

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2018/5985/P	Braulio Eduardo Morera	13/07/2019 21:16:35	SUPC	<p>It is very important that the ground floor property has a separate access. This is a much-needed improvement. Customers of the massage parlour and the offices on the basement constantly ring the bells of the First and Second Floor property – this includes disruption at night.</p> <p>The massage parlour has been operating since autumn 2018, when it was moved from no. 170, without prior notice to us as neighbours or, indeed, the Council. In the last few months we, the upstairs neighbours, have been disturbed by a few strong arguments between the parlour staff and their customers. We have even had to open the door to drunken customers who come at night and ask for 'the girls'. It is important for the Council to consider whether this use is appropriate for a building where a family with little children lives and if the proposals have considered unintended impacts that the new use may have.</p> <p>This property is located in a conservation area. The addition of the stairs and direct access to the basement is an added feature that is not present in other original terraces. Whilst this is a feature in other buildings in the block, those buildings are of later construction. In my perspective adding a direct access goes against current planning guidance and thus should be removed from the proposal.</p> <p>The original use was office space, and the proposed use involves new potential disruptions which, in my opinion, are not addressed in the proposal. For example, the massage parlour operators play music all day (often continuously) until 10pm and this is heard in the flat on the 1st floor. What measures have been put in place to mitigate such disturbance? What measures have been put in place to prevent excessive humidity from accumulating in so many rooms with no ventilation and thus building a mould problem for the whole building in the long term?</p> <p>The main elevation in the drawings uploaded does not exactly represent the existing signalling. The existing situation has signals that are a lot bigger and more strident than those of neighbouring shops, which in my opinion are not appropriate for a conservation area and reduce the value and flair of the surrounding properties. Newly installed floodlights completely illuminate the residential rooms both on the first and second floor, which is unacceptable. Shop tenants committed to improving these but no improvements have been made to date. Are the existing signals and lighting going to be replaced for smaller ones that are more appropriate to the conservation area and do not affect the upstairs flat?</p> <p>Crucially, I think it is unacceptable that the planning proposal documents name the owner of the flat upstairs as owner of this property (I only own the flat upstairs, not the shop). This is misleading and incorrect – the Applicants were notified of this problem and no action was taken. The Council should assess the validity of a proposal with incorrect data for the Ownership of the property.</p>