

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2019/6435/P	Gregorio Magnani	22/02/2020 15:27:23	COMMNT	Gregorio Magnani 82 Commercial St London E1 6LY

Objection to the Full Planning Permission Application number: 2019/6435/P for the Hilton Doubletree Hotel, 92 Southampton Row, London WC1B 4BH

London, 12.2.2020

Dear Sir/Madam,

I am the owner of flat 5, 100A Southampton Row, London WC1B 4BJ.

A large proportion of my flat faces the light well in which the construction is proposed. The specific purpose of the light well is to afford light to the numerous rooms that overlook it, and maintain amenity of peaceful level of sound and activity.

A number of major works have been undertaken in the same light well over several years, practically continuously. Though these were severely restricted before approval they caused much disruption and distress to all the residents, pointing to the need to severely regulate any further work.

In the past, scaffold has been erected and maintained in this location for long periods of time with operatives not observing standard working hours and, worse, lighting maintained 24 hours a day on the scaffold, causing disturbing light intrusion into all apartments.

#### MASSING

The proposal illustrates the removal of the existing restaurant skylight, to be replaced by a solid mass construction, practically filling the plan of the lightwell, and apparently sitting above the level of the existing skylight apex. This massing is by its nature visually intrusive, and would acoustically affect the entire lightwell; the flat roof suggests that there may well be further plant located here in the future, and it would likely be used as a maintenance walkway for access and cleaning of skylights, longterm. This would no doubt create irregular sporadic noise disruption, and considerable privacy issues, particularly to the lower flats.

The existing skylight is by its nature a light construction, minimally intrusive in massing, and prohibitive to additional construction/plant placement. Being a restaurant space, below, existing activity within is naturally minimized operationally during the night.

#### PLANT

Importantly, a condition of the recent works involved the moving of plant to a higher roof further away from residential buildings in acknowledgement of the excessive and highly disturbing noise it produce when placed in the light well. As owner of flat 5, I would like to be assured that my tenants, whose bedrooms, bathroom and kitchen face the light well, will not be subjected to further continuous noise disturbance.

I note that the current proposals illustrate a single new condenser unit to service the numerous (eleven?) new rooms created; in my opinion this appears to be a rather insubstantial provision, and it is my guess that additional, more substantial plant would be required and installed at a future date.

I understand that the new rooms are to be serviced by a new flow and return mechanical ventilation system, located within the roof void construction. I see no indication of this on the proposals, nor where intake and exhaust vents would be located. This is of obvious concern to us, and should be detailed for inclusion of consideration of the application in respect of acoustic, visual, and odour intrusions/loss of amenity.

Furthermore there is no indication of what presence would be implied by operatives undertaking ongoing maintenance of the above.

It must be remembered that every time an operative (for example, a plant engineer) is working within this area,

Application No:      Consultees Name:      Received:

Comment:

Response:

it automatically implies noise, and threat to privacy, especially in the lower flats.

NOISE

Consideration of possible plant noise generated has been noted, above.

It is not specified whether any of the windows to the proposed new rooms are openable, and the attending planning officer advised that this was not yet specified. This should be fundamental in a noise assessment, particularly in the case of a hotel, where rooms are in constantly rotating use, and most likely to be used late into the evening.

If there is a controlled ventilation and aircon system, all glazing should be sealed and insulated to have zero acoustic breakout. This should be clarified in the proposals, and included in the acoustic report.

The proposed extension by Hilton would in my opinion severely curtail both the amount of light and the quiet enjoyed by the flats at 100A Southampton Row facing the light well in question.

I ask 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. I also call for a serious and enforceable restriction to further noisy and disruptive works .

I believe the application lacks some very important detail in submitted information, vital for consideration. I believe the application represents an unnecessary overdevelopment of an already very large hotel, to the detriment of longstanding local homeowners and tenants.

