

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2019/6435/P		30/01/2020 19:31:28	OBJNOT	<p>Comments on: Full Planning Permission Application number: 2019/6435/P 92 Southampton Row London WC1B 4BH</p> <p>Reject in its current form: We call for this application to be rejected in its current form because of the way it encroaches into the light well which adjoin a residential block. This application for works occurs just after the hotel completed works which have already encroached on the light well and for that reason were significantly restricted before approval. Those works caused significant noise and continued violations such as Sunday working, which also point to a need to defer further works next to a residential building. Finally, a condition of the recent works involved the moving of plant to a higher roof further away from residential buildings, and this plan would return plant to locations next to bedroom windows.</p> <p>Request for a site visit: We (owners of flats 1, 3, 5, 7 in Ormonde Mansions) request that the planning officer Joshua Oluneye visit Ormonde Mansions to register the impact that this construction would have on our homes and private lives. We suggest Wednesday 6 February in the morning when all flats are available for a visit. The owners of each of the flats will submit their own comments but jointly we have agreed on the date for a visit.</p> <p>The light well and its use: The buildings date from the first years of the 20th century when the east side of Southampton Row was demolished for road widening. The sites are relatively deep and therefore all buildings were built with substantial light wells. Buildings all contain shops (and the hotel lobby) at ground floor. The hotel and the adjoining section of Ormonde Mansions (100a Southampton Row) together have a joint light well, which we argue must be protected. They are an essential amenity for residential blocks on Southampton Row and further encroachment cannot be permitted.</p> <p>A large brick wall was constructed at basement and ground level and remains intact. Its top is below the level of first floor bedroom windows of both flats and hotel rooms. Behind the wall in the light well a restaurant was constructed in the 1980s, with glass roof lights which reaches above the height of the wall.</p> <p>The planning application is for duplex hotel rooms with an upper duplex floor replacing and substantially increasing the area now occupied by the low roof lights. Vertical zinc siding would face Ormonde Mansions directly above the brick wall, cutting off the visual access and airflows to first floor bedrooms. In effect, at first floor level a low roof light is being replaced by an entire new story of hotel rooms having an unacceptable impact on the first floor flats of Ormonde Mansions.</p> <p>We do not object to changes to the former restaurant area which is below the wall. However, building above the level of the dividing wall is totally unacceptable, and the application must be rejected. We note that the recently completed works (on blocks labelled B and C on the plans) were carefully negotiated between the hotel and residents of Ormonde Mansions to protect the light well. It is totally unacceptable that having completed those works the hotel returns to again try to take away part of the light well.</p> <p>Plant: The former restaurant does have plant above, but it is under the sky light which reduces the noise. As part of the agreement on the works on blocks B and C, all plant (which had been subject of continual noise complaints) was moved to the roof of the new 4th floor of block B with sound insulation. The application calls for the return of plant to the light well, which goes against the agreement on the previous works and also would cause noise disturbance. Plant cannot be allowed in the light well.</p> <p>Noise, disturbance and intrusion: Over nearly two years there was substantial noise and disturbance from the works on blocks B and C, which have only just been completed. Demolition works, especially the removal of concrete floors, was so noisy that residents had to move out. The application specifically calls for the demolition of a floor, which will be equally noisy. There was also substantial visual intrusion with workmen</p>

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
				<p>able to look into flats from a very short distance away - an important reminder of just how close to Ormonde Mansions the new structure will be. We have also been forced to make complaints about illegal Sunday works, most recently on Sunday 26 January 2020.</p> <p>We argue that any works, even to the existing ground and basement, should be deferred for at least five years to allow a respite for neighbours.</p> <p>The new rooms: Of course, the hotel will build rooms that it believes it can rent. But it is for planning authorities to set some minimum standards. The new construction will be just 50 cm from the windows of the existing first floor bedrooms of the hotel. The new duplex rooms will have no windows on the lower floor and on the upper floor the window will be just 50 cm from the windows of existing bedrooms. This seems unacceptable.</p> <p>Rejection: The Ormonde Mansions Residents Association calls for the rejection of this plan because of the way that the upper floors of the duplex bedrooms intrude into light well and reduce the amenities of adjoining residents of Ormonde Mansions. We also object to the return of plant to the light well. And we call for a delay in further noisy and disruptive works.</p> <p>Yours sincerely, Teresa Smart, chair and Flat 7 Ormonde Mansions Residents Association</p>
2019/6435/P		/01/2020 19:53:23	OBJNOT	<p>I would like to strongly protest against the proposed planning application outlined above and I agree entirely with the previous response to this application made by Teresa Smart, Chair of the Ormonde Mansions Residents Association.</p> <p>I feel that our right to light, privacy and peace are constantly under threat from the Hilton and given that we have only just finished two years of noise, disruption and dirt for the previous renovations/extensions it is unreasonable that this application has been submitted.</p> <p>I would be available to meet with the planning officer on Wednesday 6th.</p>