


**Roger Garland
Stud Farm Cottage
Stratford St Andrew
Suffolk, IP17 1LW**



Rob Tulloch
Regeneration and Planning
Development Management
London Borough of Camden
Town Hall
Judd Street
London WC1 8ND

4th March 2016

Dear Mr Tulloch,

**Planning Application 2015/7079/P and 2015/7300/L
11 Rosslyn Hill
London NW3 5UL**

In response to your letter of 25th February, concerning the above Planning Application, I have been in to your website to find that comments were not accepted after 29/1/16.

You specifically say in your letter of 25th February that comments will be accepted until 21 days from the date of your letter so I am assuming that you will accept my comments below until 17th March 2016.

I have looked at the criteria on your website as to what you will accept comments on and present my objections below.

I strongly object to this application on the grounds of the impact of noise from plant equipment which will render the established business of Air Studios (over 20 years) inoperable for an extended period. As one of the many hundreds of musicians working in London, I rely on this studio as one of only 2 studios still in existence which can record a full symphony orchestra to picture. The US film companies, which regularly use the skills we offer, will go elsewhere and will not return. This subterranean building work will impact the livelihoods of hundreds of people - musicians, engineers, assistants and local hotels, pubs, restaurants, taxi firms will also suffer loss of earnings.



Roger Garland

Rob Tulloch
Regeneration and Planning
Development Management
London Borough of Camden
Town Hall
Judd Street
London
WC1H 8ND

28th February 2016

Dear Rob –

Ref: 2015/7079/P & 2015/7300/L - 11 Rosslyn Hill.

I am writing again and further to my email of 9th February with objections to the planning application at 11 Rosslyn Hill and I just also wanted to say that I feel it is totally unreasonable that my original objection for the original planning application does not apply to this second planning application as my objections remain the same. I believe the first application should be rejected and my original objections stand for the first and second applications.

The noise and disruption which would be incurred if this planning application is successful and this build was undertaken, would force Air Studios to close which would have a detrimental to London's music recording industry - long term. No effort has been made to address noise issues in the application.

Air is essential to carry on recording many Film and Pop sessions employing the country's top musicians, technicians, recording engineers, orchestral contractors, down to the staff who have worked at Air for many, many years and who give this Studio it's community feel which has become an important part of the Studio's individuality and appeal to clients from the UK and Overseas. Many would lose their jobs with a forced closure for potentially 6 months or longer and Air's spirit would be lost forever even if it were ever able to re-open.

Emerging markets for recording Orchestral Film Scores in Europe and Eastern Europe are just waiting in the wings for an opening in the market - which they haven't had due to London's superiority in this field both musically and technically. So any closure at Air, even for 6 months, could give the rest of Europe the gap in the market it has been waiting for - and once work is lost to such markets the chances of getting all of it back would be slim and would diminish London's standing in the World in this industry.

Therefore the closure of Air will have a long lasting and detrimental effect on our country's cultural future and London's local economy.

It is a little ironic that the residents of 11 Rosslyn plan for a cinema in their plans when they will be jeopardising London's future in recording Film Scores for many of the films they will be watching in their cinema should this application proceed.

I strongly object to this application and feel that not only would many people suffer should these plans be approved, but London's cultural reputation within the World would suffer at the expense of a few, namely the residents of 11 Rosslyn Hill.

Yours sincerely,

Lucy Whalley

13A Cotton Lofts
124-128 Shacklewell Lane
London
E8 2EJ

**Nick
Ingman**

Flat 61 Lewisham Hill,
Blackheath, London, SE13 7PL



Rob Tulloch
Director of Culture and Environment
Regeneration and Planning
Development Management
London Borough Of Camden
Town Hall
Judd Street
London
WC1H 8ND

29th February 2016

Application Reference: 2015/7079/P
Associated Reference: 2015/7300/L

RE: PLANNING APPLICATION CONSULTATION

Address: 11 Rosslyn Hill, London NW3 5UL

Dear Mr Tulloch,

Thank you for your letter dated 26th February 2016 concerning the above.

I am a musical director and arranger in the commercial music field, based in London and as such I have a keen interest in the continuing health of my industry.

A vital part of that industry are the engine rooms that power the music that we create - the recording studios that we work in and in which we produce the music that we sell.

Over the past decade, the industry has gone through a large number of changes, not all advantageous, that have resulted in a diminution of the business we are in.

The studios have consequently shrunk to the extent that there are now only three studios that are capable of offering the highly technical requirements of music making: Air Lyndhurst Studios, Abbey Road Studios and Angel Studios.

The music industry in the United Kingdom generates five billion pounds a year and provides employment for several thousand people. A large proportion of that revenue comes from abroad, chiefly the United States, whose clients know that, by travelling to this country they will have the benefit of the best musicians, the best technicians, and, crucially, the best recording studios.

If the proposed works at 11 Rosslyn Hill proceed we are reliably informed that Air Lyndhurst, one of the trio as described above, will close, possibly indefinitely, thus robbing the industry of a vital organ, and will result in the foreign clients looking for other locations as the remaining two studios would be unable to cope with the resultant extra workload.

I do hope that good sense will prevail and that the requirements of the very few will not decimate the welfare of the many.


Nick Ingman

February 26th 2016

Reference 11, Rosslyn Hill, NW3 Plan Ref 2015/7079

Dear Mr Tulloch

I return to the above plan following 2 submissions last year, but under renewed circumstances. A letter, cosigned by a significant number of leading players Associated with Air Studio's work and highlighting the risks posed to the studio by this development, was published in the Daily Telegraph on January 13th this year, and that 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 seemed happy to oblige 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 work can take place whilst the studios remain open'. It is therefore a matter of record that Croft Architects have acted with flagrant dishonesty as it emerged in January that the Jeffreys/Croft axis had submitted an apparently New application for the Rosslyn Hill (7079 submitted on New Years Eve, which like Maundy Thursday, is a peculiar day for this activity). This submission has to begin by demanding an explanation for this activity by the Jeffreys/Frost axis.

