

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2020/2226/P	Rebecca and Tim Carrigan	14/03/2021 18:30:04	OBJ	<p>For the Attention of Patrick Marfleet</p> <p>Re: Planning Application for Boston House, 36-38 Fitzroy Square, W1T (Ref: 2020/2226/P)</p> <p>We would like to object to this application for change of use and agree with everything my neighbour put in his objection so have repeated them here:</p> <p>We write to object to the above planning application for the third time in the last 18 months. In which time, we must add, the owner of the building has not proactively contacted any residents or businesses to discuss our objections or seek views as to the types of scheme that could be supported by the local community.</p> <p>The reasons for our objection are set out below, under headings 1, 2, 3, 4 and 5.</p> <p>1 - All the reasons outlined in our two previous objection letters, in autumn 2019 and summer 2020</p> <p>2 - Significant loss of employment space (contrary to Policy E2)</p> <p>The applicant, in their second planning application, went to great lengths to maximise office space with the inclusion of County House and Bedford Square properties.</p> <p>However, the proposed Section 106 (for a Bedford Square property) was found to be legally defective and has, therefore, been omitted by the applicant from this third application: that means there is now a significant loss of office space.</p> <p>Also, County House has now been omitted from the application, again meaning the loss of office space is even more significant: loss of office employment space is contrary to Camden local planning Policy E2.</p> <p>JLL, a reputable London and internationally-based professional advisory firm, opined on the building twice (see previous reports submitted to LB Camden) to advise that it is the lack of investment which is preventing this prestigious and well-located building from leasing - not because there is a lack of demand for offices with a PTAL rating of 6b in central London.</p> <p>Therefore, it is not credible for the applicant to suggest that a change of use should be allowed because the property is no longer sought after for office use. This is not the case: it is just that the building has not been refurbished and, therefore, is not attractive to tenants. Indeed, the high number of viewings by prospective office tenants underlines the attractiveness of the location.</p> <p>It is interesting to note that the owner is currently marketing the building for sale for £30m+, despite not making any investment in the space since acquiring it in December 2016 (when it was occupied with office users) for £24m.</p> <p>How can the owner expect a change of planning use to be consented, and to sell the building for a significant profit, when he has not invested in the building to ensure its successful letting?</p> <p>3 - No specific occupier</p> <p>The new application is even more concerning than the previous two applications, because there are so many</p>

Application No: Consultees Name: Received:

Comment: Response:

important unknowns - for example: the identity of the end user is now no longer specified; and the number of people who will actually occupy the building is not declared.

Can planning permission legitimately be granted for a change of use, from a protected employment use to educational use, without an end user?

4 - Delivery & servicing

Without knowing the occupier, how can we realistically be expected to believe the applicant's assertions regarding the proposed activities within the building? For example, how can the Council know what proportion will be teaching space, or for serving food and beverage or for administrative uses? Furthermore, how can the Council determine and restrict the servicing arrangements or the number of vehicular and bicycle movements and parking in the Square?

5 - Unsuitable use for a Conservation Area with listed buildings

As previously asserted, fundamentally, Fitzroy Square is not suitable for student use. The Square is residential and commercial and has existed in this capacity, harmoniously, for decades. Indeed, the current balance is approximately 50% office and 50% residential occupation. Students and typical student behaviour is not suitable for this quiet and virtually pedestrianised environment.

Our final point regards the time, effort and taxpayer money that has been utilised for this application. Surely, it cannot be right that the residents and businesses in and around Fitzroy Square have had to invest significant time and funds to challenge this application for the third time in just 18 months.

Also, at a time when public sector funds are under so much pressure, it seems hard to justify use of resources for this application to be administered by LB Camden for the third occasion in such a short period.

We urge LB Camden to finally address this application and make a decision to refuse it, once and for all, on the basis of one or more of the genuine planning-related arguments that have been outlined in this letter - and many of the other objection letters that have been submitted to the Council.

Yours sincerely

Rebecca and Tim Carrigan

2020/2226/P Jimmy Furland 14/03/2021 21:01:10 OBJ

I write to object to this planning application for the third time. The reasons for my objection remain the same. There would be significant loss of office space contrary to Camden local planning policy E2 and having a university at the Square would negatively change the character of the Square.

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2020/2226/P	Dr R Agble	14/03/2021 11:21:42	OBJ	For the Attention of Patrick Marfleet

Re: Planning Application for Boston House, 36-38 Fitzroy Square, W1T (Ref: 2020/2226/P)

I write to object to the above planning application for the third time in the last 18 months. In which time, I must add, the owner of the building has not proactively contacted any residents or businesses to discuss our objections or seek views as to the types of scheme that could be supported by the local community.

