

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2020/1481/P	Charlie	30/08/2020 20:25:45	PETITNOBJ E	<p>As a resident on Murray St, I strongly object to the plans to redevelop the Irish Community centre namely due to how material the plans are to increase the size and capacity of the venue.</p> <p>I would like to echo other rejections posted by nearby residents but please see my further comments below:</p> <p>1 - Capacity Increase: The proposed capacity increase would be in the region of an 80% increase from today (1,500+ capacity!)The noise, traffic &amp; disruption this would cause to Murray St &amp; Camden Square would be severe. The designs clearly show how much bigger the building would be in a residential location.</p> <p>2 - Roof Top Proposal: This is simply not acceptable nor appropriate given the size proposed &amp; noise this would create to any resident within a 100m radius. I've seen residential plans be rejected for roof terraces smaller than 10msq so I honestly cannot see how this is aligned to the current make up of surrounding streets. Anyone who has been to this location would clearly see its a quiet area with a few local shops &amp; amenities.</p> <p>3 - Relocation of Entrance to Murray St The size of queues on the street, noise created by people, cars/ taxis parking on the road and other disruption to houses on Murray St with a relocated entrance of the community centre is far too disruptive. My flat front door would be oposite the new entrance with numerous houses on Murray St having bedrooms facing the road.</p> <p>4 - Building Design The designs of the new building are really not suited to the surrounding streets or architecture. This must be considered further. The current architecture of surrounding houses &amp; properties is not a monolithic block.</p> <p>5 - Building Works, Demolition etc The complete overhaul of the site with material demolition planned &amp; building works for years would bring material disruption, traffic, noise, dust &amp; environmental pollution. As a resident to Murray St this is something that would be unavoidable to us.</p> <p>Best regards</p>

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2020/1481/P	John Withington	30/08/2020 16:26:59	OBJ	<p>I made a number of objections to the LIC's proposals, and it is disappointing to note that in its various revised and additional responses, most have received no satisfactory response.</p> <p>The LIC's proposal, therefore, should be rejected on the following grounds:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The proposed increase in capacity for the centre is completely inappropriate for a residential area. If the LIC wants a bigger venue, it needs to move to a commercial area.</li> <li>2. The increase in capacity is being proposed to enrich a private company at the expense of the community living close to the LIC.</li> <li>3. The change in location of the main entrance will add to disruption.</li> <li>4. The proposal will increase noise and inconvenience and cause disrupted sleep for residents.</li> <li>5. The proposal will cause traffic congestion and shortage of parking spaces for residents.</li> <li>6. With Covid-19 causing so much uncertainty about the future of big events, whether people can safely attend them, how they will get to them etc., it is perverse to consider the proposal until the answers to such questions are clearer.</li> <li>7. The messages of support for the LIC's proposal are shrouded in secrecy and we are not allowed to know who most of them are from, but what we can tell about those identified is that they are not local residents, they will not suffer noise and inconvenience, and they have not the slightest interest in the welfare of those who will. Perhaps Ed Sheeran and the Irish ambassador should offer to have the enlarged Irish centre opposite or next to their homes?</li> </ol> <p>Evidence:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The proposal to increase the maximum number of people attending events to 1,250 (by 25%) is completely inappropriate for a residential area. (The LIC is the ONLY commercial premises of any size in the area.) Local residents already have to put up with a great deal of noise, disruption, congestion and inconvenience, and it is unreasonable to expect us to accept any more.</li> </ol> <p>It should be noted that the LIC only 'anticipates' the maximum attendance will be 1,250. It is not a promise. So it is interesting that, although, the Centre claims it wishes to increase attendances by 25%, according to its own figures, it is increasing event space by 38%. Why?</p> <p>It is also plain that, whatever it says, the LIC is planning much bigger events. Its 'Revised Events Management Plan' envisages cordoning off part of the public footpath with 'temporary barriers' to control queues. During my 26 years as a resident, I have never known this to be necessary before.</p> <p>Whatever the exact figures, any increase is completely unacceptable in a residential area. If the LIC wants to hold bigger events, it needs to move to a commercial area.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>2. The LIC is no longer a 'communal facility'. It is now a hard-nosed commercial enterprise run by a private company, putting on events like boxing matches and renting out the centre for big weddings with no Irish connection. 75% of people who come to the centre are not Irish (LIC Planning Statement 8.2.12). In spite of all the rhetoric about 'community', it is plain from the LIC's own Planning Statement (8.2.11) that the main motive for the expansion is to make money.</li> </ol> <p>Events at the Centre are run by and for the profit of a private company, which hands back a small proportion of its receipts to the LIC. It is intolerable that the community living by the LIC should be asked to suffer more noise, disruption and inconvenience to further enrich a private company.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>3. The new entrance in Murray Street will be much more disruptive than the existing one in Camden Square, opposite the children's play centre.</li> </ol> <p>The LIC claims the change 'removes the burden on the residential square'. But actually no one lives opposite the current entrance. Dozens of people live opposite or close to the proposed one in Murray Street and if the LIC is allowed to make this change, they will now have to carry the 'burden'. It is quite untrue to claim as the LIC does (Planning Statement 4.1.5.) that Murray Street is 'commercial'. It is overwhelmingly residential with</p>

