2 November 2016

Dear Ms Phillips

**47 Doughty Street WC1N 2LW: Proposed alterations, extension and basement construction.**

**Planning Application ref 2016/1027/P; LB Application 2016/1183/L**

**COMMENTS ON REVISED PLANS**

I very much welcome the substantial reduction in extent of basement excavation. It is important that the final Basement Impact Assessment reflects the final plan and has been audited to the satisfaction of your consultants.

My concerns about other aspects of the scheme remain the same however, including the impact and effect of the rear extension.

I would also reiterate the concerns over construction impacts. There is an unusual and particularly sensitive neighbouring land use in this case: a museum of international standing occupying a Grade 1 Listed Building where the main activity relies on a quiet atmosphere during the working day. While I’m sure the Museum accepts that neighbours may carry out building work and will approach the matter in a reasonable and constructive way, it does seem to me that this is a case where a Construction Management Plan needs to be very thorough and for clarity and enforcement purposes needs to be incorporated in a s106 legal agreement.

Although this is a relatively small development, Camden’s guidance on s106 agreements and in the Statement of Community Involvement does envisage that legal agreements can be appropriate to manage construction impacts on small sites. In addition to issues already mentioned, such an agreement should require the setting up of a formal liaison process or working group between the applicant, contractors and the Museum (with involvement of other neighbours if they wish) so that noisy activities, deliveries etc can be planned and managed in advance. It is also important that the agreement includes detailed requirements for the reinstatement of any walls, paving etc which are moved or damaged during construction. A method statement for demolition of the existing extension should also be included.

Given the number of representations received for both the planning and Listed Building applications, a number of which are not resolved by the amended plans, I would hope and expect that these applications are referred to the Planning Committee for decision.

Yours sincerely

John Gardener