The reasons for my objection are set out below, under headings 1, 2, 3, 4 and 5.

1 - All the reasons outlined in my two previous objection letters, in autumn 2019 and summer 2020

2 - Significant loss of employment space (contrary to Policy E2)

The applicant, in their second planning application, went to great lengths to maximise office space with the inclusion of County House and Bedford Square properties.

However, the proposed Section 106 (for a Bedford Square property) was found to be legally defective and has, therefore, been omitted by the applicant from this third application: that means there is now a significant loss of office space.

Also, County House has now been omitted from the application, again meaning the loss of office space is even more significant: loss of office employment space is contrary to Camden local planning Policy E2.

JLL, a reputable London and internationally-based professional advisory firm, opined on the building twice (see previous reports submitted to LB Camden) to advise that it is the lack of investment which is preventing this prestigious and well-located building from leasing - not because there is a lack of demand for offices with a PTAL rating of 6b in central London.

Therefore, it is not credible for the applicant to suggest that a change of use should be allowed because the property is no longer sought after for office use. This is not the case: it is just that the building has not been refurbished and, therefore, is not attractive to tenants. Indeed, the high number of viewings by prospective office tenants underlines the attractiveness of the location.

It is interesting to note that the owner is currently marketing the building for sale for £30m+, despite not making any investment in the space since acquiring it in December 2016 (when it was occupied with office users) for £24m.

How can the owner expect a change of planning use to be consented, and to sell the building for a significant profit, when he has not invested in the building to ensure its successful letting?

3 - No specific occupier

The new application is even more concerning than the previous two applications, because there are so many important unknowns - for example: the identity of the end user is now no longer specified; and the number of

Application No: Consultees Name: Received:

Comment: Response:

people who will actually occupy the building is not declared.

Can planning permission legitimately be granted for a change of use, from a protected employment use to educational use, without an end user?

4 - Delivery & servicing

Without knowing the occupier, how can we realistically be expected to believe the applicant's assertions regarding the proposed activities within the building? For example, how can the Council know what proportion will be teaching space, or for serving food and beverage or for administrative uses? Furthermore, how can the Council determine and restrict the servicing arrangements or the number of vehicular and bicycle movements and parking in the Square?

5 - Unsuitable use for a Conservation Area with listed buildings

As previously asserted, fundamentally, Fitzroy Square is not suitable for student use. The Square is residential and commercial and has existed in this capacity, harmoniously, for decades. Indeed, the current balance is approximately 50% office and 50% residential occupation. Students and typical student behaviour is not suitable for this quiet and virtually pedestrianised environment.

My final point regards the time, effort and taxpayer money that has been utilised for this application. Surely, it cannot be right that the residents and businesses in and around Fitzroy Square have had to invest significant time and funds to challenge this application for the third time in just 18 months.

Also, at a time when public sector funds are under so much pressure, it seems hard to justify use of resources for this application to be administered by LB Camden for the third occasion in such a short period.

We urge LB Camden to finally address this application and make a decision to refuse it, once and for all, on the basis of one or more of the genuine planning-related arguments that have been outlined in this letter - and many of the other objection letters that have been submitted to the Council.

Yours sincerely

Resident of Fitzroy Square

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2020/2226/P	Nicholi Ariff	14/03/2021 15:20:55	COMMNT	<p>I am very unhappy and perturbed by this recent application, which is worse than the previous submission as it doesn't even mention a specific educational institution. My comments of 20th June 2020 stand and are attached below:</p> <p>I am writing to express my concern about the proposal to convert Boston House in Fitzroy Square into a University for up to 1200 students. If this Planning Application were to be accepted it would change forever the character of Fitzroy Square. The Square currently has a mix of residential and office space, which leads to a harmonious environment. A University with 1200 students will increase the level of noise in the Square and is likely to increase littering; the number of bicycles that the students would bring cannot be parked in a sensible manner in the square.</p> <p>As a resident of Fitzroy Square, I feel that my concerns with regards to this project are not being listened to. I objected to the previous Planning Application from NCH due to concerns that this would have on the character of the Square; this revised application makes no changes to take account of the concerns of residents, but rather increases the capacity of the University.</p> <p>Boston House has previously provided office space in the area; replacing this with a University will dramatically reduce the amount of office space in the area and correspondingly the number of people employed by businesses in the area.</p>
