

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2018/3876/P	Matthias Suchert	02/10/2018 18:36:43	OBJNOT	I OBJECT to this planning application due to below reasons:

An inaccurate documentation allows false conclusions as to the merit of this planning application.

The historical documentation focuses solely on the aspect of the building having only one facade, namely on Southampton Row. This is not the case, as it is clearly also fronting on Cosmo Place and that it is also visible as a facade from Queen Square. Simply looking at how the facade wraps around from Southampton Row to Cosmo Place and further to the back of the building shows that the architect was evidently aware of this fact. Misleading Statements and Facts include the mentioning that the facade where the extension is planned, is not visible because of tree foliage - which is not true. It is a well known fact that trees lose their foliage in winter, hence this argument would only be limited to a very select position from Queen Square while standing near a tree where the trunk obscures visibility. It allows the conclusion that the objectivity of the documentation is questionable. Furthermore, Tree Loss in Queen Square Gardens have exacerbated the visibility issue.

The proposed structural extension will be eminently visible from Queen Square and throughout Cosmo Place, and so must be treated as being interventions on the facade of the existing structure itself.

The documentation does not take into view Loss of Light and Overshadowing. My property extends to the boundary line of the property where the proposed extension will take place. As being nearly blind and highly dependent on lighting, any loss of light will lead to a detrimental ability of myself to access or pass through my property. The raising of the roof line and the additional massing of the extension will create significant overshadowing and extensive loss of light. This will be the case both within my house as well as on the property outside it. It is surprising that no effort has been made to contact any adjacent property owners to liaise and mitigate such effects. This would be in direct adverse contrast to the Local Plan Policy, A1, as set out by Camden Council. The Proposal does not mention the properties in direct view of the newly planned extension - namely 2 Queen Square and 3-5 Queen Square, where bathrooms and bedrooms are located within direct view of the new planned extension.

The additionally created rooms will overlook my property and also allow unobstructed view into its interior, creating a significant loss of privacy. There is no mention of such in the planning application support documents or Heritage reviews.

The additional rooms will increase traffic and supply traffic, which is currently routed via Queen Square, via a parking bay in front of my house. The increase will manifest itself in additional pollution and noise that is already at an unsustainably high level. With an increase of rooms, a different traffic and schedule arrangement must be found to minimise impact. There is no mention of such in the planning application support documents or Heritage Reviews. Camden is currently trying to enforce the Clean Air Act and drastically minimise traffic into its borough. This application will increase Traffic influx and work against the Clean Air Act. Additional traffic will also decrease Highway Safety by putting more vehicles on the road in an already extremely congested system. Additionally, any extra congestion will exacerbate the traffic conditions in front of Great Ormond Street hospital, which is already dire. Ambulances are sometimes not able to access the Hospital. Additional traffic in the immediate area surrounding the Hospital will put children's lives at risk. Servicing this larger hotel will require more servicing traffic and capacity - which currently is contrary to claims in the Proposal that no adverse effects will be a result.

Application No: Consultees Name: Received:

Comment:

Response:

An expanded and enlarged Hotel as proposed, will increase noise levels primarily due to additional and enlarged plant requirements and already unsustainable delivery traffic and activities. There is mention of noise pollution in the Proposal, yet focuses only on maintaining current levels, which are already high. Camden is currently trying to alleviate noise concerns to create a liveable urban environment for its permanent residents and visitors alike. Camden is following Noise as a pollutant and has numerous policies addressing a limitation of Noise and the detriment it has on its residents. The planned proposal will increase Noise. The Noise Survey has as measurement points three locations inside the private area of Queen Square Gardens, which is shielded by buildings, trees and is sitting within the noise shadow of a larger structure. It is obvious that these selection points have been groomed to deliver satisfactory-on-paper results.

Conservation Issues arise from the proposed material of the extension since the Elevation fronting Cosmo Place and the side labelled as 'Side Elevation' do not fit the building structure, its massing and the fact that the wrap-around facade from Southampton Row via Cosmo Place to the Side elevation will be disrupted. The material proposed is not found within Conservation Area guidelines nor does it contribute to the historical character of the area, especially this building. Predominantly used construction materials are neglected and are replaced with a cheap and utilitarian alternative that do not contribute to the building, its heritage status nor the neighbourhood. Camden has strong protective structures in place to protect the heritage, history and quality of its borough. The planned proposal will decrease heritage and quality of its historic fabric.

Looking at the proposed extension plans, it does not appear that the proposed extension will benefit disabled persons by way of accessibility. Accessibility concerns are Government Policy and these are not met. An Accessibility Review is not found in the planning application nor its supporting documents. Therefore the Proposal will result in an inaccessible hotel for anyone with disabilities. This is contrary to new requirements.

In conclusion, the consideration of this planning application does not alleviate, but makes worse many of Camden's stated goals of enhancing the borough and its quality. Critical aspects are not mentioned and statements or surveys provided are subjective and allow false conclusions as to the impact of this planned development.