

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2017/1550/P	Paul Cockle	Flat 3 13 Tavistock Place London WC1H 9SH	12/05/2017 11:46:04	OBJ	<p>I am a resident of 13 Tavistock Place and Director of 13TP Ltd which is a shared freehold.</p> <p>I oppose the development on the following grounds:</p> <p>1 Breaches Camden Policy CS7. Tavistock Place is primarily residential - several of the hotels are hostels for staff working at Imperial Group. A change of use to a café sets a precedent to expand such development which is inimical to residential use: increased street noise; footfall on a pavement which Camden in its Tavistock -Torrington Cycle scheme claims is already congested; a greater volume of smells from the air conditioning wafting into flat bedrooms.</p> <p>2 Claim that it will create community (who he?) and student synergies. This is palpable tosh. No public café I have been in has been consumed by exchanges across table on the optimal treatment of viral infections. If LSHTM want a relaxed place to discuss their work then they should take a leaf from UCL"s Department of Biology - the Sir Jeremy Bentham public house has probably been responsible for more research ideas than many university sites. Not only have I witnessed it myself, but in the company of the Professor who ran the department for years, and swears to its important role. LSHTM can use the Lord John Russell.</p> <p>3 Signage. Any signage, particularly the simulacra in their planning documents suspended on our party wall, is not only intrusive, signals a quite different use from the surrounding residences but also implies that our building might be in the restaurant business.</p> <p>4. Change of Use and Extra laboratories. I find it inexplicable why LSHTM is proposing to build a 5 storey building that runs the risk of disturbing the foundations of adjacent buildings because they need vital research space, and at the same time wasting their existing space which is marginal to their principal activity. If the space is not suitable to their sybaritic wants they should not change the building but change their address.</p> <p>5 External lighting is totally unacceptable first for the integrity of the buildings design, secondly for the visual intrusion in the street. I also do not see why it is necessary unless they plan now or at some point in the future to have late night opening, which is definitely inimical to residential expectations. The current proposal signals a Trojan horse. Once they have permission, they, or some future occupant, is likely to seek an alcohol licence, which will again add to late night noisy streets. This is already a problem for us seeking sleep at night.</p> <p>6 Transport. Mr Lester incorrectly suggests to LSHTM that there is no loading and unloading. The true situation is that it was removed on the North Side of Tavistock Place for the purposes of the temporary experimental Traffic scheme. I am not even sure whether the proper procedures were followed to impose the temporary loading and unloading ban. The transport officer in charge at the time was not even aware that loading and unloading was permitted, until we stood together in the street and I pointed it out. The Scheme"s Public Inquiry will doubtless investigate this. So at present the loading/unloading ban is temporary. That having been said, there will be deliveries to the café - if they will be selling more to the public - which taken in conjunction with what now appears to be a greater number of workers in the newly re-planned laboratories means the combined transport impact needs to be re-assessed.</p>

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2017/1550/P	Katharine Owen	Flat 9 13 Tavistock Place	11/05/2017 12:53:12	COMMEM AIL	<p>I wish to object to this application on the following grounds.</p> <p>This is a mixed area of residential and institutional use but at present carefully zoned so that the two can co-exist with a minimum of adverse effects to the people who live here. The introduction of a food outlet and activity of this kind will introduce a level of noise, light pollution, smells and litter will have a detrimental effect on the quality of residents' lives and the character of the street.</p> <p>13 Tavistock Place already suffers severe problems of litter and fly tipping, which are a public nuisance and will only be exacerbated by the opening of a commercial food outlet, not to mention increasing the public health nuisance we already have of people smoking immediately outside our gate and disposing of their cigarette ends on the pavement.</p> <p>We already have vermin problem, to the extent that we have had to put bait boxes in the garden. Again, this problem will only be compounded by the consumption of food next door, especially outside.</p> <p>Finally, when parties and outside events have been held at 15-17 Tavistock Place in the past, the noise levels have severely disrupted our lives and prevented us from being able to relax in our own homes or engage in any activity that requires concentration.</p> <p>I hope that all these factors will be taken into account when considering the application, along with the desire to maintain a vibrant, living community in the area rather than it becoming yet another soulless part of London where commercial considerations have taken precedence over the desire of ordinary people to live and work where they have resided for many years.</p>