I did not take long to establish the dishonesty of this application. Submitted on 31.12.15, it was supported by Colejarman noise reports (6.1.14 and 23.3.15), Arboricultural statements (all March 2015), Donald Insall Assoc reports (5.1.2015) Alan Baxter BIA (March 2015) Perice Myers' Code for sustainable homes (27.3.15) Clearwater Pool details (2.2.15) New drawing of plans (March 2015) Paul Mew Assoc (Outline CLP, March 2015) and other documentation from 2015. The tactic mounted to render over 900 written and 10,000 epetitioned objections null and void by attaching a new case number to old documentation deserved to fall at the first hurdle. This attempt to manipulate the Planning Process, though completely legal (this legality has nothing to do with Justice) is truly revolting given the claim that Croft Architects made on January 13th, having slid through an alternative application without consultation, that 'they can find ways around Air Studio's concerns'

When considering the Application (2089 has a longer narrative than 7079), we must centre on what Thomas Croft likes to label the 'concerns' of Air Studio. For this the Independent Audit of the BIA by Reith Campbell is highly indicative. In Section 2.12, RC admit that 'objections raised on the LBC 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'. Noise vibration and loss of business ARE the CORE ISSUES in Air's case. Colejarman (for Jeffreys) with an inadequate, misleading and at times non-sensical reply to Vanguardia (for Air), displayed similar Kafka-esque tendencies; the CJ report completely overlook Air studios as a potential noise receptor. Vanguardia replied to CJ with significant and cogent detail. Examples of CJ's absurd presentation proliferate, principally centering on their assumption that Air (a 24/7 operation) might be able to record (using microphone engineering of extreme sensitivity), working around differing levels of Low Frequency Noise caused by excavation and other works (for which CJ also presume a very short time span of excavation/construction)

Of more importance to your consideration of these applications, I would suggest reference to your Council's Draft Local Plan (2015). The Draft submitted is to make 'Camden a better Borough, and create conditions for growth (p165-5.4). Under Economic Development (5.5d) the plan is to 'encourage creative industries in the Borough', with (5.g) 'safeguarding employment sites, and (5.6) Camden 'will support businesses of all sizes'. Camden wishes to make 'Camden the best place to do business in London (Camden Business charter, 5.21). As for Creative Industries (5.23), accounting for 40,000 jobs with £1 billion turnover, Camden 'recognises the importance of creative industries, especially the contribution they make to the unique character and vitality of the Borough'.

Most importantly, 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: 'Aspects of construction phase must avoid harmful effects, or take measures to minimise potential negative impacts'. The mitigating measures proposed by Cole Jarman are totally irrelevant, as Low Frequency Noise, from Air's reports needs prevention, not minimising. Policy A4 (NOISE) states the Council 'will not give permission for development likely to generate UNACCEPTABLE noise/vibration impacts' and (p207) 'permission will only be granted if noise generating development can be operated WITHOUT CAUSING HARM TO AMENITY'.

Campbell Reith sidestepped all issues relating to potential harm to the crucial Amenity at Air. Cole Jarman's reports predicate absurd operating conditions, assuming that this World Important recording Studio might shift its production schedules for the sake of their neighbour's Leisure driven ambitions. As the letter to the Telegraph argued, Camden's tardiness in rejecting these applications already creates uncertainties for Air's substantial timetable of bookings. Your department needs to be aware of a present public mood which views, and more often, suffers from, a detached elite drifting away from the general population; furthermore, Camden Planning cannot reconcile the Planning Application for 11 Rossllyn Hill with the declared aims of Camden's Draft Local Plan. As I wrote twice last year, I urge you to reject Planning application 2015 2089/ 0r7079, whichever vessel Croft architects choose to steer their clients

Yours sincerely
Patrick Williams
21, Clapham Common Northside
SW4 0RQ

HELEN NATTRASS
Chartered Engineer – Chartered Geologist

19, St. Peter's Grove
Canterbury
Kent, CT1 2DH

Attention: Rob Tulloch
Development Control Team
London Borough of Camden
Camden Town Hall,
Judd Street,
London WC1H 9JE.

5th March 2016

Dear Sirs,

Objection to Applications 2015/7079/P and 2015/7300/L - 11 Roslyn Hill

I wish to object to the above applications as they do not appear to have addressed in sufficient detail the impact of the proposed demolition, excavation and construction works on the business of the adjacent property Air Studios. The business is a high-quality recording studio used, inter alia, by major film producers for the production of film sound tracks. Because of the nature of their business, the building, its recording equipment and the acceptable acoustic environment within the studios have requirements which are likely to be outside the usual limits set for demolition and construction work.

The building does not appear to be identified as a sensitive receptor for noise and vibration.

As a minimum I wish to ask for a site-specific environmental impact assessment to quantify the likely effects of the development works on Air Studios' recording sessions. Furthermore in the event of an eventual grant of planning permission, any eventual contractors should produce an Environmental Impact Plan in consultation with the Camden EHO and Air Studios. This should address in detail the methods the contractors will use to adhere to any eventual noise and vibration limits imposed by the London Borough of Camden. For the control of the works and also the avoidance of unquantifiable disputes, there should be provision of independent monitoring and reporting on noise and vibration during the demolition, excavation and construction period; reports being made available to Air Studios as well as the owners of the property in question.

Yours faithfully


Helen Nattrass
CEng FICE CGeol FGS