With best regards

Gregorio Magnani  
82 Commercial st  
London E1 6LY  
gregorio@magnani.co.uk

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2019/6435/P	Dr J Riordan and Dr C Conte	23/02/2020 22:26:53	OBJ	<p>Dear sir/madam,</p> <p>Re: Planning Application - 2019/6435/P for 92 Southampton Row London WC1B 4BH</p> <p>We are the current tenants of Flat 5 in the adjacent Ormonde Mansions (WC1B 4BJ). We have lived in this apartment for over seven years.</p> <p>In short, we oppose this further incursion into our privacy, amenity and serenity, and fully endorse the previous objections submitted by local residents and community associations in opposition to this planning application.</p> <p>For the last two years we have been subjected to more or less continuous construction noise, pollutants, and disruption from the adjacent hotel's ongoing works. Those works have been repeatedly carried on in breach of the permitted hours and noise requirements (as other respondents have noted), making it difficult to place any weight upon the already thin assurances contained in the present application.</p> <p>Firstly, there is no community benefit from the proposed development, which necessarily comes at a further substantial cost to adjoining neighbours and the local community.</p> <p>Secondly, the Hotel's application is inconsistent with at least the following aspects of the Camden Local Plan for the Bloomsbury Conservation Area:</p> <p>A. Policy CC2 Adapting to Climate Change - there has been no attempt to comply with paragraph 8.42 of the Local Plan, which states that "active cooling (air conditioning) will only be permitted where dynamic thermal modelling demonstrates there is a clear need for it after all of the preferred measures are incorporated in line with the cooling hierarchy". No thermal modelling appears to have been included with the planning application. The proposed area is on the ground floor and it seems inherently unlikely that there could be a "clear need" for active cooling -- still less to justify "equipment [which] has the propensity to operate 24 hours per day 7 days per week" (see section 8.1 of the Environmental Noise Assessment).</p> <p>B. Policy A4 Noise and vibration - paragraph 6.99 of the Local Plan states that "Air conditioning will only be permitted where it is demonstrated that there is a clear need for it". Paragraph 6.97 also refers to internal noise levels and vibration. It is apparent that little consideration has been given to issues of noise insulation bearing in mind the close proximity of the guest rooms to existing residential accommodation.</p> <p>C. Policy A1 Managing the impact of development. The proposal would have a material negative effect upon visual privacy (particularly for those of us with large bathroom windows overlooking the proposed development site), outlook (having to stare out at a large roof-mounted air conditioner, for example), sunlight and overshadowing (for the lower floors), artificial lighting and light pollution levels (from corridor lighting and skylights), noise and vibration levels, and dust. The proposal fails adequately to assess and address or mitigate any of these impacts.</p> <p>D. Policy CC4 Air Quality - no air quality impact assessment has been undertaken for the proposed works, which will involve further potentially hazardous dust being produced and spread around surrounding properties. The dust fallout from previous works was significant; further work would inevitably pose concerns for any resident with a respiratory condition.</p>

Application No:      Consultees Name:      Received:

Comment:      Response:

Thirdly, we note that the Environmental Noise Assessment prepared by SPEK Noise Control Ltd contains, in section 8, the manufacturer's specifications for a "Daikin REYQ20U Air Cooled Condenser". There are a number of obvious problems with this analysis:

(1) It is based on what appear to be incorrect specifications. The official Daikin website rates the Q20U at 87.9 dBA of sound power and 65.0 dBA of sound pressure: see p 5 of [http://www.daikintech.co.uk/Data/VRV-Outdoor/REYQ/2019/REYQ-U7Y1B/REYQ-U7Y1B\\_Databook\\_EEDEN19.pdf](http://www.daikintech.co.uk/Data/VRV-Outdoor/REYQ/2019/REYQ-U7Y1B/REYQ-U7Y1B_Databook_EEDEN19.pdf). That is approximately 5 orders of magnitude greater than that claimed in the application supporting documents and would pose an extremely serious noise hazard.

