

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2019/1710/L	Simon Oliver	18/04/2019 15:31:28	OBJ	<p>My wife and I reside [REDACTED] with the rear of our property overlooking Ching Court. We purchased our property in 1996, with the main appeal being the close proximity to Covent Garden but still managing to obtain the privacy and peacefulness whilst living in London. We really enjoying living here and feel that the proposed application (referenced above) will ultimately be of huge detriment to our property and neighbouring properties destroying this peaceful safe haven. The current set up of mixed use of the buildings within Ching Court is vital to this level of privacy and security being maintained. The proximity of the proposed apartments to my property is 9 metres and I was of the understanding that Camden have a strict policy whereby they try to keep at least 18 metres between properties in regard to direct overlooking.</p> <p>Another major concern of ours is the noise what with having tenants coming and going continuously which under the current use we do not have, especially at night as with the buildings current use as offices, the courtyard is very quiet. Also I would like to further point out to you that having the mixed usage definitely deters drug addicts from using the courtyard and its doorways. Office workers are continuously using the doorways to gain access to Ching Court, however should this change to residential use the doorways in question will most certainly not be used as much and thus encourage the likelihood of drug users to use these areas. This does not sit comfortably with us at all especially when we have grandchildren visiting regularly and at the moment it is managed to an acceptable level.</p>
2019/1710/L	Gary Young	18/04/2019 12:16:31	OBJ	<p>The mix of uses including offices as well as residential above shops are a significant part of Sir Terry Farrell's vision for Comyn Ching Triangle. The proposed change of use two buildings on Monmouth St, losing offices to residential, would damage the vision of the place. Key to the success of Comyn Ching Triangle is the arrangement for the offices over retail on Monmouth Street to use the entrances doors from the rear courtyard. This creates a mix of use in a tightly designed external space, with both shared public day time activity and private evening tranquility. The mix of use is a significant contribution to the courtyard's success. The proposed change of use for two buildings from office to residential will damage this mixed use to the detriment of both the surrounding buildings and the courtyard which Historic England emphasised by confirming protection with grade 2 listed status.</p> <p>Regarding the proposed changes to the buildings, both the properties affected by the application are intact individual buildings with separate staircases. A key part of the listed building consent in 1980's was to preserve these two as exemplars of individual building plans, whilst allowing more latitude to other buildings which had been linked previously. No 55 includes the only intact room interiors from the late 17th century which were carefully restored and would be significantly compromised by linking through to the neighbouring property and any proposed alterations to listed fabric.</p> <p>On the above grounds we object to the proposed change of use and alterations to grade 2 listed buildings and courtyard which would damage a significant landmark of urban design.</p>

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2019/1710/L	Philippe Ward	18/04/2019 15:32:34	OBJ	<p>This building is one third of the office side of Ching Court and, if lost as an office, would shift the mix of frontages around the Triangle to predominantly residential and the back of shops. Terry Farrell's vision for the space and its buildings, as protected by listing, would be greatly diluted by the proposed changes. Farrells architects and conservation groups believe that Ching Court should retain its character, as a seminal early post-modern example of mixed-use development.</p> <p>The designed mix of uses work very well. Offices currently lie along the side of the Triangle that overlooks residential units, which allows for high density with good amenity. It evokes the original mixed-use plans of Thomas Neale for Seven Dials in the 1690s. This character was a major factor driving Historic England to list not only the remaining buildings around the courtyard, but also as much of their rear space as possible, in 2017.</p> <p>The proposal would also knock-through a passageway at first floor level between two distinct listed buildings, damaging the 17th century pattern.</p> <p>The street history plaque states "From the outset, Neale planned Seven Dials to be a mix of residential, retail and crafts, very different from the fashionable, purely residential London squares of the day. Today Seven Dials stands as the only quarter of London remaining from late Stuart England - its layout is unaltered and many of the original houses remain, mostly re-faced in the late eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries." 2 & 3 Ching Court are important examples of this.</p>
2019/1710/L	Philippe Ward	18/04/2019 15:32:40	OBJ	<p>This building is one third of the office side of Ching Court and, if lost as an office, would shift the mix of frontages around the Triangle to predominantly residential and the back of shops. Terry Farrell's vision for the space and its buildings, as protected by listing, would be greatly diluted by the proposed changes. Farrells architects and conservation groups believe that Ching Court should retain its character, as a seminal early post-modern example of mixed-use development.</p> <p>The designed mix of uses work very well. Offices currently lie along the side of the Triangle that overlooks residential units, which allows for high density with good amenity. It evokes the original mixed-use plans of Thomas Neale for Seven Dials in the 1690s. This character was a major factor driving Historic England to list not only the remaining buildings around the courtyard, but also as much of their rear space as possible, in 2017.</p> <p>The proposal would also knock-through a passageway at first floor level between two distinct listed buildings, damaging the 17th century pattern.</p> <p>The street history plaque states "From the outset, Neale planned Seven Dials to be a mix of residential, retail and crafts, very different from the fashionable, purely residential London squares of the day. Today Seven Dials stands as the only quarter of London remaining from late Stuart England - its layout is unaltered and many of the original houses remain, mostly re-faced in the late eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries." 2 & 3 Ching Court are important examples of this.</p>

