



Bleeding Heart Yard, off Greville Street, London EC1N 8SJ

January 20, 2020.

Laura Hazleton,
Planning Officer,
Development Management,
London Borough of Camden,
5 Pancras Square,
London N1C 4AG

DEAR LAURA

Planning Application Reference 2019/6272/P (the "New Planning Application")
20-23 Greville Street, LONDON, EC1N 8SS (the "Property")

I wish to put on record my personal and commercial objection to the above application.

As a resident, I face the serious issue that the proposal invades my family's privacy.

Eighteen adjacent windows, as shown on the proposed south elevation drawings, provide views into my home, as will the proposed roof terrace.

The privacy of my roof terrace will be destroyed by the six adjacent windows overlooking it.

As the owner of three business in the Yard, I join with others* doing business in the Yard in being stunned that the applicant, in an effort to justify their proposal, describes the Yard as inactive.

The Yard is home to four thriving jewellery businesses, two popular photographic studio and a long-established design business all of which attract people to the Yard.

DeBeers are refurbishing their buildings at 6 and 6a as part of a project that will see, later this year, 1,000 employees return to their Hatton Garden base.

The restaurants in the Yard have seating for 380 people, who create a buzz of activity as they come and go across the Yard.

Add the Scotch Malt Whisky Society's members. Their licensed premises on the first and second floor of 19 Greville Street can accommodate 90.

Add the many people who traverse the Yard on their way to and from Ely Place.

And the Bistro Terrace adds, as you will see from the attached, a touch of gaiety to the historic Yard.

My restaurants in the Yard employ 80 people and additional staff are called to service the numerous banquets we hold for up to 100 people in our medieval venue, The Crypt, in Ely Place, which is accessed directly from the Yard.

The Tavern is open for breakfast, lunch and dinner. Lunch and dinner are served in the Restaurant, Bistro and Tavern Dining Room.

Rather than being inactive, I have seen, in the 37 years since I opened a small basement wine bar, the Yard develop the atmosphere of a thriving village square, where neighbourhood business people meet and greet as they head for their chosen lunch or dinner venue.

I and others in the Yard are concerned that the Yard will, in fact, become hyperactive if the applicants' vision comes to pass.

Not just in terms of the pressures of additional daily number of people the developer envisages using his proposed new entrance but the fact they forecast deliveries will double the current number to the Yard, blighting air quality and adding to worries of pedestrian safety.

Turning the Yard from a thriving cobbled village square to the blandly oppressive ambience of Piccadilly Circus is not what I or my fellow business owners and their staff in the Yard see as beneficial.

They are astonished that the Council has supported this massive overdevelopment in a world seeking cleaner, greener less noisy and invasive outcomes - as well as destroying one of the few uniquely historic destinations in a conservation area of the Borough.

The council should withdraw their support for a scheme that will destroy our home and a popular atmospheric community space in the unique, historic setting of the Yard.

The council-funded report from BPS of Dorking supported the application by forecasting levels of rental incomes which I as an operator and my real estate advisors know to be totally unrealistic.

The report had to combine these unrealisable rental incomes with the halving of the obligation to provide workshop space to reach the extraordinary conclusion that the proposal is a better option than simply refurbishing a very ordinary building.

The council must ask BPS to update their forecast and have that report tested against current rental values.

The council are supporting a developer who, when I turned down his offer to buy my building said: "You will regret it. I will destroy your business."

The council now has an opportunity to withdraw that support. It should do so.

The proposal shows Bleeding Heart expanding into the developer's building. That is a blatant untruth.

The developer's argument that the eventual arrival of Crossrail justifies the proposed increase in retail and A3 accommodation does not withstand even cursory scrutiny.

Additional people will join the twice daily flood heading purposefully up and down Greville Street to and from their Holborn offices, but that flow will be tempered by the additional Farringdon ticket halls and entrances.

Any incremental footfall should flow to the existing, struggling retailers in Greville Street. The council

decision denies these retailers that prospect.

That is wrong and the council decision should be reversed.

The transformation of Smithfield into a new Borough Market, the arrival of the Museum of London and the large number of retail opportunities planned around the Crossrail entrances will do little to stimulate Greville Street growth.

The street is destined to remain a conduit and not a destination.

I would also like to comment on the following specific matters.

106

1. Since the applicant's name has changed and Santander mortgage has been transferred to others, the current agreement is invalid.
2. Their use of the Yard as a loading bay was justified in the application to allow their tenants to remain in occupation during construction. There are now no tenants. The Yard should not be their loading bay and construction should take place in the conventional manner from Greville Street.

3. Item 2.14 requires that construction is carried out safely and with the minimal possible impact and disturbance to the surrounding environment. That could not be achieved if construction takes place from the Yard.
4. The suggested removal of the pavement kerb would breach 1980 deed entered into between the council and the then owner of the building
5. If the applicant is suggesting that improvements to the pedestrian access to the Yard can be undertaken that will ensure all building users can reasonably reach the entrance of the building, then these alterations should be included in the design proposals and costed for inclusion in a new Section 106. Publication of such a design would allow the conservation officer and heritage bodies to review any proposed changes in the light of the heritage value of the environment of the area. Without a positive outcome to such a review it is likely that this building will be completed without proper access being provided.

Construction management plan

1. The requirement to ensure emergency vehicle access cannot be achieved under the current proposal.
2. The insistence that there be no adverse effects on "conservation area features". A main feature is the historic setts. It cannot be argued that using the Yard as a loading bay would not damage them.
3. Community working group should refer to the Bleeding Heart Society, which represents businesses and occupiers of the Yard.

Regards,



Robert Wilson

*Those who objected last year are joined this year by DeBeers, Grafton Commodities Trading at 4 BHY, Hatton Garden workshop at 2aBHY, The cotech Malt Whisky Society, Vainer and Co, Shore Properties and City Apartments.