(2) It is inconsistent with document "5097-M17-R01-01 - PHASE 4 ROOF LEVEL AIR CONDITIONING SERVICES", which refers to the proposed plant as a "Daikin Condensing Unit - Heat Recovery" external condensing unit for which the noise level is given as "65 dBA (sound pressure)". This appears to be the lower estimate for the range. But this means that the Environmental Noise Assessment was done on an incorrect basis.

(3) The Noise Assessment ignores the other two items of plant mentioned in document 5097-M17-R01-01, namely a Daikin Slim Concealed Ceiling Unit and Daikin Concealed Floor Standing unit, which may also be sources of combined noise and vibration.

(4) The Noise Assessment fails to account for the height of the condensing unit (1.68m) which would tower above the assessment location and be more likely to disperse sound across a larger area.

(5) The Noise Assessment assumes that there will be no vibration (see section 8.3) on the basis that it "should be resiliently mounted". No detail of this is given. In reality, roof-mounted plant of this kind will inevitably transmit vibrations to the surrounding masonry and brickwork and is therefore likely to be audible at greater distances.

Fourthly, at a personal level, we would also stand to be immediately and seriously impacted by the proposed development. The existing plant noise and vibrations are already distinctly audible from the two lightwell-facing bedrooms, and poses a constant, low-pitched hum day and night. In an otherwise quiet oasis within Bloomsbury, this is intolerable -- and we are on the fourth floor, so we hate to think of the impact on residents lower down. In assessing the likely impact of this application, we urge the Council to take account of what, until recently, has been an extremely quiet level of background noise within the internal courtyard and light-well.

We are both sensitive sleepers, work long hours and rely on a good night's sleep for mental and physical wellbeing. The prospect of any further disturbance would make each of us think very seriously about moving out and finding different accommodation, rather than ensure a yet further cycle of noisy, disruptive and valueless development at this site.

We therefore respectfully ask the Council Planning Officer to reject the application.

Yours sincerely,

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
				Dr Jaani Riordan Dr Carmine Conte

---

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2019/6435/P	Debbie Radcliffe	24/02/2020 22:04:24	OBJ	<p>The Bloomsbury Residents Action Group (BRAG) was founded in 2016. We campaign to ensure that interventions, development and traffic management schemes do not undermine the quality of life of residents in the three wards of south Camden (Kings Cross, Bloomsbury and Holborn &amp; Covent Garden). We want decision-makers to understand, respect and respond to our stated aim: that 'residents matter'.</p> <p>On behalf of the many residents who live in very close proximity to the Hilton at Doubletree Hotel (formerly Bonnington Hotel) we wish to register our support for the Ormonde Mansions Residents Association in their objection to the proposed changes with application 2019/6435/P, 92 Southampton Road, WC1B 4BH.</p> <p>The Applicant proposes to erect a double storey rear and side infill at ground and first floor level, together with change of use of ground floor space, to add 11 new guestrooms to the hotel, together with additional plant.</p> <p>The proposed plans include the removal of the glass roof lights that rise above the dividing wall between the hotel and Ormonde Mansions. These will be replaced by a much larger zinc-clad roof that will impact negatively on the residential amenity of Flats 1 and 3. The proposed plant for air conditioning etc from the new duplexes will also cause noise pollution for flats 1, 3, 5 and 7.</p> <p>We understand from the residents of Ormonde Mansion that they have already experienced three separate periods of noise and nuisance from construction work, which has been carried out over recent years to create additional space for the adjacent hotel. The cumulative impact is taking its toll on the wellbeing of Ormonde Mansions residents, and yet another application for building work (with the last one only just finished) will have an unacceptable impact on residents' quality of life.</p> <p>We understand that the recent works have already encroached on and filled up the light well between the two Edwardian buildings (Ormonde Mansion and the Hotel) where the external walls for both properties are faced with white glazed brick - intended to increase the reflection of sunlight within the space. A light well is, as its name suggests, an external space provided within the volume of a large building to allow light and air to reach what would otherwise be a dark or unventilated area.</p> <p>We would like to draw your attention to paragraph 2.12 in Camden Planning Guidance on Basements (March 2018). The presence or absence of light wells helps define and reinforce the prevailing character of a neighbourhood. In Camden's Conservation Area and Management Appraisal (2011) both Ormonde Mansions and the Hotel are identified as positive contributors to the Conservation Area. The light well between the two buildings does indeed contribute to the character of the neighbourhood and any further harm to this heritage asset is unacceptable, albeit it is not viewed from the street.</p> <p>A key test in justifying the demolition (and associated harm to the surrounding conservation area) of 'a designated Positive Contributor' is to demonstrate that the harm would be weighed against the public benefits of the scheme. Although the light well is only one element of the positive contributor buildings, it is an important heritage asset, and as such should be protected, not further encroached on due to the Hotel's desire to increase its number of guest rooms.</p> <p>The Application does not provide evidence of ANY public benefits of the scheme. On the contrary, it will impinge unacceptably on the neighbouring occupiers in Ormonde Mansions.</p>