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2019/1710/L	Deborah Loth	19/04/2019 19:48:47	OBJEMAIL	Converting these premises for residential use goes against the original intention of the Ching Court development. By having office use (daytime occupation) on one side of the courtyard residential use (evening and weekend occupation) on the other side(s) the original architect encouraged a harmonious mixed-use approach the urban block. Having residents watching each other across the courtyard and looking into each others' homes is undesirable. Once converted, it's hard to go back.
2019/1710/L	Anthony Jennings for Bloomsbury CAACv	18/04/2019 18:35:47	OBJEMAIL	The proposed change of use two buildings on Monmouth St, losing offices to residential, would disrupt the concept for these offices over retail on Monmouth Street using the courtyard entrances. The proposed change of use for two buildings from office to residential will damage the mixed use vision and concept. Both properties are individual buildings with separate staircases, which the listing was intended to preserve. We also understand No 55 contains intact room interiors from the late 17th century which were carefully restored and that these would be significantly compromised by any proposed alterations. This change of use and alterations would quite obviously neither preserve nor enhance the conservation area and would also damage listed buildings and we accordingly strongly object to the proposal.

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2019/1710/L	Elizabeth Bax, Covent Garden Community Association	19/04/2019 20:18:19	OBJ/NOT	<p>CGCA objects to both the listed buildings application and the planning application for these two buildings on the grounds of:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none">1. Damage to the fabric and character of two listed buildings with parts dating from Stuart times.2. Damage to the character of Ching Court, an award-winning development made up of 18 listed buildings including these two.3. Loss of residential amenity in relation to overlooking and disturbance.4. Loss of residential, commercial and public amenity in relation to security.5. Loss of interesting and affordable offices for small businesses in the West End of London. <p>Issues relating to listed building consent overlap somewhat with those relating to planning consent. However, we concentrate on issues 1 and 2 in this submission, being more specific to the listed building application.</p> <p>-----</p> <p>At the outset it is important to understand the reason for these applications. The applicant, Shaftesbury, owns many of the buildings around Ching Court, and others around the Seven Dials area. The company is open about its commercial strategy being to shift uses around in their estate, to meet higher investment returns as the property market shifts.</p> <p>At present:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none">a) rental prices on small, unmodernised offices are under pressure, and higher returns can be made in the residential private rental market;b) rental prices on larger (family) flats are less than the same square footage split into little flats or converted and modernised as open-plan offices. <p>So the applicant wishes to turn two small offices with staircases on Monmouth Street into 1 bedroom flats, and to turn a 3 bedroom flat on Shorts Gardens with lift access into a modern office (the latter being the subject of two separate applications, 2019/1709/L and 2019/1294/P).</p> <p>We do not believe that the increased financial return projected for Shaftesbury by this exercise justifies the damage to important listed buildings, damage to the character of this unique post-mode</p>