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2017/1550/P	Luke Dodimead	Flat 5 13 Tavistock Place	10/05/2017 22:12:38	OBJ	<p>As a direct neighbour of this property I am concerned that the planning request submitted will have a detrimental impact on my property, my comfort and the wider look and feel of the street.</p> <p>The outdoor seating area butts onto the wall of the communal garden linked to my block of flats. Given the proximity, the noise pollution will be significant and detrimental to the enjoyment of the residents.</p> <p>There is already a significant issue with litter blowing into our garden which then attracts vermin into the neighbourhood, an outdoor eating area will only exacerbate this problem.</p> <p>Tavistock Place is primarily residential on the north side and a cafe is not in keeping with the road, in addition there are numerous cafes and restaurants not more than a stones throw away on Marchmont Street and within the Brunswick shopping centre.</p> <p>I cannot see why a meeting place primarily for the students needs a front entrance onto the street, the current cafe contained within the premise is surely a more intuitive option.</p> <p>The opening times of the cafe have not been stated but early morning deliveries would be expected which will not only wake residents but also impact traffic on what is a one way road. The impact to cyclists is likely to be delivery drivers rushing across the cycle lane and potentially causing accidents.</p> <p>I confirm that I object to this planning application.</p>

2017/1550/P	Roger Cline	Flat 13 13 Tavistock Place London WC1H 9SH	10/05/2017 15:28:44	COMMEM PER	<p>I am a resident of the premises (13 Tavistock Place) and also chairman of the directors of 13 Tavistock Place Ltd the company owning the freehold of the building adjoining the address for which the application is made. Tavistock Place is essentially a residential street whereas commercial/restaurant premises are zoned in Marchmont Street and should be kept there. A restaurant with external seating will cause noise and litter to invade my premises and destroy the quiet enjoyment of my residence to which I am entitled. Food scattered around the external seating will attract undesired vermin such as rats, pigeons and seagulls. The public pavement is already crowded with tourists ambling along with their suitcases and students with their smartphones and any encroachment from the private external area of the planning application address will add to the crowding problem. Vehicles servicing such restaurant premises will cause further congestion on the one-lane street which already has no-loading restrictions.</p>
-------------	-------------	---	---------------------	---------------	--

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2017/1550/P	Dr Deirdre Stein	14A Tavistock Place London WC1H RD	10/05/2017 10:27:51	COMMEM PER	<p>On behalf of my family, I object to the change of use from D1/Non-Residetnial Institution to A3 Restaurant and Cafe.</p> <p>This is a significant change of use in a largely residential area.</p> <p>My famly lives in a basement flat which is less than 100 yards from 15-17 Tavistock Place (14A Tavistock Place is our address). Our child is 11 and has Down Syndrome. He has sleep problems associated with his conditiion. He is usually in bed by 8.30pm. The noise of diners in an outdoor area so close to his bedroom would severely compromise his sleep, not to mention ours.</p> <p>We believe that the Council has a duty of care to ensure that residents in the area don't have their sleep disturbed beyond reason, particularly those with vulnerabilities.</p> <p>We will be in touch with MP Keir Starmer about this planning possibility, who knows about our son Ethan.</p> <p>Furthermore I would like to add that the area already has well over twenty restaurants and cafes on nearby Marchmont Street and the Brunswick Centre.</p> <p>A change of use for a restaurant with outfdoor seating in a residential section of the neighborhood is unreasonable and unnecessary. It will creatre noise problems for my family and for the neighborhood.</p>

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2017/1550/P	Tamar House RTM Co Ltd	c/o 6 Tavistock Place London WC1H 9RD	09/05/2017 15:34:30	OBJ	<p>This comment comes from the Tamar House RTM Co Ltd which manages a block of 31 flats at 12 Tavistock Place, almost opposite 15-17 Tavistock Place.</p> <p>We object to the proposed change of use for five reasons:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none">1. A pavement café is not in keeping with the character of the street. Tavistock place should be left residential and institutional.2. There is no evidence of need. There are plenty of cafes and restaurants nearby, in Marchmont Street and the Brunswick Centre.3. It sets an unacceptable precedent. If this application is approved, it would be difficult to refuse similar applications from Mary Ward House or further applications from LSHTM along its street frontage.4. Pedestrians could be at risk. Pavement tables will reduce pavement space. As customers come and go from the café or restaurant, passers by could be squeezed off the pavement into the cycle track.5. Noise and litter nuisance is likely. This will depend on opening hours and the type of food and drink being sold. But once change of use is agreed the business will be largely free to evolve. The only long-term protection for residents is to block use of this building as a restaurant. <p>We support the objection already submitted by the Bloomsbury Conservation Area Advisory Committee.</p>