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
				We urge Camden to reject the application.
2019/6435/P	M chowdhury	23/02/2020 21:52:46	OBJNOT	<p>I strongly disagree with the planning permission to be granted for the following reasons .</p> <p>This hotel has been given permission in the past without prior consultation to at least us the 32 old Gloucester street, this has been granted I believe 3 to 4 time and work has been going on for the last 3 to 4 years . This has had a devastating and detrimental effect on the area and local businesses and residents.</p> <p>The following has been a serious issues,</p> <p>Noise levels have been high, with the construction company and hotel going beyond legal noise levels.</p> <p>Construction waste and dust this has been a serious issue with windows not being able to be open and dust and dirt forming on the windows.</p> <p>Pollution from the construction has been detrimental to residents with no consideration given to residents.</p> <p>Construction waste left out on the road and not move for full days.</p> <p>Parking of cormasule vehicles for delivery for the hotel is constant and parking and contervining parking laws from theres vehicles .</p> <p>Noise and pollution from these vehicle are very high and damaging pavements and trees that have been planted recently. Parking for residents have been taking aways before and caused a serious impact on residents. Vehicle of residents have also been damaged by large numbers of commercial vehicles passing by or parking in contravention.</p> <p>Workers for the construction company have been congratulating outside residents properties have caused noise nuisance and rubbish outside residents properties.</p> <p>Site entrance is right next to my window and cause noise and nuisance.</p> <p>Old Gloucester street is a small narrow road and can not withstand this vehicle on our roads .</p> <p>My property is directly next door to the hotel and all the above issues have been faced by us . 4 years we have not been able to use our garden due to noise , dust and privacy and this summer we are planning to enjoy our garden with is overlooked by the hotel, the noise dust that will be created will be overwhelming.</p> <p>I also disagree as these extra rooms will over look our property and windows with no privacy at all at the back of number 32 old Gloucester street.</p> <p>Once again I 100% disagree with this and I will be getting petitions for our local residence and businesses.</p>

