<b>Consultees Name:</b>	<b>Consultees Addr:</b>	Received:	Comment:	Response:
Sir Terry Farrell	Farrells London 7 Hatton Street NW8 8PL NW8 8PL	08/05/2017 14:55:45	COMMEM AIL	The application relates to the pair of early 18th century houses 57-59 in the middle of Monmouth St with an entrance door to the Ching Court giving access to offices over shops. The proposal is to convert offices into flats.
				The two houses were converted for retail and office use and linked as a pair in the 1982-5 by Farrells with new entrance door case to Ching Court and refurbished internal timber staircase. The offices interiors were designed with mouldings and colours to have similarity of detail across the Monmouth St terrace, with each house having a unique design to suite the particular layout. In the proposals part of the interior lobby and wc on each upper floor will be ripped out to make a second connecting door through party wall between houses, an existing connecting door will be infilled as a cupboard, stair walls will be covered by new acoustic lining concealing mouldings, new fitted bathrooms and fitted cupboards will cut across ceiling, wall and skirting mouldings, therefore the integrity of interiors will be lost.
				A previous application in 2011-12 had received consent from Camden but was not implemented. This application is for renewal. Since the previous application, however, the historical and architectural context and significance of Comyn Ching Triangle has been recognised and given elevated status through the 2016 group listing. Comyn Ching Triangle has been widely supported and recognised as an exemplar of a mixed use scheme with sensitive adaptation of historic fabric and inventive detailing, including the interiors. The proposed change to residential use will be detrimental to the mix of use and the character of the courtyard which are both essential parts of the architectural and historic value.
				Moreover the new listing description updated in 2017 has added more detailed reference to the office interiors of Monmouth St and includes description of this particular pair of houses with reference to description, plans and elevations in the AJ of March 1985. Therefore in 2017 there is a much stronger case to retain the integrity of the historic architectural interiors and the existing office use.
				We therefore strongly object and recommend refusal of the application for alterations and change of use.
				Yours sincerely
				Sir Terry Farrell CBE
		Sir Terry Farrell Farrells London 7 Hatton Street NW8 8PL	Sir Terry Farrell Farrells London 08/05/2017 14:55:45 7 Hatton Street NW8 8PL	Sir Terry Farrell Farrells London 08/05/2017 14:55:45 COMMEM 7 Hatton Street AIL NW8 8PL

Printed on: 09/05/2017

09:10:02

					Printed on: 09/05/2017 09:10:02
Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2017/1261/L	Neil munn	Flat 1 17 Shelton street Covent garden London	06/05/2017 16:25:21	OBJLETTE R	Dear sir  We have recently bought Flat 1 17 Shelton Street (one month ago). We bought the flat because we really like the privacy that it offers based on the current set up at Ching Court. Today I learned about this Monmouth Street planning proposal for the first time.  The one thing we have not enjoyed in our first month is the drug usage around Ching Court. Just today my 13 year old daughter had to step over two active crack using addicts at 11am on a Saturday morning on our front door step! This is a terrible thing. The idea that, due to the proposed change of usage, the courtyard gates will no longer be officially kept locked from 6pm is appalling (because it will instead rely on flat owners and their tenants). What a perfect invitation to encourage increased drug usage in the area. Surely this cannot be acceptable under any circumstances purely for safety reasons.  I am also unhappy about the corresponding loss of privacy because the new flats will look directly into our first floor living room windows.  As a family we strongly request that this planning application is rejected. The issue around safety and security is undeniable. There can be zero justification for increasing the risk to personal safety of the existing residents, especially children.  I would be grateful if you would acknowledge receipt of this objection.  Thank you  Neil Munn.