Application No:      Consultees Name:      Received:

Comment:      Response:

just a handful of small shops, an increasing number of which are being converted to dwellings.

The LIC appears unaware that its proposed new entrance is very close to a very severe width restriction at the road junction of Murray Street, St Augustine's Road and Agar Grove, and has not addressed the congestion this is likely to cause.

Bizarrely in its response to objections, the LIC claims that 'patrons of the Centre seeking to use using taxis are likely walk [sic] to Camden Road where there are more available.' Which means it makes even less sense to move the entrance further from Camden Road.

The LIC should not be allowed to make this change.

4. I mentioned in my original objection that over the years we have had to complain on a number of occasions about late night noise, and sometimes we have just suffered it in silence. It tends to arise because the LIC allows people to congregate outside late at night. They say they have stewards on duty but these appear to be ineffective. One problem is that when people have been drinking, it is very hard to get them to be quiet.

The LIC's responses to the concerns raised by many residents about noise are inadequate, to say the least. It claims: 'the number of late night events at the LIC is limited to 16 per year', but this ignores the fact that the Centre has a licence to serve alcohol until midnight every night from Monday to Saturday, and until 2330 on a Sunday. This is already 'late'. It means that local people can have their sleep disrupted until at least midnight on a Sunday and until about 0030 every other night.

These hours are completely inappropriate for a residential area, and the centre's licence should be amended to prevent the serving of any liquor after 2230, meaning that with a bit of luck, noise will have stopped by 2300. Surely the rights of people who need a decent night's sleep so they can do a day's work should take precedence over those who want to drink until all hours of the night.

The centre gives no undertaking that it will not seek even more very late events, saying only: 'this is not proposed to be increased'. Sixteen occasions a year is already too many, and any extra late openings should be limited to the night before a Bank Holiday, though even this will be an inconvenience to residents who have to work on Bank Holidays.

One of main generators of noise and nuisance by the LIC has been its regular inability to direct people away from an event quickly and quietly. Its promise to 'be pro-active in keeping noise levels to a minimum and encourage guests to leave the area as quietly and quickly as possible,' must be regarded with the utmost scepticism as similar promises have been given and broken over the years, and if more people are attending the centre, keeping the promise will be even more difficult.

The LIC promises 'much reduced potential for local loitering and disturbance for local residents arising from any activities at the Centre,' but also says there will be 'a large community hub area at ground floor and mezzanine level above. These areas will be used as holding spaces following meetings and events' to 'ensure a slow and steady flow of visitors leaving the LIC.' This exposes the insoluble dilemma at the heart of the LIC's proposal: either 1,250 people are disgorged into a quiet residential area in one go, or they flow out and cause noise over a longer period of time. Neither is acceptable.

In order to protect the quality of life of residents, all events should be required to finish by 2230, with a view to getting the residential area completely cleared by 2300, and there should be an option to have all events finishing by 2200 should the 2230 deadline be inadequate.

#### 5. Traffic

In its response to objections, the LIC makes a number of odd, and apparently unfounded assertions. It states: 'The proposed development will be car-free and will have a minimal impact on parking on the surrounding roads', while Caneparo Associates, on behalf of the LIC claim, that none (!) of the proposed additional 250 event attenders will come by car.

This beggars belief. It is already extremely difficult for residents to find parking spaces when big events are

