

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2020/3107/P	John Kelly	10/08/2020 18:41:05	COMMNT	<p>Dear Mr Farrant,</p> <p>We are writing to you regarding application ref. 2020/3107/P. We note that the primary purpose of the application is to secure an increase in hotel bedrooms at the site from the consented 166 bedrooms to 208 bedrooms, an increase in 42 bedrooms. As owner-occupiers of the nearby The Bloomsbury Hotel, we note the proposed increase in bedrooms could result in increased vehicle movements to and from the site including servicing and waste management vehicles which has the potential to affect the operation of our own hotel. We respectfully request that Officers factor this into their considerations when determining the application.</p> <p>Yours sincerely,</p> <p>John Kelly</p> <p>John Kelly Hotel Manager The Bloomsbury 16-22 Great Russell Street, London WC1B 3NN, UK</p>

---

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2020/3107/P	Covent Garden Community Association (Elizabeth Bax, Chair of Planning Subcommittee)	15/08/2020 16:40:16	OBJNOT	<p>Covent Garden Community Association objects strongly to this application. Our objections are principally on three grounds.</p> <p>1. The application should not be allowed retrospectively given the extensive nature of the works</p> <p>Firstly, this retrospective application that seeks to legitimise works that have been carried out in brazen contradiction of planning consent.</p> <p>On occasion one may sympathise with a developer who over-reaches his consent in a marginal way, then scrambles to get retrospective consent rather than having to unpick his work. But this is far from such a case. One cannot build 208 bedrooms instead of 166 'by accident'. Nor can one 'forget' that one's permission was explicitly for "Change of use ... to 166 bedroom hotel" – which was the description on the face of appeal decision ref. APP/X5210/W/16/3147078 dated 04/11/2016.</p> <p>No, the works have been carried out from an early stage so as to accommodate an increase in occupancy 36% greater than what is permitted.</p> <p>To grant permission retrospectively would be to allow an abuse of the planning system, and to open up the system in Camden to more such abuses. This is why we are an interested party and must express our clear objection to such a thing happening nearby to us in the borough.</p> <p>2. The application is over-development at this site</p> <p>Secondly, the site has a difficult history in relation to its redevelopment as a hotel. It was objectionable as a site for 166 small bedrooms. It is even more objectionable with 208 bedrooms squeezed into the same space, and with the attendant need for additional plant.</p> <p>The Planning Inspector agreed that levels of plant noise, guest vehicle movements and servicing could be problematic. Conditions were therefore imposed within the 2016 consent to attempt to mitigate these issues. An increase in guest occupancy of almost 40% would increase the intensity of the same problems, but we have seen no data from the applicant to show how the proposed planning conditions would be sufficient to mitigate this intensification.</p> <p>We are particularly concerned at the proposal to remove Condition 9, which protects the neighbouring environment by requiring noise from any plant and equipment to be 15 dB(A) or more below ambient in perpetuity, and ongoing maintenance.</p> <p>The significant increase of 25% in bedrooms, and of 36% in bed places, has largely been achieved through reduction in typical guest bedroom space as shown in the application plans. These rooms are now scarcely larger than the beds they accommodate, which would be bad enough if the rooms had windows. However, with no windows, and such intensely cramped space, we believe that this accommodation falls below acceptable standards in Camden.</p>