DATE: 12 MARCH 2022

From: Dr L. O'Connor, 118 Bedford Court Mansions, Bedford Ave. London WC1B

3AG

## PLANNING OBJECTION 2020/310/3107/P - 112A Great Russell St WC1

I write to object to 2020/3107/P: as a local resident who is directly affected. I live in the Bedford Court Mansions block across Adeline Place from the YMCA and directly opposite to what has been proposed as the delivery and collection bay for the Underground Hotel. I have lived at this address since 1977, and am very well aware of the impact that various changes have made on the area. I was horrified when the proposals for an Underground Hotel were first made, and have objected throughout the process (my objections should be in your files) on the grounds of

- Safety inadequate internal safety in case of fire or emergency, impacting the safety of our adjacent residential properties
- Noise (increased noise from greater number of hotel users, plus noise generated by having to increase power and ventilation systems
- Loss of amenity and public access (obstruction of public footpath)
- · Air pollution/damage to air quality
- Sanitation (inadequate refuse storage and collection or delivery facilities)

I was one of the residents that sat on the 'consultation committee' comprised of locals and representatives of CENTRO the developers of 112A Great Russell st London W1B 3NP the firm behind the hotel. In the course of these sessions it became clear that they were not minded to respond to our concerns,, but were only taking part because they had been obliged to by Camden. Then – cynically and without prior warning - they announced that they were increasing the number of rooms in the hotel, which would exacerbate all of our concerns. After which no further 'consultation meetings were held.

As you can see from various objections on behalf of the residents made by the Bloomsbury Association, the plans misrepresent the situation, and in particular have misrepresented – literally erased – surrounding residential property and conservation zones. In the course of the meetings with CENTRO, it was clear that arrangements for deliveries and collections were inadequate. Everything had to come up a very small interior ramp – but there was no place at street level for the deliveries or collections to sit. Because there were no restaurants in the Underground Hotel, the applicants claimed there would be no food waste. This is nonsense, there are already mountains of takeaway detritus in the surrounding streets every day, and increasing the number of rooms would exacerbate this, as well as laundry and other insanitary waste. With no holding bay it would sit on the public sidewalk. It would also increase noise, loss of amenity and impede

public access. It would require increased ventilation and more noise. It would increase the internal safety problem for which we already consider inadequate provisions have been made. And this sets a terrible precedent. How can you possibly allow developers to cynically rewrite the grounds on which the original approval was given?

In our view this project should never have gone ahead. It poses a risk to the area for the reasons above. I hope the committee will take a better approach to it than has been the case to date, and refuse permission for the number of rooms to be increased. If they have already done the work, this should not be an excuse for allowing the new plan to go ahead.

I wish to be kept informed of this application.

Dr L. O'Connor