

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2020/0599/P	A Thompson	12/04/2020 22:31:47	OBJNOT	<p>I wish to object on four counts</p> <p>1) I don't think it's right that planning applications can go ahead at the present time given the national crisis and stay at home order. People can't easily see the posters you pin up (by the way, I walked all around the site today and didn't see one). People without computers can't get to the library.</p> <p>2) additional height will block light to the flats in Neal's Yard including 14-17. It's not fair to say there are other buildings at this height - Neal's yard is a cultural treasure and a home to many residents who have made this place one of London's top 10 attractions, like Anya who set up Neals Yard Remedies. Why should these people be deprived of light? Also, the character of this area is interesting BECAUSE it is higgledy piggledy and not uniform in height and character, so there is no benefit to raising this one.</p> <p>3) changing a family flat into two smaller ones is not good for the area. I would love to be able to stay in the area and have a child but there are few family flats in the area and this is removing yet another. It is obvious in the lockdown there are very very few families here at all which is not the kind of mixed community that Camden aspires for. I suspect these tiny flats will become Airbnb's and contribute to the loss of community in the area.</p> <p>4) Overcrowding: I was amused to see the picture of a domestic bin in the application. For the avoidance of doubts these flats will use on street rubbish (bags on street) on narrow pavements. Packing in as many flats as possible into this area stretches this which is already problematic, further. For reference you have given Shaftesbury permission for additional 4 flats (every single one of them tiny 1 beds that don't meet Camden's aspiration nor minimum standards nor any idea of mixed units) within the last year in the same block. In my last objection, I saw that Thomas' reply was that each application is independent. In this case I don't understand how this can ever protect any area or residents from overcrowding. By definition each application is only adding one more flat to the problem so gets waived through. Perhaps we could be told whether this is something Camden is interested in and how many more flats you will allow to be built in this area?</p>

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2020/0599/P	Covent Garden Community Association (Elizabeth Bax, Chair of Planning Subcommittee)	12/04/2020 17:36:07	OBJNOT	<p>Covent Garden Community Association (CGCA) objects to this planning application ref. 2020/0599/P on the grounds of:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Loss of family-sized accommodation. <p>The previous occupants of 17a Monmouth Street were a family who had lived there since the 1970's. Their recent move is a sad loss to our community, but at least we had hoped that another family would move in. Instead, the applicant wishes to eliminate the family flat and replace it with two much smaller flats – 1 x 1 bedroom and 1 x 2 bedroom.</p> <p>We are very concerned about the incremental loss of family dwellings in the area. The applicant seeks opportunities to increase yield on its property portfolio by eliminating 3-bedroom flats. A good example last year was application ref. 2019/1294/P at 20 Shorts Gardens, where the community lost a good-sized family flat with outside space and it was replaced with two small flats in a nearby location with no private outside space.</p> <p>We ask that the applicant refurbish the existing flat at 17a Monmouth Street. If it is really deemed appropriate by the LPA to use the building's roof space, then some outside space (in the spirit of the CPG) could be created by introducing a terrace there.</p> <p>If, despite our objection to increased height (below), the LPA is minded to allow an additional storey, then we ask you to require a 3 bedroom flat to be retained in this building. The addition of a studio flat at first floor level could make use of the extra space created, and still increase the yield for the applicant.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 2. Loss of amenity for residents at the back <p>We would like to see a drawing and report to show the effect of the proposed rooftop extension on residents living directly behind at 11-13 Neal's Yard.</p> <p>Residents there have approached us with their concerns and, looking out from their windows, an additional storey would seem likely to have a material effect on their amenity.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 3. Design. <p>The Seven Dials Renaissance study refers to this building as "although unlisted, the property is of townscape value, contributing positively to the character, appearance and significance of the Seven Dials Conservation Area".</p> <p>Although other buildings in the street have mansards, this does not support the case for adding one to number 17. Part of the charm of Seven Dials is the variation along the streetscapes, characterised by uneven roof forms that reflect the evolution of the area over 330 years. This was an important factor in your committee's consideration and refusal of a roof extension under application ref. 2017/5659/P for buildings on Neal Street nearby.</p>