

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2016/1964/P	David Judd	104-A Bedford Court Mansions Bedford Avenue London WC1B 3AG	15/05/2016 17:09:49	OBJLETTE R	<p>To whom it may concern</p> <p>I am writing to object to the following planning application 2016/1964/P in its entirety. I live next door to no 15 Adeline Place at Bedford Court Mansions</p> <p>Neighbours have not been consulted, nor have they even received notice of the application. Surely it must be someone's responsibility to ensure that the surrounding (and in this case, the adjoining building) is notified of any application that will affect them. Or is the intention to approve the application based on the fact that no neighbour objected, because they weren't notified?</p> <p>I also must say that the application is incomplete. Given the numerous questions about the application already raised from neighbours is surely an indication that the applicant has not thought through the details before submitting the application, and is relying on either the council to ask the questions, or the neighbours, thereby doing the work for them. Is this an indication of how it works these days. Outrageous.</p> <p>The applicants have no consideration for their neighbours. I object strongly to any further development at roof level in its entirety. The proposed screen to give privacy also blocks light, which in this small light well is the only source of daylight into the rooms facing it. Then they want to add vegetation, to do what exactly, make the roof prettier for them - well that will only add to the blockage of daylight, not to mention added mess for those of us in the light well might experience come Autumn. Some of the lower flats already have limited light, and further proposal to block either partially or completely in any form should be denied. The proposal also goes on to create a roof terrace, and that is also a concern. The noise, nuisance, and disturbance from anything at this level is surely something that must not happen. There is a reason that there are no windows from 15 Adeline Place into the light well and that is for privacy. This is the same reason why a roof terrace is not wanted and not warranted under any circumstances. Roof parties are all the rage, summer is coming, and this is a concern. The roof terrace currently overlooks residents living areas and this must be protected. Businesses come and go as we have seen in No 15 Adeline Place over the years. Bedford Court Mansions is a residential block of flats that have been here since the late 1880 and will be here alot longer. We are constantly bombarded with planning applications from all directions from business hoping to muscle in on this residential corner, and are tired of the complacency and disregard of our neighbours who are only after a quick buck.</p> <p>The proposal to then have 6 extractors units at this level again is a huge noise disturbance. Whether they have sound attenuation or not, what about vibration? The details provided are insufficient and poorly submitted. Again no regard for the neighbours whose flats are directly opposite to this proposal all the way up and down the adjoining wall. Why don't they put them at the back of the building at ground level. They are currently at the front at basement level. Leave them there.</p> <p>The removal of the rear fire escape must also remain. It is there for a reason, and any suggestion that it be removed is ludicrous. If there was a fire in 2 locations, lets say main front door and roof level, how</p>

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

are people going to escape - both exits would be blocked. Surely this is the main reason why the rear staircase was erected. Are the applicants blind to this fact.

I object to the proposed roof level changes in their entirety

Regards

David Judd
104a Bedford Court Mansions

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2016/1964/P	M. Stroud	114 Bedford Court Mansions Bedford Avenue London WC1B 3AG	15/05/2016 14:25:25	OBJLETTE R	<p>I am writing to object to the planning application 2016/1964/P in the strongest possible terms.</p> <p>I live adjoining 15 Adeline Place and will be directly affected by the proposed alterations about which I have not been consulted by the developers.</p> <p>I am objecting to the parts of the application that propose turning the roof of 15 Adeline Place into a social space/amenity.</p> <p>I live in Bedford Court Mansions, in a flat on the first floor with windows facing directly onto the well which forms the external north wall of 15 Adeline Place. The distance between these windows and the wall is, at most 4 metres.</p> <p>My flat and the many others around this light well depend on it for light, air and ventilation.</p> <p>The proposed plans involve obstructing the top of this lightwell on the roof level of Adeline Place using planters, a timber fence and an opaque screen.</p> <p>Although no height measurements are given – I cannot understand why this essential information has been omitted from the application – any obstruction would deprive residents of Bedford Court Mansions around the well of light and air, and would give an unacceptable sense of enclosure.</p> <p>The proposed development of the 15 Adeline Place roof will also affect noise levels. Noise travels down the well. Bedford Court Mansions is a residential property. The development of the roof into a social space is going to generate noise disturbance detrimental to the residents of Bedford Court Mansions.</p> <p>No information has been given about hours of use or numbers of people expected to be using the roof.</p> <p>As the plans now stand, many of the details of the proposal have not been fully thought through, and the effects on my own property and similarly located flats in Bedford Court Mansions have not been fully calculated.</p> <p>This application must be rejected.</p>