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2017/1550/P	Christopher Catling	Flat 9 13 Tavistock Place London	11/05/2017 10:27:52	OBJ	<p>I would like to object to the application on the following grounds.</p> <p>1) The character of the area around Tavistock Place is in part created by clear zoning: some street are residential (including hotels) and institutional while others were built as and have long served as shops and small businesses with residential accommodation above. The proposed café and restaurant disrupts this pattern and sets a precedent that would be to the detriment of the area's character.</p> <p>2) When in the past parties and events have been held at 15-17 Tavistock Place (eg at the end of term) the noise and the smells have been very disruptive to the residents of 13 Tavistock Place -- so much so as to make it impossible to focus on any activity requiring concentration. This is especially the case in summer when the flat residents have their windows open for fresh air.</p> <p>3) We already suffer a high degree of littering in and around our block of flats, with rubbish (especially take-way food containers) being dumped in our gateway, which also serves as a magnet for smokers who drop their litter outside our property. I fear that this will simply increase if there is a food outlet on our doorstep.</p> <p>I hope these points will be taken into account: the character of this part of London is very largely the result of the fact that real people live here and there is a real community; disrupting this by introducing noise, smells, litter and commercial activity into a residential area will simply drive people out and lead to another part of London becoming unliveable.</p>

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2017/1550/P	Paul Cockle	Flat 3 13 Tavistock Place London WC1H 9SH	12/05/2017 11:46:19	OBJ	<p>I am a resident of 13 Tavistock Place and Director of 13TP Ltd which is a shared freehold.</p> <p>I oppose the development on the following grounds:</p> <p>1 Breaches Camden Policy CS7. Tavistock Place is primarily residential - several of the hotels are hostels for staff working at Imperial Group. A change of use to a café sets a precedent to expand such development which is inimical to residential use: increased street noise; footfall on a pavement which Camden in its Tavistock -Torrington Cycle scheme claims is already congested; a greater volume of smells from the air conditioning wafting into flat bedrooms.</p> <p>2 Claim that it will create community (who he?) and student synergies. This is palpable tosh. No public café I have been in has been consumed by exchanges across table on the optimal treatment of viral infections. If LSHTM want a relaxed place to discuss their work then they should take a leaf from UCL"s Department of Biology - the Sir Jeremy Bentham public house has probably been responsible for more research ideas than many university sites. Not only have I witnessed it myself, but in the company of the Professor who ran the department for years, and swears to its important role. LSHTM can use the Lord John Russell.</p> <p>3 Signage. Any signage, particularly the simulacra in their planning documents suspended on our party wall, is not only intrusive, signals a quite different use from the surrounding residences but also implies that our building might be in the restaurant business.</p> <p>4. Change of Use and Extra laboratories. I find it inexplicable why LSHTM is proposing to build a 5 storey building that runs the risk of disturbing the foundations of adjacent buildings because they need vital research space, and at the same time wasting their existing space which is marginal to their principal activity. If the space is not suitable to their sybaritic wants they should not change the building but change their address.</p> <p>5 External lighting is totally unacceptable first for the integrity of the buildings design, secondly for the visual intrusion in the street. I also do not see why it is necessary unless they plan now or at some point in the future to have late night opening, which is definitely inimical to residential expectations. The current proposal signals a Trojan horse. Once they have permission, they, or some future occupant, is likely to seek an alcohol licence, which will again add to late night noisy streets. This is already a problem for us seeking sleep at night.</p> <p>6 Transport. Mr Lester incorrectly suggests to LSHTM that there is no loading and unloading. The true situation is that it was removed on the North Side of Tavistock Place for the purposes of the temporary experimental Traffic scheme. I am not even sure whether the proper procedures were followed to impose the temporary loading and unloading ban. The transport officer in charge at the time was not even aware that loading and unloading was permitted, until we stood together in the street and I pointed it out. The Scheme"s Public Inquiry will doubtless investigate this. So at present the loading/unloading ban is temporary. That having been said, there will be deliveries to the café - if they will be selling more to the public - which taken in conjunction with what now appears to be a greater number of workers in the newly re-planned laboratories means the combined transport impact needs to be re-assessed.</p>

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