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
				<p>being held at the LIC. Increasing capacity is bound to make this even worse.</p> <p>The LIC claims: 'the number of trips generated is expected to be similar to the existing Centre'. This too beggars belief unless attendance is restricted to the present limit.</p> <p>Caneparo also claims: 'departure profiles will likely be staggered as people will arrive and depart at different times.' When people are attending a big event, this seems extremely unlikely.</p> <p>The LIC builds its whole case on the contention that most people will use public transport, citing the number of bus routes that run close to the site. But Covid-19 has severely reduced the number of people prepared to use public transport. The whole foundation of the LIC's case on traffic is, therefore, undermined.</p> <p>Indeed, Covid-19 has cast so much doubt on the future of big public events, whether people will be able to attend them, how they will get to them, etc. that it would be perverse to consider the LIC's proposal at this uncertain time, and the planning application should be put on hold until the future profile of the pandemic is clearer.</p>
2020/1481/P	Robert and Christine Buchanan	30/08/2020 18:55:16	OBJ	<p>We have already made comments (objections) on the original proposals. Due to the re-consultation, we add comments as follows:</p> <p>The increase in the number of guests/visitors, now up to 1250, will cause more disturbance and noise for residents. More cars; taxis; coaches (regularly currently used); even double-decker buses (used occasionally). The LIC Licensing hours are already ridiculously late for a small residential area. In addition, licence extensions enable the LIC to remain open until 1.30 am, which means that guests will not be out of the area before 2 am. These extensions are available 16 times a year, approx every 23 days. The increase in visitor numbers will mean more disturbed sleep for residents. The LIC has no control over guests once they have left the premises.</p> <p>CROWD MANAGEMENT 4.5 (LIC file): "...temporary barriers will be placed along the entrance route to guide guests to queue for the entrance. This ensures that the road and footpath are kept clear for other users." This statement shows that the problem has not been properly worked out. The pavements in Murray St and the east side of Camden Square are too narrow to take queues of people and barriers as well as other pavement users. Everybody, including wheelchair users and those with pushchairs, will be forced onto the road - a completely unacceptable situation.</p> <p>Comments from people from outside of the area should not be considered. They have no concept of the noise and disturbance caused to local residents. This is a local issue.</p> <p>The number of people leaving the LIC is potentially so large that it is greater than the entire resident population of Camden Square, Murray St and Stratford Villas combined. This illustrates the enormity of the proposed development. It shows how inappropriate it is for this small residential area.</p> <p>Having studied what the LIC wishes to achieve, it seems obvious to us and other residents that we cannot have such a large events venue in this area. It would be far more appropriate to re-locate the events side of the LIC activities to a non-residential area, and to leave the other activities (welfare work, tea dances, classes etc) in the existing building. This would mean less traffic, no late nights and no problems with noise and disturbance. Has the LIC considered this?</p> <p>We are long-term residents of Camden Square. Our family has lived in the same house in Camden Square since 1943, long before the LIC arrived. We strongly object to the redevelopment.</p>

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2020/1481/P	Ben Rosier	28/08/2020 23:24:54	OBJ	<p>Further to my previous comments I would like to register my surprise at the way in which this consultation has been conducted. There is considerable goodwill toward the LIC into local area, but it appears that this has been taken advantage of in the current situation.</p> <p>Already, it appears that the LIC has undertaken works for which it seems there has been no consultation or notice - something I fear that does not bode well for the upcoming proposals and wider development. I refer to the recent installation of bars across the windows (with associated noise / disruption) on the 2nd floor of the existing building on Murray Street on or around 23/08/20. Has this been registered and agreed - and if so, when?</p> <p>Further, I am concerned that the Council does not have an effective integrated plan for development and management of building-related traffic on or around Murray Street - something that has been highlighted by Costain-branded mixer lorries driving at speed over speed bumps on Murray Street and York Way during recent redevelopments on York Way and Market Road. Ironically, these appear to have had a detrimental effect on the existing LIC building, with cracking reported upwards from the windows. Clearly, the concern is around similar detrimental effects on other properties on and around Murray Street as a result of the works themselves (demolition / digging into foundations / re-piling / ) and use of heavy good vehicles.</p> <p>There is the wider question of the effect on listed buildings in a conservation area - and the loss of value to properties in the area as a result of noisy works during development, and the appearance of the new building which does not appear in keeping with surrounding properties.</p> <p>I have particular concerns about the works on Murray Street and Murray Mews - and the destruction of cobbled stone and detrimental damage to foundations and fabric of surrounding buildings / infrastructure, points which appear to have been overlooked or not addressed/ communicated in this consultation.</p> <p>Subterranean works and re-piling have the capacity to cause damage to surrounding properties, particularly given the geography of the area, the lack of Victorian foundations on Murray Street and the fact that we sit on London Clay. I would ask for further details on the monitoring and compensation plans which are in place - and that concerns in this area have been addressed. Please provide.</p> <p>In addition to my previous comments, I would ask for clarity on the issues of usage and licensing. There is much talk about "communal kitchens" and the like - but I would like to better understand the business model and the breakdown of usage and proposed revenues, which provide the basis for this application, rather than the communal PR gloss which appears to have been put on things.</p>