

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2020/0141/P	John Coombe-Tennant	10/03/2020 16:48:07	OBJ	<p>We would like to comment as a resident whose home backs directly onto the controversial Brownlow Mews redevelopment. My wife and I did not see these revised building plans until 26th February, when luckily our neighbours alerted us. We ourselves have not had any approaches for discussions nor heard anything directly from the developer at any stage - it is as if they are trying to push this change through under the radar!</p> <p>We are horrified to see that the new plan proposes to move the bulky aircon units from one end of the building onto the roof of the building at the other end. This haphazard alteration simply shuffles the problem around at the cost of a different set of local residents, it does not address any of the residents' concerns about this ugly new looming (and noisy) presence in a conservation area. In fact the new proposal means it faces straight onto our garden and bedroom windows!</p> <p>The aircon noise is likely to affect us 24/7 (there is no limitation in the plan on the operating hours) and we will hear it in our bedrooms and in the kitchen and in the garden. The proposed housing is much bigger than an old water tank which used to stand on the roof and was already an eyesore. As far as we can see from the plan the air vents are facing directly towards us.</p> <p>I am told that after their first plan was rejected the the developers agreed that the units would be located within their building. instead we have a classic case of profit before people, the developers are maximising their rentable space inside the building at the cost of the local residents and environment!</p> <p>As we said in our earlier letter of objection we do not see the necessity for air conditioning in a building which has functioned effectively for more than a hundred years without it. Airconditioning is power-wasteful, noisy, and not particulaly hygenic (it can be the source of legionnaires' disease).</p> <p>Our neighbours up and down the street are equally unhappy at this development. The developers have not had the courtesy to contact any of us and are simply trying to force through their commercial interest with no regard to the local environment! Having failed once they have simply tried the same again in a different spot.</p> <p>Your sincerely,</p> <p>John and Clare Coombe-Tennant 44 Doughty Street WC1N 2LJ 020 7242 2287</p>

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2020/0141/P	Andrew Love	08/03/2020 12:01:53	OBJ	<p>I live at 41 Doughty Street. The rear of our property is adversely affected by the re-proposed new plant enclosure to the first floor flat roof on the rear elevation of the applicant's property.</p> <p>I would ask that the planning committee reject the current proposals for the following reasons.</p> <p>1. This is a re-submission of a slightly different plan following the refusal of the original planning application in October 2019. The new plans contains the same air conditioning equipment and the same type of enclosure. It suffers from the same noise and encroachment issues. The equipment is shown as located on a different part of the flat rear roof which is in fact even closer to the residential houses of Doughty Street. The placing of external plants here is unnecessary and totally inappropriate.</p> <p>According to the Delegated Report for the original planning application, the planning officer's assessment was that:</p> <p>"The proposal has been revised to omit the external plant and enclosure, balustrade and access door, and instead it is proposed to locate the plant within the existing building envelope in the southern corner. Associated external works include two rear roof vents at eaves level and one rear louvre vent at first floor level within an existing door opening."</p> <p>In our view this latest submission is an to attempt to get around this decision in order to maximise internal floor space and therefore rental income. The applicant benefits financially at the expense of the environment and the local community.</p> <p>2. The submitted proposals have not had any local community input. In speaking to our Doughty Street neighbours it is clear that no engagement has been sought prior to submitting these new plans.</p> <p>3. The installation of a large plant enclosure is completely out of keeping with the Grade II listed buildings that surround it in this conservation area. The Georgian houses of Doughty Street, Guilford Street and Grays Inn Road are made of brick as are the Brownlow Mews properties. The rear façade of the applicant's property is brick and glass. This is our view and it has a certain continuity. If the proposal were to go ahead, this view would become that of a large acoustic enclosure made of aluminium acoustic louvres and polyester powder coated acoustic panels. It will look completely out of place and dominate everything around it. It cannot be said that this will preserve or enhance the character or appearance of the Bloomsbury Conservation Area.</p> <p>The plant enclosure will also significantly encroach on what is now an open space. The sense of space, already limited, at the back of our Doughty Street houses will be reduced. We have already seen this space eroded over recent years as other properties in Brownlow Mews and on Grays Inn Road have added unsightly plant, extraction vents and mobile phone masts.</p> <p>4. The proposals are contrary to many of the principles and policies of various Camden Development Policies (CDP) and the Bloomsbury Conservation Area Appraisal and Management Strategy.</p>