

1. The proposed ground floor plan is annotated to indicate a refuse holding area on the footway of Adeline Place. The same plan is annotated that existing crossovers are to be removed but other documents submitted for approval contain plans showing the crossovers or existing external levels to be retained. Which is correct?

It is correct that the mechanical & electrical services drawings submitted do not annotate that the crossovers would be omitted. It is not the purpose of these drawings to record what might happen outside of the Applicant's red line. Nevertheless, we have revised these drawings omitting the crossover, for the sake of consistency.

2. Centro state that obligation 10.2b of the Unilateral Undertaking has been discharged. This has been without Member or public scrutiny. Can the information that has been submitted and approved by officers be made publicly available or does this have to be through a formal FOI request?

The Applicant has no objection to this information being made publicly available.

3. How and when are works by others in the public realm at street level going to be integrated with the hotel contractors' overall programme?

For the Council to confirm.

4. Ditto works on the facades outside the developer's demise, particularly those necessary for public safety, like the planters that fall onto people below?

This façade is owned by and maintained by St Giles Hotel (it is outside of the Applicant's leased demise). St Giles Hotel can be asked to remove the planters, but we cannot remove them ourselves. Photo attached.

5. The proposed ground floor plan also indicates refuse holding areas within -4 ramp on Adeline Place. The Servicing Management Plan states that refuse will be held within the building at the top of the -5 service ramp, which is our preference. Which is correct?

The Servicing Management Plan explains that refuse will be stored in the designated bin storeroom at level -5. Prior to timed collections refuse will be transferred from the bin storeroom at level -5 to a designated refuse storage area off Adeline Place (at the top of -4 ramp).

6. Can the Applicant be asked to look at flipping cycle parking to -4 (substation) ramp in order to accommodate refuse containers awaiting collection at the top of the -5 (service) ramp. Reason: to reduce disturbance of containers being moved between ramps.

This option has been investigated and it is not possible to accommodate a refuse store at the top of the -5 ramp.

7. How will the proposed electric vehicle turn around at the top of the ramp?

The vehicle will be turned at the top and bottom of the ramp via a three-point turn (see page 6 of the Servicing Management Plan).

8. The Fire Strategy Report shows access at ground level but omits the TfL docking station. Is fire tender access to the dry riser inlet still possible with the docking station in place?

Please see the attached plan (GRS-0103 – Proposed Ground Floor Plan Planning-Layout1 (Dry Riser Distance)) – the hose distance is 9.6m, much less than the maximum allowed length of 18m.

9. The proposed ground floor plan shows a different entrance arrangement for the -4 ramp to that shown on the electrical drawings submitted for approval. Which is correct?

The electrical drawings relate specially to the substation works only (undertaken by UKPN themselves), and cannot be updated. Please refer to the revised mechanical drawings.

10. The proposed ground floor plan shows the dry cooler plant located in a different position on the -5 ramp to where it appears to have been built. Which is correct?

Please refer to the Proposed Ground Floor Plan (Rev P3).

11. No podium roof plan is provided to show the location of plant on Great Russell Street.

Please see the Roof Level drawing.

12. Can names be provided of owners on whom notice of the application has been served? Section 8 of the application form only includes addresses.

This seems to be a redaction point.

13. Section 7 of the application form states that pre-application advice has been sought from the local authority. By whom and can details be provided?

I do not think there is anything we can add here.

14. Has notice of the application been served on all with an ownership interest of 7 years or more, including Rank, VQ and Hudson's House?

This was raised as part of the NMA application, and we confirmed at the time that everyone that we served notice on (which is the same as for the current MMA) formed the exhaustive list of those parties with a relevant interest, requiring statutory notice to be served.