/P</p> <p>I return to the above planning application which follows Application 21015/2089 last year, but now under renewed circumstances . A letter, co-signed by a significant number of leading players associated with work undertaken by Air studios, and highlighting the risks posed to the Studio by this development, was published in the Daily Telegraph on Jan 13th this year: the paper reported the story of this development at considerable length on page 3 the same day. The Jeffreys refused to make comment, but their architect obliged, and claimed that their client " have no desire to cause any needless disruption " while blithely insisting that " they can find ways around any concerns- so that building works can take place while the studios remain open". It is a matter of record that Croft Architects have acted with flagrant dishonesty since it emerged in January this year that the Jeffreys/Croft Axis had submitted an apparently "New " Application for 11 Rosslyn Hill ( no 7079 submitted on New Year"s Eve, which like Maundy Thursday, is a peculiar day for this type of activity. So this submission has to begin by asking for an explanation for this activity by the Jeffreys/Frost Axis.</p> <p>To claim that Application 7079 is New, when compared to 2089 (2015) is dishonest . Submitted on 21.12.16, it was supported by documentation dated from 2014/2015. These include: ColeJarman noise reports (6.1.14/31.12.15)Arboricultural statements )March 2015) DonaldInsall Assoc reports(5.1.15)Alan Baxter BIA (March 2015) PriceMyers" Code for sustainable homes (27.3.15) Clearwater Pool details (2.2.15)new drawings of plans (March 2015) PaulMew Assoc (Outline CLP, March 2015) and other documentation from 2015.Here was a tactic to render the over 900 written and 10,000 petitioned objections raised to the Jeffreys first application in April ,2015, and such a tactic has deserved to fail at the first hurdle.Though correct in procedure and legality, this attempt to manipulate the Planning Process is truly revolting, given the claim made by Croft Architects in the Daily Telegraph (Jan 13th), that " they can find ways around Air Studio"s concerns ", having slid through an alternative Application without any consultation .</p> <p>When considering the Application of 31.1.15 ( the first,2089 having a longer narrative and documentation than 7079) we must centre on what Thomas Croft labels as the "concerns" of Air Studio. Camden"s commission of the Independent Audit of the BIA by ReithCampbell is most indicative. In section 2.12, RC admit that " objections raised on the MBC portal are almost exclusively with respect to noise vibration and loss of business which, although very important matters, are subjects lying outside the remit of this audit and therefore have not been addressed " . The impact of noise vibration and consequent loss of business ARE the CORE ISSUES central to Air Studio"s case. Acting for the Jeffreys, ColeJarman, replying with an inadequate, misleading and, at times, nonsensical report in answer to Vanguardia"s (for Air) submission, displayed similar Kafka-esque tendencies. CJ"s report completely overlook Air Studios as a potential noise receptor. Vanguardia, in turn, replied to CJ with significant and cogent detail. CJ"s submission was absurd as it principally centred on the assumption that Air ( a 24/7 operation) might be able to to record (using microphone engineering of extreme sensitivity), somehow sidestepping differing levels of ~Low Frequency Noise caused by excavation/other works ( for which CJ also presume a short time span of building work- now measured as 7-8 months according to documents supporting Application 7079 )</p>

More importantly, in consideration of these applications (2089/7079), I would direct your attention to

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

**Comment:**    **Response:**

Camden"s Draft Local Plan (215). Submitted to " make Camden a better Borough, and create conditions for growth (p165-5.4) this plan aims to " encourage creative industries in the Borough ", with (5.g) "safeguarding employment sites " and (5.6) "supporting businesses of all sizes ". The LDP wishes to make Camden " the best place to business in London (Camden Business Charter 5.21).as for Creative industries (5.23), accounting for 40,000 jobs, with £1Billion turnover , Camden claims " to recognise the importance of creative industries , especially the contribution they make to the unique character and vitality of the Borough " .

As important, Section 6 of the LDP concerns the PROTECTION OF AMENITY. Page 181- " developments are allowed UNLESS they cause UNACCEPTABLE HARM to Amenity " Section 6.3. states: Aspects of construction phase MUST avoid HARMFUL EFFECTS, or take measures to minimise potential negative impacts".

ColeJarmans proposals for mitigating measures are completely inadequate, " not fit for purpose", as the cliché might state . Low Frequency Noise, the greatest threat to Air Studios" ability to produce its work needs to be prevented, not minimised. Your Policy A4 (Noise) states that the council " will not give permission for development likely to generate UNACCEPTABLE noise/vibration impacts ", and " permission swill only be granted if noise generating development can be operated WITHOUT CAUSING HARM TO AMENITY " .

ColeJarman"s report for the Jeffreys sidestepped all issues relating to the Acoustic harm crucially threatening Air Studios ability to record/produce their work. Cole Jarman"s reports predicate absurd operating conditions, and assume that this world important recording Studio might compromise its production schedules to adjust for their neighbours"s Leisure driven ambitions. As the letter to the Telegraph (Jan 13th) argues, Camden"s 8 month long indulgence of the Jeffreys" application, leaving aside their renewed Application, creates already destructive uncertainties for Air"s already substantial timetable of bookings. Your Planning department needs to be aware of a present public mood which views, and so often suffers from, a detached elite drifting away from the general population. Furthermore, the Planning Application for 11 Rosslyn Hill cannot be reconciled with the declared aims of Camden Council"s Draft Local Plan. I have written twice, last year , urging you reject planning application 2015/2089. I now urge you to reject this so-called ~New Application, 7079, or whichever numbered vessel Thomas Croft Architects choose to steer their clients, Andrew and Elizabeth Jeffreys.

yours sincerely  
Patrick Williams

patrickskitchen53@gmail.com  
078 434 909 44