

<b>Application No:</b>	<b>Consultees Name:</b>	<b>Consultees Addr:</b>	<b>Received:</b>	<b>Comment:</b>	<b>Response:</b>
2017/3034/P	Peter Zenneck	1A Doughty Mews	30/06/2017 21:46:10	OBJLETTE R	I object to the development as proposed in the application 2017/3034/P. The scale and proportion of the in-fill as it relates to the John's Mews outlook is inappropriate and against the character of John's Mews and the surrounding mews. The development destroys the rhythm of the mews where you have higher facades at the end of the mews and lower in the middle. The development also does not fit in the conservation area. I also believe that the light and overlook study does not properly address the needs of the school and school playground

---

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2017/3034/P	Bilgin Ersin - The Duke Pub	7 Roger Street London WC1N 2PB	03/07/2017 09:27:30	OBJ	<p>I am the owner occupier of the Duke Public House and the flat above at 7 Roger Street, London, WC1N 2PB and I OBJECT TO THIS PLANNING APPLICATION.</p> <p>Firstly, I would like to point out that the notice outside my Pub only appeared on 19th June 2017 and this is deliberate and intentional so that people in the area does not have enough time to object to the planning application-this is totally unfair and unacceptable.</p> <p>I have also rang on 2 separate occasion to speak to Kristina Smith and as of today"s date I had no response from her.</p> <p>I object to this planning application and think it should be refused on the following grounds:</p> <p>“All development should secure the amenities of its future occupants, and protect those amenities enjoyed by nearby and adjacent properties. The design of development, should have regard to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>(i) privacy, daylight, and sunlight; and</li> <li>(ii) noise, vibration, light, heat, smell and airborne emissions consisting of fumes, smoke, soot, ash, dust and grit; and</li> <li>(iii) activity levels and traffic generation”.</li> <li>(iv) there is no need for more commercial units in the area, many commercial units are empty</li> <li>(v) there is no more room for additional residential units,</li> <li>(vi) LB of Camden is no help during any developments regardless how dangerous it is around the development and the conduct and the behavior of the developers.</li> </ul> <p>I have now had 2 developments around my pub and on both occasions LB of Camden have turned a blind eye to all my complaints regardless have dangerous they may have been, to my staff and customers, members of public passing by and to the school children and and teachers in John Mews.</p> <p>Both, Roger Street and John mews are narrow streets but the size of the lorries using these roads during the developments are causing problems to the traffic and the cars and lorries have to drive on the pavements in order to pass each other or while the lorries are parked next to the development and the damage the additional traffic is causing the the area, the roads and the pavements</p> <p>My delivery hatch has been constantly damaged beyond repair during both recent development and LB Camden just turn a blind eye to all my complaints.</p> <p>Besides the traffic problems around my pub and damage to my delivery hatch by the traffic from the development, there is the problem of noise, dust and debris from the development,which has very adverse effect on my business especially at lunch time between 12 noon to 3.00pm. and not once LB of Camden have taken this into any consideration and dealt with my complaints.</p>

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

According to latest information, the actual owners of 21A, John Street, Bedford House and Haines House - 21 John Street are same but under different companies.

One of the main reasons for granting the change of use for Haines House - 21 John Street from Commercial to Residential from 2nd Floor to 7th floor was that they are unable to get the commercial units occupied which was read out by LB of Camden planning officer as if he was working to the owners of Haines House - 21 John Street.

It is a well know fact that they are problems of occupying Commercial units in the area and what is the point of building more commercial units and also bearing in mind the argument and the proposal put forward for the change of use from Commercial to Residential units for Haines House - 21 John Street?

Is this another clever move by the owners to built commercial units and later on to go for change of use to residential units on the grounds that they were unable to get them, occupied just like Haines House - 21 John Street.

I have been in my pub since 2003 and during that time, I have witnessed many of the building which were occupied as office have been turned into residential units and there is no need for additional commercial units in the area.