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2016/1964/P	Dr L. O'Connor	118 Bedford Court Mansions	15/05/2016 14:12:25	OBJLETTE R	<p>This is a formal objection to the above planning proposal for 15 Adeline Place, WC1, specifically to the proposed development of the flat roof of the property. The proposal is to develop the flat roof of 15 Adeline Place, previously a functional empty space, into a roof terrace with projected intensive use. The proposed roof terrace is adjacent to a large residential mansion block whose residents will be adversely affected by this development. I am objecting to the proposal on the grounds of:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) loss of light and air 2) noise disturbance 3) party wall issues 4) possible contravention of Fire Regulations 5) security and possible breaking through into the lightwell <p>In addition, I object to the lack of detail and necessary information contained in the plans, which are not sufficient for a proper determination of the above issues.</p> <p>This information should be submitted in writing, and made fully available to the public in a timely manner.</p> <p>Camden seems to think that the information submitted is sufficient. It is not.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) Loss of light and air. <p>Bedford Court Mansions (BCM) is a large residential block six stories high that adjoins 15 Adeline Place. 15 Adeline Place forms one side of a lightwell that goes down six stories into the basement of BCM. There are many flats around that lightwell which depend upon it for light and air. Maintaining ventilation is essential in a part of London with high levels of air pollution. The planning application proposes to cut off this lightwell from the Adeline Place side by erecting a row of planters, and a timber fence and opaque fence. No measurements are given, but any obstruction of the lightwell in this way would be detrimental to the amenities of residents in BCM by reason of loss of light and an additional sense of enclosure contrary to established policy.</p> <p>I would like to remind Camden Planning that a primary remit of the NPPF is to safeguard and secure a good standard of amenity for all existing and future occupants of land and buildings. Specifically, Camden policies CS5 and DP26, with regard to visual privacy, overlooking, overshadowing, outlook, sunlight and daylight state – ‘We will expect that these elements are considered at the design stage of a scheme to prevent potential negative impacts of the development on occupiers and neighbours’. The developers have not provided the necessary information, and these things have not taken into consideration. The proposed development will negatively impact on existing levels of daylight, sunlight, and air to BCM residents and for this reason the application should be rejected.</p> <p>Note: ‘Privacy’ is no justification for using planters, fence and screen to cut off daylight, sunlight and air to the lightwell.</p>

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

2) Noise disturbance

The flat roof of 15 Adeline Place has always been a purely functional area, bare and empty, but the proposed application is to turn the flat roof into a roof terrace/amenity space. We at BCM would see this as a change of use, although Camden Planning takes the view that it is an ancillary use of the building, part of it's office function.

Either way, the proposed amenities – built in seating, furniture, installation of a glazed roof – indicate extensive and intensive use. The social areas are directly adjacent to the lightwell of BCM, and also to BCM residential properties. Noise is bound to be generated. The proposals give no details as to numbers of people, or hours of use, or use of music, or of installation of secondary facilities (running water, light, music, cooking/food service). Hours (9-5:30?) and days (weekends?) and type of use must be specified and controlled but in any case this use of the roof which is so close to BCM as a social space will cause unacceptable levels of noise to BCM residents, who have never been consulted.

Another kind of noise arises from the proposed installation of condensers. No noise, vibration and ventilation impact studies has been carried out on the effects on Bedford Court Mansions, only on properties much further away. Attention has not been given to the noise impact of the proposed development on residents of Bedford Court Mansions, and for this reason the application should be rejected.

Note: Even if condenser noise, ventilation and vibration are dealt with by Environmental Health, Camden Planning cannot make a decision on this application until these issues have been considered.

3) Party Wall issues.

15 Adeline Place directly adjoins the back of BCM for its entire length, sharing a party wall with it. On the flat roof level, the wall belongs wholly to BCM. Even with the lack of detail on the plans submitted, it is clear that the development of the 15 Adeline Place roof will involve using the BCM wall – installation of condensers and of built-in seating, attaching the glazed roof at several points, alteration (no details provided) of fire stair linking 15 Adeline Place and BCM. Permission for use of the BCM wall has not been sought by the developers or granted by BCM, and no party wall notice has been issued. While party wall issues may not come under the strict remit of building regulation, having been notified of this omission on the part of developers, Camden should not approve something that has not been duly agreed and for this reason too this application should be rejected.

