



**Follow Up Flag:** Follow up  
**Flag Status:** Completed

**[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 Mr Marfleet

I write to object to this further planning application, the latest in a series made by the owner and prospective occupiers without any prior public or other consultation with local residents or business owners.

In terms of reason for objections I would mention the following:

**a) the reasons outlined in my email below sent in July and November 2020 in respect of previous applications**

**b) Significant loss of office space (contrary to Policy E2)**

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

However, both County House and Bedford Square are now omitted from this Application meaning there is now a significant loss of office space which is clearly contrary to LB of Camden local planning Policy E2.

This is not because the property is no longer sought after for office use as the Applicant tries to suggest. It is simply that the building has not been refurbished. You will recall previous evidence from JLL surveyors that it is this lack of investment which is preventing this building from being attractive to potential office users - not because there is a lack of demand for offices in central London, especially as London recovers from the Covid pandemic.

**c) No identified occupier and adverse potential impact**

There are many unknown implications of an application which does not identify the end user or the number of people who would occupy the building.

The absence of a known occupant makes a nonsense of so much of this latest Application. As just one example, it renders misleading and spurious the various statements about the impact of the proposals. Absent such a user being specified, how would the Applicant be able to support the statements as to the extent of operating hours, office jobs, cycle parking (paras 3.4, 6.4 and 6.57 of the Planning Statement respectively)?

These are just some of the factors relevant to an Application which would have a fundamental effect on this quiet, largely residential square; there is no simply no evidence whatsoever to support the Applicant's statements.

**d) Not suitable for education use in a Conservation Area with listed buildings**

LB of Camden has heard from many sources that Fitzroy Square and therefore this building is not at all well suited to educational use - and for many reasons.

In the context of a quiet central London square which is residential with some commercial occupiers these reasons include

- the potential for huge numbers of people moving in and out of the square;
- activity spilling out into the square given inadequate congregation spaces within the building itself; and
- students and typical student behaviour not being suitable for this quiet and virtually pedestrianised environment.

I urge LB of Camden to reject this latest application which has considerably less merit than the two previous applications – and given the defects of previous Applications, that is really saying something.

Yours sincerely

Lauren Kemp