Additional proof that they are no need for additional commercial units in the area is that, the ground floor and and 1st floor of Haines House - 21 John Street have been empty for nearly 2 year and it is only recently the ground floor was rented out below market rent and the 1st floor is still empty and unoccupied.

Should you decide to grant permission for this development our first objection should be noted, particularly by the local licensing authority who must consider our objection if any complaints should arise from future occupants of the proposed development.

I repeat. LB of Camden never once dealt with my complaints regardless how serious and I have even lost my case for rates reductions on the ground that the Chancellor changed the ruling and I was constantly mislead by LB of Camden regarding how to get help and assistance for my Business rates during the developments around my pub.

LB of Camden is not responsible to anyone, they are law onto them self. LB of Camden just ignores small business like mine and work hand in hand with developers regardless of the damaged caused to small my businesses like mine.

It is no surprise that we end up with problems like Grenfell Tower - Local authorities working hand in hand with developers and big business.

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2017/3034/P	Nicholas Clough	Flat 7 21 John Street WC1N 2BF	30/06/2017 20:11:59	OBJ	<p>Objection to Application 2017/3034/P Bedford House 21a John Street From Nicholas Clough, Flat 7, 21 John Street WC1N2BF</p> <p>I object to this application on the grounds that:</p> <p>(a) the proposal is wholly inappropriate to this area. Over the past few years I have been proud of Camden Planning, when it has protected the skyline and general "look and feel" of Doughty and John Streets, with conditions such as "no additional built form should be added". (Indeed there is that same condition on further development here at 21 John Street.) Bedford House is already the tallest building on the street, and is an ugly modern one too; this proposal will only increase its presence, and negatively impact many of the surrounding terrace and mews houses - the Charles Dickens museum is only 50m away</p> <p>(b) Most affected by this proposal however, are the residents of 21 John Street, an iconic, Grade II listed building which shares a common wall with Bedford House, and already has serious issues with the management of the Bedford House property, re noisy air conditioners and tenant's compressors cycling on and off at all hours, 24-7.</p> <p>Please note that 21 John Street itself is a very recent conversion to residential (2014), so we are all relatively new tenants – already grateful to Camden Planning for holding the developers to a high standard, and protecting the area from inappropriate applications.</p> <p>My flat here on the 6th floor at 21 John Street has 5 windows which face the north-facing backside of Bedford House. We get the sun, but just barely, over the top of Bedford House; adding another storey to Bedford house will block out that much more sun and light. Most disturbingly, the new windows at Bedford House will be just a few metres away from ours! We will have to keep the blinds closed at all times. Would you be happy about that, if you had just moved into Camden and this building just 2-3 years ago? Think how much worse the privacy and light issues will be for the tenants in the 5 floors below, here at 21 John Street. Moving all of the noisy Bedford House air conditioners from the north lightwell/basement well, onto the roof, will only bring the noise closer to the residents here – and it's a noise residents in this building have already complained about to Bedford House, to no avail.</p> <p>So I hope you will deny this application, on at least the grounds of its inappropriateness for the area, and its direct impact on neighboring residents with the loss of light, increased noise from building air conditioning/plant equipment, loss of privacy, and overlooking issues.</p> <p>Thank you for your consideration, Nicholas Clough Flat 7, 21 John Street, WC1N 2BF</p> <p>~</p>

