
From: Marfleet, Patrick
Sent: 17 March 2021 16:46
To: Planning
Subject: FW: Ref:2020/2226/P - Planning Application Objection, Boston House, Fitzroy Square

Please upload to the above.

Patrick Marfleet
Senior Planning Officer

Telephone: 020 7974 1222



The majority of Council staff are continuing to work at home through remote, secure access to our systems. Where possible please communicate with us by telephone or email.

From: Claire Bruce-Lamblin [REDACTED]
Sent: 17 March 2021 16:33
To: Marfleet, Patrick <Patrick.Marfleet@camden.gov.uk>
Cc: Harrison, Adam (Councillor) <Adam.Harrison@camden.gov.uk>
Subject: Ref:2020/2226/P - Planning Application Objection, Boston House, Fitzroy Square

[EXTERNAL EMAIL] Beware – This email originated outside Camden Council and may be malicious Please take extra care with any links, attachments, requests to take action or for you to verify your password etc. Please note there have been reports of emails purporting to be about Covid 19 being used as cover for scams so extra vigilance is required.

Dear Patrick,

We spoke on the phone last year and I sent objection letters regarding the two earlier planning applications regarding Boston House. My objections stand for the current one.

There is a change of applicant but the **absence of an identified occupier makes it an entirely speculative application**, which should be summarily refused on the basis of its conflict with Local Plan Policy E2 and Principle 6 of the Fitzrovia Area Action Plan. The special case that was advanced previously falls away completely.

The applicant did **not provide any evidence in support of his statements about the potential impact** of the proposed use. Examples: claims about operating hours (para 3.4 of the revised Planning Statement), components of use (3.5), academic terms (3.8), the necessity for external alterations (3.7), extent of office use (6.4), jobs (6.5), the potential for noise and disturbance (6.40), the potential for congregation of people (6.42), cycle parking (6.57) and transport impact (6.58). The claims that were made previously were in

most instances suspect. The claims made now - which go to the heart of the acceptability of this use in a quiet, largely residential, London Square and Conservation Area - should be disregarded.

There is an **even bigger loss of space than in the earlier applications**, as accepted by the applicant. Thus, what was already a clear conflict with Policy E2 has become even more so.

It is claimed at para 6.4 that it can be expected that there would be continued "genuine" office use within the building. The **applicant has no idea which organisation would occupy the building**, there is no evidential basis at all for this statement. The same can be said for para 6.5.

The claims made last year about the unsuitability or unattractiveness of the building for continued office use are repeated (para 6.6). However, the **previous evidence has not be updated**. Not only was the previous evidence comprehensively rebutted by JLL, but, given the extent of economic and societal upheaval over the last twelve months, any market assessment prepared last Spring or Autumn must now automatically be regarded as out of date. It is suggested that floor-by-floor letting would not be "easy". The fact that something is not easy is not a convincing justification for setting aside an important development plan policy.

The building is not at all well suited to educational use: the potential for large numbers of people moving backwards and forwards; activity spilling out into the square on account of there being inadequate congregation spaces within the building; late night and weekend activity; the potential for anti-social behaviour.

Once planning permission was granted for Class F1 use, the building could be used for any of these purposes **without further planning permission**. No attempt has been made to even consider the implications of uses other than a non-residential educational institution.

There has been **no attempt to consult the local community** over this latest application.

The statement in para 3.12 is wrong that residents accepted the principle of the change of use, and that they were only concerned about how the use was to be managed. This is not the case. There is considerable opposition to the principle of educational use, as will be apparent from the many objections submitted.

This application is likely to have **substantial adverse effects upon a quiet largely residential square in a Conservation Area**. We do not know who the applicant is, which should cause the Council to refuse to further process the application in any event. The applicant has not provided credible evidence before the Council, either as to the unsuitability of the building for continued office use or as to the implications of non-residential education use.

No attempt has even been made to assess the implications of all the other uses that would be opened up by permission being granted for Class F1 use.

We hope that you will review the application in light of these objections and reject it outright.

Yours sincerely,

Richard and Claire Bruce, no 18 FS