

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2017/1759/P	B P Oliver & Prof D H Lam	Flat 1 Lytton Court 14 Barter Street London WC1A 2AH	23/05/2017 19:58:24	OBJ	<p>Our objection to this application relates to the proposed changes of use for the car park behind Lytton Court. These proposals would seriously damage the residential nature of Barter Street and particularly Lytton Court.</p> <p>The original planning approval for the development of the whole site, including Lytton Court (ref PL/8800104/R2) includes the following clause: "the whole of the car park accommodation shown on drawing No AL/1484/61 shall be provided and retained permanently for the parking of vehicles of the occupiers of the residential accommodation hereby approved."</p> <p>There has been no consultation with leaseholders of Lytton Court by the freeholder or his agents about the proposed changes of use of the car park.</p> <p>In the Design and Access Statement, Part 1, provided by Oktra in support of this planning application, on page 6 there are proposals relating to the car park.</p> <p>This document claims that all 6 parking bays are allocated to Hogarth House. In fact one of those spaces is held by a leaseholder of Lytton Court.</p> <p>Oktra say that the client wishes to allocate four parking bays to food carts and one parking bay for cycle racks. They also say that loose furniture suited for the external environment will be provided. They go on to say that the car park will become a central focal point for people using the workspace to network and connect and that it can also be used as an occasional events space.</p> <p>Entry to the car park is currently limited to people who have a key to operate the gates on Barter Street. No information is given in Oktra's statement about whether the gates are to be retained. We would object strongly to any proposal to remove the gates.</p> <p>Several flats in Lytton Court have bedrooms overlooking the car park, including our flat. The proposals in Oktra's statement seem to us to be bound to result in noise and disturbance for the residents of Lytton Court. We also consider that food carts in the confined space of the car park will give rise to unpleasant odours. (The two restaurants which have back doors onto the car park at present do not cause a nuisance because they have adequate venting of cooking smells. This would not be possible for food carts.) There is no information in Oktra's statement about the likely hours of operation if these proposals were put into effect. This is particularly worrying for "events" proposed in Oktra's statement. We are concerned about disturbance if operations were to take place outside normal office hours.</p> <p>In conclusion, we request that the Council refuses planning permission for all the proposals relating to the car park. If, despite our objection, the Council is inclined to allow some of the changes proposed, we request that (a) food carts in the car park are not permitted; (b) "events" are not permitted; (c) that any other of the activities proposed would be allowed to take place only within the hours of 0800 and 1800 on weekdays.</p>

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2017/1759/P	Mr Peter Cooke	Flat 8 Lytton Court 14 Barter Street London WC1A 2AH	24/05/2017 08:10:57	OBJ	<p>I am a resident of Lytton Court, 14 Barter Street. A fellow resident has just informed me of a notice attached to a lamppost in Barter Street concerning a planning application for 133-136 High Holborn numbered 2017/1759/P. This application includes changes to the use of the car park behind 133-136 High Holborn and alongside Lytton court, a residential block. The changes include placing food carts in the car park and using the area for events and as an outside meeting space. The application also appears to include opening entrances in 133-136 High Holborn on Bloomsbury Court, a narrow passageway, which also runs alongside Lytton Court. At present the only entrances to 133-136 High Holborn are on High Holborn.</p> <p>I have a number of objections to this proposal as follows:</p> <p>The change of use of the car park including food carts and meetings/events and the opening of entrances on Bloomsbury Court will have unacceptable noise and food smell implications for residents of Lytton Court.</p> <p>The original planning approval for the development of the whole site, including Lytton Court,(ref PL/8800104/R2) includes the following clause : "The whole of the car parking accommodation shown on drawing number AL/1484/61 shall be provided and retained permanently for the parking of vehicles of the occupiers of the residential accommodation hereby approved." I am not aware that residents of Lytton Court have ever been consulted on amending this permission.</p> <p>Residents of Lytton Court have received no notification of the current proposal 2017/1759/P though they are obviously strongly affected by it. The deadline for consultation is very short ending in May.</p> <p>I do not believe the elements of this application related to change of use of the car park and opening entrances on Bloomsbury Court should be approved. Any activity permitted within the car park should be subject to the same time limit requirements as at present - 8 a.m. to 6 p.m. Monday to Friday.</p>
2017/1759/P	John Ye	Flat 3 Lytton Court Barter Street WC1A 2AH	23/05/2017 21:31:26	OBJ	<p>I am writing to oppose the application. I believe that the conversion of the car park adjacent to Lytton Court, a residential property, would have a detrimental impact on the welfare of the inhabitants of the surrounding buildings, both commercial and residential. Firstly, I believe that this would bring along considerable noise pollution to the area, especially considering that the buildings which are intended to be converted in all likelihood would cause the car park to be both a social and 'events' place into the late evening/early morning. Considering that a considerable number of people live in both Lytton Court and nearby buildings, many of whom have lived here for many years happily and are much more involved in the local area, I believe that the negative impact that this conversion would bring should outweigh the reasons in favour.</p>