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2019/1710/L	David Kaner	19/04/2019 22:11:57	OBJNOT	<p>Part 3 of 3</p> <p>This combination of the absence of overlooking at the rear of the residential properties and the daytime policing of the space are both important features of the original ingenious design by Farrell. The conversion of the upper floors of 53-55 Monmouth Street will result in a significant change to this aspect of the design and so will harm the amenity of the existing residential uses and the setting of their buildings, all of which are now listed.</p> <p>The applicants letter makes reference to the approval of 2010/6158/P for a similar conversion of 57-59 Monmouth Street and seeks to use this as a reason why this application should be approved. The application for this conversion has since lapsed and the more recent renewal of the Listed Building Consent associated with it pointed out that it a new application was now required. With the recent listing of the whole of Ching Court as a 'masterly exercise in placemaking' (according to Historic England in their listing documents) the fact that there is an existing permission should not influence the decision on this application. In this case two wrongs do not make a right.</p>
2019/1710/L	David Kaner	19/04/2019 22:09:07	OBJNOT	<p>Part 2 of 2 (as the system appears to contain an error in its character limit)</p> <p>Ching Court contains a mix of A1, B1 and C3 uses. Farrell's design has B1 offices at upper levels on the West side with C3 flats on the South side and C3 houses on the East. This means that the offices look over the rear of the houses and vice-versa. As the offices are occupied during the day this means that the houses and flats are not overlooked at the rear at night. This gives the occupants a sense of privacy which is not common in City Centre locations.</p> <p>In addition the fact that the Courtyard is used during the day as an entrance for the offices but is not used at night means that it is effectively policed during the day by workers and those visiting the offices but can be kept unoccupied at night. This prevents it being used as a location for illegal and anti-social activity which is rife in the area. The fact of this activity is referred to by the same applicant and agent in 2018/0371/P, an application for the installation of a gate at the South entrance to the courtyard.</p> <p>This combination of the absence of overlooking at the rear of the residential properties and the daytime policing of the space are both important features of the original ingenious design by Farrell. The conversion of the upper floors of 53-55 Monmouth Street will result in a significant change to this aspect of the design and so will harm the amenity of the existing residential uses and the setting of their buildings, all of which are now listed.</p> <p>The applicants letter makes reference to the approval of 2010/6158/P for a similar conversion of 57-59 Monmouth Street and seeks to use this as a reason why this application should be approved. The application for this conversion has since lapsed and the more recent renewal of the Listed Building Consent associated with it pointed out that it a new application was now required. With the recent listing of the whole of Ching Court as a 'masterly exerci</p>

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2019/1710/L	David Kaner	19/04/2019 22:10:18	OBJ/NOT	<p>Part 2 of 3 (as the system appears to contain an error in its character limit)</p> <p>Ching Court contains a mix of A1, B1 and C3 uses. Farrell's design has B1 offices at upper levels on the West side with C3 flats on the South side and C3 houses on the East. This means that the offices look over the rear of the houses and vice-versa. As the offices are occupied during the day this means that the houses and flats are not overlooked at the rear at night. This gives the occupants a sense of privacy which is not common in City Centre locations.</p>
2019/1710/L	David Kaner	19/04/2019 22:07:25	OBJ	<p>Part 1 of 2 (as the system appears to have an error in its settings)</p> <p>I am writing to object to the application for Listed Building Consent to convert the 1st to 3rd floors of 53-55 Monmouth Street, otherwise known as 2 Ching Court, from office to residential use.</p> <p>The proposed site is on the West side of the Ching Court triangle and I live on the East side. As this is a listed building application my concerns are related to the impact of the proposed development on the setting of my own listed building and the impact on their setting, namely Ching Court as a whole.</p> <p>Ching Court was, as the applicant has pointed out, an extensive mixed use redevelopment in the 1980s by Terry Farrell. Pevsners Buildings of England: London 4 North describes it as an 'ingenious and tactful scheme'. As someone who has lived here for 25 years I can confirm that it is very ingenious and that a significant part of that ingenuity is the way in which the uses relate to one another. This is a significant feature which would be forever lost if this application was permitted.</p>

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2019/1710/L	David Kaner	19/04/2019 22:04:48	OBJ	<p>I am writing to object to the application for Listed Building Consent to convert the 1st to 3rd floors of 53-55 Monmouth Street, otherwise known as 2 Ching Court, from office to residential use.</p> <p>The proposed site is on the West side of the Ching Court triangle and I live on the East side. As this is a listed building application my concerns are related to the impact of the proposed development on the setting of my own listed building and the impact on their setting, namely Ching Court as a whole.</p> <p>Ching Court was, as the applicant has pointed out, an extensive mixed use redevelopment in the 1980s by Terry Farrell. Pevsners Buildings of England: London 4 North describes it as an 'ingenious and tactful scheme'. As someone who has lived here for 25 years I can confirm that it is very ingenious and that a significant part of that ingenuity is the way in which the uses relate to one another. This is a significant feature which would be forever lost if this application was permitted.</p> <p>Ching Court contains a mix of A1, B1 and C3 uses. Farrell's design has B1 offices at upper levels on the West side with C3 flats on the South side and C3 houses on the East. This means that the offices look over the rear of the houses and vice-versa. As the offices are occupied during the day this means that the houses and flats are not overlooked at the rear at night. This gives the occupants a sense of privacy which is not common in City Centre locations.</p> <p>In addition the fact that the Courtyard is used during the day as an entrance for the offices but is not used at night means that it is effectively policed during the day by workers and those visiting the offices but can be kept unoccupied at night. This prevents it being used as a location for illegal and anti-social activity which is rife in the area. The fact of this activity is referred to by the same applicant and agent in 2018/0371/P, an application for the installation of a gate at the South entrance to the co</p>