4) Possible Contravention of Fire Regulations

15 Adeline Place has no back entrance or exit. In the case of fire, a fire stair at the rear enabled people on lower floors to climb up to the flat roof, and then escape over a second stair to Bedford Court Mansions. This was put in place in 1927. The planning application proposes to remove access to the

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

Comment: **Response:**

rear fire stairs for some of the floors and also proposes to make alterations in the fire stairs that link 15 Adeline Place and BCM. These proposed changes would certainly impact on the safety and security of BCM residents and the occupants of 15 Adeline Place. No consultation with BCM on this has been carried out by the developers and it is doubtful that the proposed changes would be approved by the appropriate fire authority. Having been notified of this omission on the part of developers, Camden should not approve something that has not been duly agreed and for this reason too this application should be rejected.

5) Security and Breaking Through into the Lightwell – General Objections

Security. No provisions have been made for ensuring the safety and security of BCM during the works proposed at 15 Adeline Place, including the erecting of a barrier on scaffolding between 15 Adeline Place and BCM to bar access from one site to another. In the past, BCM has been burgled while work was in progress on adjoining properties. Scaffolding and the introduction of casual labour greatly increase the security risk, and the developers have not given BCM any assurances about this. Camden should require the developers to address this in their Construction Management plan.

Breaking Through. There are at present no openings into the lightwell from 15 Adeline Place, because it was a condition of the 1927 agreement governing construction of the property that no openings or windows or vents be knocked into it from the 15 Adeline Place side, and this remains in force. The submitted plans are not sufficiently detailed to see that this is being observed, and it must be confirmed that proposed plans comply with this.

For all of the above reasons, this application should be rejected. I wish to be kept informed of the progress of this application.

Dr L. O'Connor
118 Bedford Court Mansions

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2016/1964/P	Dr R. Poignant	115 Bedford Court Mansions Bedford Ave London WC1B 3AG	15/05/2016 13:53:02	OBJLETTE R	I object to the Planning Application 2016/1964/P, 15 Adeline Place, which should be rejected because it is detrimental to the amenities of residents of Bedford Court Mansions because of loss of light, and of air in a very polluted area of London, and because of noise disturbance and other factors.

I live in 115 Bedford Court Mansions (Block D), on the third floor, and would be seriously disturbed by the proposed alterations to 15 Adeline Place, changing the use of the flat roof from a functional space which has always been empty to a social entertainment area.

My flat partly overlooks the area - both to the front and the rear of the site. My first objections are to the planters and timber fence that are proposed to be put across the top of the lightwell that we share with 15 Adeline Place, blocking the flow of light and air into the lightwell.

I benefit from the lightwell that provides the daylight for me to write this email to you, and I also depend on it for ventilation. So you see my wellbeing would be drastically reduced as would the wellbeing of residents on floors above and particularly below me, by the installation of planters, timber fence or opaque screen, which would deprive us of our right to light and air.

Then there is noise disturbance. The noise factor generated by such a change of use would not be acceptable in this very quiet living area. There would be the noise generated by people on the roof, and then there is the noise of the condensers they propose to install there, which would transmit noise and vibrations through the party wall (which is my kitchen wall) and through the windows. The developers did not assess the effect of noise and vibration on Bedford Court Mansions. Noise would be transmitted directly into a part of my flat used for both sleep and relaxation, the living heart of my flat where I spend most of my day.

I am also concerned about party wall issues. The party wall runs the full length of my flat, and the proposed changes would impact directly on it, but I and others have never been consulted by the developers which is unacceptable.

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
					<p>Just as important to me would be the removal of the fire escape down the back of 15 Adeline Place. Indeed this would restrict our only exit in the case of fire to to the main stairs in our building. Some years ago, the fire brigade came and inspected the flats in Block D and advised on fire drill. The instructions were that in case of fire we should go up not down , ie onto the roof and use the fire escape to 15 Adeline Place, and from the roof down the back to the found level. But on the planning application, that back fire stair is blocked.</p>

The proposed development is quite unsuitable for the site and detrimental to the rights of neighbours who have never been consulted by the developers. It must be rejected.

