

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2021/4090/PVL	Covent Garden Community Association (Elizabeth Bax, Chair of Planning Subcommittee)	31/08/2021 23:58:33	OBJNOT	<p>As the amenity society for the area, Covent Garden Community Association (CGCA) must object to this application.</p> <p>However, if the applicant were to revert to the plan last consented at this location, ref. 2015/5362/TC, we would withdraw our objection subject to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - the screwed-down matting being removed and the pavement made good, and - a later start time than 8am at weekends. <p>-----</p> <p>Our objection is based upon the following grounds:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. There should be no furniture at all in Tower Court, the narrow alleyway beside the premises, which also has residents above and opposite and where sound echoes. This has always been refused in the past. 2. The amount of furniture on Monmouth Street seems too tightly packed to retain the clear footway required when actually in use. 3. 8am is too early to start at the weekend, directly below residents' windows. 4. The management of the premises are irresponsible, as shown by what they have already put in the public realm without consent and their unwillingness to engage with neighbours. <p>-----</p> <p>CONTEXT</p> <p>The premises are on the corner of Monmouth Street and Tower Court in Seven Dials. Seven Dials is characterised by narrow historic streets dating back to the late 1600's.</p> <p>The premises are below Fielding Court, a residential block of flats. There are family dwellings on Tower Court, adjacent. And there are new family dwellings opposite, at 53-55 Monmouth Street.</p> <p>The dwellings above and opposite on Tower Court are particularly sensitive to any sound made in Tower Court. Putting tables & chairs out in the morning and away in the evening generates noise that keeps people awake.</p> <p>The pavements are narrow and difficult for easy passage at the best of times. The situation is doubly challenging with the current need for social distancing.</p> <p>The most recent applications for tables and chairs directly outside these premises were:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - 2020/2959/TC including tables & chairs in Tower Court - Withdrawn. - 2017/3017/TC including tables & chairs in Tower Court – Refused.

Application No: Consultees Name: Received:

Comment: Response:

- 2015/5362/TC including tables & chairs in Tower Court – Refused, then Granted once it had been amended with nothing in Tower Court.

2015/1612/TC including tables & chairs in Tower Court – Refused.

The most recent application that was granted is therefore 2015/5362/TC. This involved 2 tables and 4 chairs on Monmouth Street and allowed ample clear passage for pedestrians.

We would be content with a return to this arrangement except that the applicant's past and current behaviour which may make it difficult for you to grant any licence whatsoever with any likelihood of its conditions being respected.

CURRENT PROBLEMS & COMPLAINTS

The applicant placed immovable tables, benches and matting on Monmouth Street and Tower Court last year – all screwed down into the paving stones. These were eventually removed following complaints from neighbours and enforcement action by the council in April 2020.

During 2020 neighbouring residents reached out to the applicant and suggested that he should make a legitimate tables & chairs licence application, excluding furniture on Tower Court and excluding any matting. They also suggested that he approach us as the amenity society, to discuss what might be acceptable. However, he has not made any contact with us nor offered any meaningful engagement with his neighbours.

When Covid-19 lockdown restrictions were eased in Summer 2020, the applicant put out the following new items:

- 20 wide arm chairs.
- 7 tables.
- 2 sails.
- Matting screwed into the pavement, along Monmouth Street and in Tower Court.

This furniture was even worse than what your enforcement team had removed. And consent has never been applied for nor granted for any of it. It has been very unpleasant for residents to live with, and numerous emails have been sent to the council asking for enforcement.

The reasons for complaints are that the situation has been causing an unacceptable level of obstruction, that noise causes a nuisance in Tower Court, and that the matting is dangerous and left out all night.

We sadly conclude that this applicant may not be fit to hold a Tables & Chairs licence at all.

You will have a number of photographs on file from last year, sent to Camden by us and by residents, to show the shocking situation.

Application No: **Consultees Name:** **Received:** **Comment:** **Response:**

PROBLEMS WITH THE NEW PROPOSAL

The proposals include 4 tables and 15 chairs in, and at the opening of, Tower Court. However, there should be no tables and chairs service on Tower Court because the characteristics of the space are so sensitive, as described above. And the plan shows only 1.35 metres of width remaining for pedestrian passage past the BT service box – space that would also have to be used by staff going to and from customers; this is clearly well below the requirements of Camden’s guidance, and allows no social-distancing either. For these reasons all applications in the past have been refused where they included furniture and service in Tower Court.

The proposals include 4 tables and 8 chairs directly outside the front of the premises on Monmouth Street. These chairs are arranged in the plan so that they are 2 deep and leave 2 metres of pavement width which is the minimum requirement under Camden’s pavement licensing guidelines. However, the area is very crowded at times and we believe that a) in this location more than the 2 metre minimum footway is required to be safe and b) the chairs are unlikely to remain squeezed together as shown on the plan, and will be moved around when in use so that even less of the pavement is free. Given our experience with the management, we do not believe that this will be managed well. We believe that 2 tables and 4 chairs would be more appropriate here, as previously consented.

Finally, we believe that any consent for tables & chairs in this location should have start time of 9am on Saturdays and 10am on Sundays, to allow some respite for those sleeping directly above, especially since it is so hard to engage with the operator if there are problems.

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2021/4090/PVL	Kenton Price	31/08/2021 13:27:33	OBJ	<p>I live directly above the premises.</p> <p>The premises has operated with wanton abandon since covid hit, putting as many pieces of street furniture as possible on the public highway with no planning permission whatsoever, blocking wheelchairs and prams, even people just walking down Earlham Street have to dodge its multiple A-boards and poorly-positioned tables. It has also a severe trip hazard astroturf permanently secured to the public highway - and Camden by continually failing to enforce its removal will be liable for that accident when it happens.</p> <p>I have made many complaints to Camden about this premises' violation of its non-existent tables and chairs licence, none of which have been acted upon.</p> <p>All the prior occupants of this premises have had just two tables of two people each, sideways on, on the Earlham Street elevation - and nothing on Tower Court.</p> <p>Camden came to do a site visit for the previous occupant and determined that there was no way of putting tables and chairs in Tower Court whilst maintaining access. Nothing has changed. Tower Court should be kept completely clear.</p> <p>The premises has clearly been aware that it has needed planning permission for its unlawful tables and chairs since at least September 2020, as it applied for two tables across the street diagonally opposite the premises under application 2020/4032/TC. It has never had permission for the tables and chairs outside the premises on Earlham Street and Tower Court.</p> <p>I request that this applicant be refused for prior appalling behaviour as a poor neighbour, and requested to apply again in a year. I then request that Camden enforces it, as they have failed to do for the continued violations by this applicant for the past year.</p> <p>Should Camden be minded to give the applicant anything at all, nothing more than prior permissions should be given: two tables of two people side-on to the window facing Earlham Street, and nothing in Tower Court.</p>