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2019/6435/P	Debbie Radcliffe	24/02/2020 22:04:27	OBJ	<p>The Bloomsbury Residents Action Group (BRAG) was founded in 2016. We campaign to ensure that interventions, development and traffic management schemes do not undermine the quality of life of residents in the three wards of south Camden (Kings Cross, Bloomsbury and Holborn &amp; Covent Garden). We want decision-makers to understand, respect and respond to our stated aim: that 'residents matter'.</p> <p>On behalf of the many residents who live in very close proximity to the Hilton at Doubletree Hotel (formerly Bonnington Hotel) we wish to register our support for the Ormonde Mansions Residents Association in their objection to the proposed changes with application 2019/6435/P, 92 Southampton Road, WC1B 4BH.</p> <p>The Applicant proposes to erect a double storey rear and side infill at ground and first floor level, together with change of use of ground floor space, to add 11 new guestrooms to the hotel, together with additional plant.</p> <p>The proposed plans include the removal of the glass roof lights that rise above the dividing wall between the hotel and Ormonde Mansions. These will be replaced by a much larger zinc-clad roof that will impact negatively on the residential amenity of Flats 1 and 3. The proposed plant for air conditioning etc from the new duplexes will also cause noise pollution for flats 1, 3, 5 and 7.</p> <p>We understand from the residents of Ormonde Mansion that they have already experienced three separate periods of noise and nuisance from construction work, which has been carried out over recent years to create additional space for the adjacent hotel. The cumulative impact is taking its toll on the wellbeing of Ormonde Mansions residents, and yet another application for building work (with the last one only just finished) will have an unacceptable impact on residents' quality of life.</p> <p>We understand that the recent works have already encroached on and filled up the light well between the two Edwardian buildings (Ormonde Mansion and the Hotel) where the external walls for both properties are faced with white glazed brick - intended to increase the reflection of sunlight within the space. A light well is, as its name suggests, an external space provided within the volume of a large building to allow light and air to reach what would otherwise be a dark or unventilated area.</p> <p>We would like to draw your attention to paragraph 2.12 in Camden Planning Guidance on Basements (March 2018). The presence or absence of light wells helps define and reinforce the prevailing character of a neighbourhood. In Camden's Conservation Area and Management Appraisal (2011) both Ormonde Mansions and the Hotel are identified as positive contributors to the Conservation Area. The light well between the two buildings does indeed contribute to the character of the neighbourhood and any further harm to this heritage asset is unacceptable, albeit it is not viewed from the street.</p> <p>A key test in justifying the demolition (and associated harm to the surrounding conservation area) of 'a designated Positive Contributor' is to demonstrate that the harm would be weighed against the public benefits of the scheme. Although the light well is only one element of the positive contributor buildings, it is an important heritage asset, and as such should be protected, not further encroached on due to the Hotel's desire to increase its number of guest rooms.</p> <p>The Application does not provide evidence of ANY public benefits of the scheme. On the contrary, it will impinge unacceptably on the neighbouring occupiers in Ormonde Mansions.</p>



Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
				We urge Camden to reject the application.
2019/6435/P	M chowdhury	23/02/2020 21:52:27	OBJNOT	<p>I strongly disagree with the planning permission to be granted for the following reasons .</p> <p>This hotel has been given permission in the past without prior consultation to at least us the 32 old Gloucester street, this has been granted I believe 3 to 4 time and work has been going on for the last 3 to 4 years . This has had a devastating and detrimental effect on the area and local businesses and residents.</p> <p>The following has been a serious issues,</p> <p>Noise levels have been high, with the construction company and hotel going beyond legal noise levels.</p> <p>Construction waste and dust this has been a serious issue with windows not being able to be open and dust and dirt forming on the windows.</p> <p>Pollution from the construction has been detrimental to residents with no consideration given to residents.</p> <p>Construction waste left out on the road and not move for full days.</p> <p>Parking of cormasule vehicles for delivery for the hotel is constant and parking and contervining parking laws from theres vehicles .</p> <p>Noise and pollution from these vehicle are very high and damaging pavements and trees that have been planted recently. Parking for residents have been taking aways before and caused a serious impact on residents. Vehicle of residents have also been damaged by large numbers of commercial vehicles passing by or parking in contravention.</p> <p>Workers for the construction company have been congratulating outside residents properties have caused noise nuisance and rubbish outside residents properties.</p> <p>Site entrance is right next to my window and cause noise and nuisance.</p> <p>Old Gloucester street is a small narrow road and can not withstand this vehicle on our roads .</p> <p>My property is directly next door to the hotel and all the above issues have been faced by us . 4 years we have not been able to use our garden due to noise , dust and privacy and this summer we are planning to enjoy our garden with is overlooked by the hotel, the noise dust that will be created will be overwhelming.</p> <p>I also disagree as these extra rooms will over look our property and windows with no privacy at all at the back of number 32 old Gloucester street.</p> <p>Once again I 100% disagree with this and I will be getting petitions for our local residence and businesses.</p>