Yours sincerely, Dr Roslyn Poignant. 115 Bedford Court Mansions, Bedford Avenue, London WC1B3A

2016/1964/P	Dr R. Poignant	115 Bedford Court Mansions Bedford Ave London WC1B 3AG	15/05/2016 13:51:45	COMMNT	
-------------	----------------	--	---------------------	--------	--

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2016/1964/P	Dr R. Poignant	115 Bedford Court Mansions Bedford Avenue London WC1B 3AG	15/05/2016 14:16:18	OBJLETTE R	<p>I object to the Planning Application 2016/1964/P, 15 Adeline Place, which should be rejected because it is detrimental to the amenities of residents of Bedford Court Mansions because of loss of light, and of air in a very polluted area of London, and because of noise disturbance and other factors.</p> <p>I live in 115 Bedford Court Mansions (Block D), on the third floor, and would be seriously disturbed by the proposed alterations to 15 Adeline Place, changing the use of the flat roof from a functional space which has always been unused to a social entertainment area.</p> <p>My flat partly overlooks the area - both to the front and the rear of the site. My first objections are to the planters and timber fence that are proposed to be put across the top of the lightwell that we share with 15 Adeline Place, blocking the flow of light and air into the lightwell.</p> <p>I benefit from the lightwell that provides the daylight for me to write this email to you, and I also depend on it for ventilation. So you see my wellbeing would be drastically reduced as would the wellbeing of residents on floors above and particularly below me, by the installation of planters, timber fence or opaque screen, which would deprive us of our right to light and air.</p> <p>Then there is noise disturbance. The noise factor generated by such a change of use would not be acceptable in this very quiet living area. There would be the noise generated by people on the roof, and then there is the noise of the condensers they propose to install there, which would transmit noise and vibrations through the party wall (which is my kitchen wall) and through the windows. The developers did not assess the effect of noise and vibration on Bedford Court Mansions. Noise would be transmitted directly into a part of my flat used for both sleep and relaxation, the living heart of my flat where I spend most of my day.</p> <p>I am also concerned about party wall issues. The party wall runs the full length of my flat, and the proposed changes would impact directly on it, but I and others have never been consulted by the developers which is unacceptable.</p> <p>Just as important to me would be the removal of the fire escape down the back of 15 Adeline Place. Indeed this would restrict our only exit in the case of fire to to the main stairs in our building. Some years ago, the fire brigade came and inspected the flats in Block D and advised on fire drill. The instructions were that in case of fire we should go up not down, ie onto the roof and use the fire escape to 15 Adeline Place, and from the roof down the back to the ground level. But on the planning application, that back fire stair is blocked.</p> <p>The proposed development is quite unsuitable for the site and detrimental to the rights of neighbours who have never been consulted by the developers. It must be rejected.</p> <p>Yours sincerely, Dr Roslyn Poignant. 115 Bedford Court Mansions, Bedford Avenue, London WC1B 3AG</p>

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2016/1964/P	M. Stroud	104 Bedford Court Mansions Bedford Avenue London WC1B 3AG	15/05/2016 17:04:04	OBJLETTE R	I am writing to object to the planning application 2016/1964/P in the strongest possible terms. I live adjoining 15 Adeline Place and will be directly affected by the proposed alterations about which I have not been consulted by the developers.

I am particularly objecting to the those parts of the application that propose turning the roof of 15 Adeline Place into a social space/amenity.

I live in Bedford Court Mansions, in a flat on the first floor with windows facing directly onto the well which forms the external north wall of 15 Adeline Place. The distance between these windows and the wall is, at most 4 metres.

My flat and the many others around this light well depend on it for light, air and ventilation.

The proposed plans for developing the social space involve obstructing the top of this lightwell on the roof level of Adeline Place using planters, a timber fence and an opaque screen.

Although no height measurements are given – I cannot understand why this essential information has been omitted from the application – any such obstruction would deprive residents of Bedford Court Mansions around the well of light and air, and would give an unacceptable sense of enclosure.

The proposed development of the 15 Adeline Place roof will also affect noise levels. Noise travels down the well. Bedford Court Mansions is a residential property. The development of the roof into a social space is going to generate noise disturbance detrimental to the residents of Bedford Court Mansions.

No information has been given about hours of use or numbers of people expected to be using the roof.

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

As the plans now stand, many of the details of the proposal have not been fully thought through, and the effects on my own property and similarly located flats in Bedford Court Mansions have not been fully calculated.

This application must be rejected.
