

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2019/1289/P	Dr L. O'Connor	23/04/2019 11:21:44	OBJEMAIL	<p>Application for planning permission: 2019/1289/P Enforcement reference: EN19/0248</p> <p>I live opposite the site and am directly affected. I object to this application in the strongest possible terms, and wish to complain to the council about the consistent disregard shown by the submitters to the residents, the environment and to Camden Council's planning regulations and procedures.</p> <p>1) This is a misleading and disingenuous application. The original permission 2015/3605/P allowed at appeal ref APP/X5210/W/16/3147078 did not reveal the relocation of the air conditioning plant or the impact it would cause, and we believe that if it had been revealed at that time, as it should have been, the permission would not have been granted.</p> <p>2) The work appears to have been carried out without planning permission, so this is actually a retrospective application, and it should be treated as the violation it is.</p> <p>3) This property has a bad record stretching back over many years of adding air conditioning units in an ad hoc manner without permission and then resisting any attempts at enforcement. This disregard of health and safety and quality of life regulations cannot be allowed to continue.</p> <p>4) Acoustic and other surveys cited by the submitters are old and out of date, and should not be allowed. New surveys are necessary. I checked the noise being emitted this morning. The noise level is not acceptable – it is a ROAR.</p> <p>5) the air conditioning units attached to the building are already operating at full capacity with regard to the impact on residents and the environment, and cannot justifiably be increased.</p> <p>6) Noise emanating from this building, refuse collection, deposit of hotel guests, and deliveries all already outstrip acceptable limits, but violations are not enforced. The re-siting of plant will only increase this.</p> <p>7) I support and endorse the much more detailed objections registered by the Bloomsbury Association.</p> <p>8) For the reasons the</p>

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2019/1289/P	Dr L. O'Connor	23/04/2019 11:20:24	OBJEMAIL	<p>Application for planning permission: 2019/1289/P Enforcement reference: EN19/0248</p> <p>I live opposite the site and am directly affected. I object to this application in the strongest possible terms, and wish to complain to the council about the consistent disregard shown by the submitters to the residents, the environment and to Camden Council's planning regulations and procedures.</p> <p>1) This is a misleading and disingenuous application. The original permission 2015/3605/P allowed at appeal ref APP/X5210/W/16/3147078 did not reveal the relocation of the air conditioning plant or the impact it would cause, and we believe that if it had been revealed at that time, as it should have been, the permission would not have been granted.</p> <p>2) The work appears to have been carried out without planning permission, so this is actually a retrospective application, and it should be treated as the violation it is.</p> <p>3) This property has a bad record stretching back over many years of adding air conditioning units in an ad hoc manner without permission and then resisting any attempts at enforcement. This disregard of health and safety and quality of life regulations cannot be allowed to continue.</p> <p>4) Acoustic and other surveys cited by the submitters are old and out of date, and should not be allowed. New surveys are necessary. I checked the noise being emitted this morning. The noise level is not acceptable – it is a ROAR.</p> <p>5) the air conditioning units attached to the building are already operating at full capacity with regard to the impact on residents and the environment, and cannot justifiably be increased.</p> <p>6) Noise emanating from this building, refuse collection, deposit of hotel guests, and deliveries all already outstrip acceptable limits, but violations are not enforced. The re-siting of plant will only increase this.</p> <p>7) I support and endorse the much more detailed objections registered by the Bloomsbury Association.</p> <p>8) For the reasons the</p>

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2019/1289/P	Dr L. O'Connor	23/04/2019 11:20:01	OBJEMAIL	<p>Application for planning permission: 2019/1289/P Enforcement reference: EN19/0248</p> <p>I live opposite the site and am directly affected. I object to this application in the strongest possible terms, and wish to complain to the council about the consistent disregard shown by the submitters to the residents, the environment and to Camden Council's planning regulations and procedures.</p> <p>1) This is a misleading and disingenuous application. The original permission 2015/3605/P allowed at appeal ref APP/X5210/W/16/3147078 did not reveal the relocation of the air conditioning plant or the impact it would cause, and we believe that if it had been revealed at that time, as it should have been, the permission would not have been granted.</p> <p>2) The work appears to have been carried out without planning permission, so this is actually a retrospective application, and it should be treated as the violation it is.</p> <p>3) This property has a bad record stretching back over many years of adding air conditioning units in an ad hoc manner without permission and then resisting any attempts at enforcement. This disregard of health and safety and quality of life regulations cannot be allowed to continue.</p> <p>4) Acoustic and other surveys cited by the submitters are old and out of date, and should not be allowed. New surveys are necessary. I checked the noise being emitted this morning. The noise level is not acceptable – it is a ROAR.</p> <p>5) the air conditioning units attached to the building are already operating at full capacity with regard to the impact on residents and the environment, and cannot justifiably be increased.</p> <p>6) Noise emanating from this building, refuse collection, deposit of hotel guests, and deliveries all already outstrip acceptable limits, but violations are not enforced. The re-siting of plant will only increase this.</p> <p>7) I support and endorse the much more detailed objections registered by the Bloomsbury Association.</p> <p>8) For the reasons the</p>