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2017/3034/P	Nicholas Clough	Flat 7 21 John Street WC1N 2BF	30/06/2017 20:11:48	OBJ	<p>Objection to Application 2017/3034/P Bedford House 21a John Street From Nicholas Clough, Flat 7, 21 John Street WC1N2BF</p> <p>I object to this application on the grounds that:</p> <p>(a) the proposal is wholly inappropriate to this area. Over the past few years I have been proud of Camden Planning, when it has protected the skyline and general "look and feel" of Doughty and John Streets, with conditions such as "no additional built form should be added". (Indeed there is that same condition on further development here at 21 John Street.) Bedford House is already the tallest building on the street, and is an ugly modern one too; this proposal will only increase its presence, and negatively impact many of the surrounding terrace and mews houses - the Charles Dickens museum is only 50m away</p> <p>(b) Most affected by this proposal however, are the residents of 21 John Street, an iconic, Grade II listed building which shares a common wall with Bedford House, and already has serious issues with the management of the Bedford House property, re noisy air conditioners and tenant's compressors cycling on and off at all hours, 24-7.</p> <p>Please note that 21 John Street itself is a very recent conversion to residential (2014), so we are all relatively new tenants – already grateful to Camden Planning for holding the developers to a high standard, and protecting the area from inappropriate applications.</p> <p>My flat here on the 6th floor at 21 John Street has 5 windows which face the north-facing backside of Bedford House. We get the sun, but just barely, over the top of Bedford House; adding another storey to Bedford house will block out that much more sun and light. Most disturbingly, the new windows at Bedford House will be just a few metres away from ours! We will have to keep the blinds closed at all times. Would you be happy about that, if you had just moved into Camden and this building just 2-3 years ago? Think how much worse the privacy and light issues will be for the tenants in the 5 floors below, here at 21 John Street. Moving all of the noisy Bedford House air conditioners from the north lightwell/basement well, onto the roof, will only bring the noise closer to the residents here – and it's a noise residents in this building have already complained about to Bedford House, to no avail.</p> <p>So I hope you will deny this application, on at least the grounds of its inappropriateness for the area, and its direct impact on neighboring residents with the loss of light, increased noise from building air conditioning/plant equipment, loss of privacy, and overlooking issues.</p> <p>Thank you for your consideration, Nicholas Clough Flat 7, 21 John Street, WC1N 2BF</p> <p>~</p>

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2017/3034/P	Jason Karas and Anna Baillie-Karas	Flat 6 21 John Street London WC1N2BF	30/06/2017 19:17:19	OBJ	<p>We strongly object to the application. Our main concerns are:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The loss of natural light to 21 John Street. Our flat is on 5th floor and our four windows facing South-South West are affected. The Section AA and Axonometric Projection shows the height of the proposed building blocking sunlight to our flat. Contrary to the BRE report, it is clear that the effect on South-facing windows in particular will be significant, as the sky above Bedford House is the primary source of South light for these windows and the proposed addition of two stories would block this light.</li> <li>2. The noise of the air-conditioning units. The existing air-conditioning units have already affected our sleep from the ground position. The proposal would increase the number of units and place them at roof level. We note the proposed increase in floor area is significant and the type and number of air-conditioning units has not been provided, nor does the Provisional Plant Noise assessment give any indication of measures that would be undertaken to reduce noise to meet Council criteria (there is mention of screening and housing but no assurance these would be done or would be sufficient).</li> <li>3. The amenity of the area. John Street contains many listed buildings, including residential buildings on either side of Bedford House. Adding a storey plus a rooftop will negatively impact on the listed houses and the character of the street, which has been carefully preserved. The proposed in-fill of the light-well would clash with the scheme of the adjacent buildings backing onto Johns Mews and the proposed glazing at roof level is out of keeping with the streetscape. We also note it is not compliant with the Council plan which requires 50% of new floor space to be residential.</li> <li>4. Overlooking: the windows of the proposed extension would be opposite our bedroom windows, which creates overlooking issues and is an unacceptable invasion of our privacy.</li> <li>5. The proposed Amenity Terrace would have people congregating outside our bedroom - with associated talking, music and smoking. We would have to keep our windows closed and blinds down permanently for the peaceful enjoyment of our flat, which is unacceptable (especially in summer). The proposed Amenity Terrace exacerbates the noise and privacy issues raised above and the loss of amenity and enjoyment of our flat.</li> <li>6. Whilst we appreciate the desire to modernise the space within Bedford House to make the offices more functional, the proposal, both in style and scope, is at odds with the amenity and character of the street.</li> <li>7. Finally, the letter from Savills incorrectly refers to 21 John Street as 11 storeys but it is 7 storeys (and a ground level).</li> </ol>

We urge the Council to reject this application. Please notify us of the Committee date.

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

Jason Karas and Anna Baillie-Karas

---