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2019/1710/L	David Kaner	19/04/2019 22:01:43	OBJ/NOT	<p>I am writing to object to the application for Listed Building Consent to convert the 1st to 3rd floors of 53-55 Monmouth Street, otherwise known as 2 Ching Court, from office to residential use.</p> <p>The proposed site is on the West side of the Ching Court triangle and I live on the East side. As this is a listed building application my concerns are related to the impact of the proposed development on the setting of my own listed building and the impact on their setting, namely Ching Court as a whole.</p> <p>Ching Court was, as the applicant has pointed out, an extensive mixed use redevelopment in the 1980s by Terry Farrell. Pevsners Buildings of England: London 4 North describes it as an 'ingenious and tactful scheme'. As someone who has lived here for 25 years I can confirm that it is very ingenious and that a significant part of that ingenuity is the way in which the uses relate to one another. This is a significant feature which would be forever lost if this application was permitted.</p> <p>Ching Court contains a mix of A1, B1 and C3 uses. Farrell's design has B1 offices at upper levels on the West side with C3 flats on the South side and C3 houses on the East. This means that the offices look over the rear of the houses and vice-versa. As the offices are occupied during the day this means that the houses and flats are not overlooked at the rear at night. This gives the occupants a sense of privacy which is not common in City Centre locations.</p> <p>In addition the fact that the Courtyard is used during the day as an entrance for the offices but is not used at night means that it is effectively policed during the day by workers and those visiting the offices but can be kept unoccupied at night. This prevents it being used as a location for illegal and anti-social activity which is rife in the area. The fact of this activity is referred to by the same applicant and agent in 2018/0371/P, an application for the installation of a gate at the South entrance to the co</p>
2019/1710/L	Michael Howell	19/04/2019 20:21:31	INT	<p>Amanda Rigby (chair of the Ching Court Association is writing a letter to the case officer detailing at some length the objections the Association has to this application. I support the objections raised.</p>

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2019/1710/L	Elizabeth Bax, Covent Garden Community Association	19/04/2019 20:19:56	OBJNOT	<p>CGCA objects to both the listed buildings application and the planning application for these two buildings on the grounds of:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none">1. Damage to the fabric and character of two listed buildings with parts dating from Stuart times.2. Damage to the character of Ching Court, an award-winning development made up of 18 listed buildings including these two.3. Loss of residential amenity in relation to overlooking and disturbance.4. Loss of residential, commercial and public amenity in relation to security.5. Loss of interesting and affordable offices for small businesses in the West End of London. <p>Issues relating to listed building consent overlap somewhat with those relating to planning consent. However, we concentrate on issues 1 and 2 in this submission, being more specific to the listed building application.</p> <p>-----</p> <p>At the outset it is important to understand the reason for these applications. The applicant, Shaftesbury, owns many of the buildings around Ching Court, and others around the Seven Dials area. The company is open about its commercial strategy being to shift uses around in their estate, to meet higher investment returns as the property market shifts.</p> <p>At present:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none">a) rental prices on small, unmodernised offices are under pressure, and higher returns can be made in the residential private rental market;b) rental prices on larger (family) flats are less than the same square footage split into little flats or converted and modernised as open-plan offices. <p>So the applicant wishes to turn two small offices with staircases on Monmouth Street into 1 bedroom flats, and to turn a 3 bedroom flat on Shorts Gardens with lift access into a modern office (the latter being the subject of two separate applications, 2019/1709/L and 2019/1294/P).</p> <p>We do not believe that the increased financial return projected for Shaftesbury by this exercise justifies the damage to important listed buildings, damage to the character of this unique post-mode</p>