

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2022/3289/P	Angela Essien	22/09/2022 06:01:56	OBJ	<p>I hereby object to this planning application being granted for the reasons below:</p> <p>1a. On a "healthy and Covid safe working environment", it shows that the applicants intend the terrace to be used extensively. It will impose and encroach on our rightful benefits of our property, our privacy and peace even if that takes place only during the working day as we work and study from home.</p> <p>1b. Our lives and I'm sure that of other residents of our block (Beaconsfield) will be put at severe risk of fire hazard because the terrace opens up an area/space for smoking which would allow lit cigarettes/cigarette butts to be flicked/thrown/blown into the residents' windows and properties which could be fatal.</p> <p>1c. There's also the risk of creating or exacerbating various medical conditions if not death from the inhalation of the smoke of the cigarettes.</p> <p>1d. Alcoholic drinks can also be consumed at any time, day or night, subsequently causing antisocial behaviour, noise, vomiting, excreting, various forms of violence and danger to us and other residents alongside being forced to witness prostitution, its effects and possibly substance abuse and the calling out for the police an example we currently experience from the restaurant beside us on Red Lion/Eagle Street.</p> <p>2. It is wrong for the applicants to suggest that there will be no impact on the residents of neighbouring properties as implied from the application. The applicants say that "predominant use of the office terrace will be during office hours with occasional use after normal working hours. The applicant is happy to discuss limiting the hours of use by condition at the weekends and, to, say 10 pm on weekdays". Camden Council needs to consider this application completely from beginning to end and the applicant has recognised and acknowledged a serious harmful and dangerous impact on us, the neighbouring properties.</p> <p>3. Enforcing permission for partial use of the terrace as is being proposed is very hard to enforce meaningfully and in practice so no use of the terrace should be permitted because of the impact on our property. This imposition of a condition doesn't adequately protect our rights as enforcement will be difficult and impracticable.</p> <p>4. 10pm is much later than normal working day/hours if there will be limited use by imposition of a condition because it means that in reality, the terrace will be used for most of any 24hr period (as there is no idea of when the terrace will begin).</p> <p>5. Given the plan and proposal that conditions might permit use until 10pm, the aim and goal seem clear that the terrace will be used for social and recreational purposes. Conditions have to limit the use to working purposes, not social or recreational.</p> <p>6. As we are being told about the imminent spike of the covid-19 and its variants, the applicant has statutory duties and duty of care to ensure that the interior of the office space is safe and healthy, generally and covid-specifically. The applicant should not be allowed to escape those duties by relying solely on the use of the existing flat roof as a terrace, when that has such dangerous and deadly consequences for us (the neighbouring property) and other residents of our block, Beaconsfield. There are children, visibly & invisibly disabled/vulnerable people, people with long-term medical conditions, elderly people alongside fit and healthy people including working ones in Beaconsfield so the reference to a healthy and Covid safe working</p>

Application No: **Consultees Name:** **Received:**

Comment: **Response:**

environment is misleading, deceptive and merely a distraction.

Please note that the windows of our flat and Beaconsfield are literally next to the 'proposed terrace' and probably less than a metre away.

This application will have severe harmful and adverse effect on us, our property and other residents of Beaconsfield so Must Be Refused.

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2022/3289/P	Victoria Head	20/09/2022 21:18:25	OBJ	Dear Sir/Madam,

I write to communicate my OBJECTION to the planning application 2022/3289/P submitted for 39-40 Eagle Street, London, WC1R4TH. I am a resident of the neighbouring building – Beaconsfield, 64 Red Lion Street, WC1R4PA – and live in extremely close proximity to the proposed terrace. I have reviewed the application and its associated documents and strongly feel as though this would unreasonably and disproportionately detriment my quality of life, as it would for my fellow residents. The grounds for which I object are as follows: overlooking and loss of privacy; noise and disturbance resulting from use; smells; and other.

Noise and disturbance resulting from use:

It is made abundantly clear in the application that the true purpose of the terrace is for socializing. The applicants say that they would be open to considering limiting use to 10pm on weekdays. This is hours beyond the working day, and it is inconceivable for access this late into the evenings to be required to “create a COVID safe working environment” – as is cited as the reason for the application. The applicants have directly contradicted themselves with that assertion. It is clear that the true motivation for the terrace has absolutely nothing to do with COVID.

This terrace sits around 1 meter away from my property’s windows, the noise emitted from this social use will undeniably cause disturbance. The noise of having multiple people gathering on the balcony and socializing would be intrusive and impede my day-to-day life. Quite frankly, a suggestion that the balcony would be used on the weekends at all is outrageous and entirely outside of the scope of what the property alleges to be designed for. Why would weekend access to a terrace be required to ensure COVID safety in an office block? Imposing a condition to limit the use is inadequate in any event. It does not protect my rights as conditions are widely unenforceable and unmonitored.

In a post-COVID world, it is reasonable and expected that residents of Beaconsfield use their homes during the day to work from home. I regularly do this and rely on this use of my property for my income. Even if the use of the terrace could be restricted to during working hours, this would still be wholly unacceptable. This would restrict my ability to work from home in my property due to the noise and disturbance caused throughout the day. This is unreasonable and disproportionate to the benefit of allowing the application.

Overlooking and loss of privacy:

The windows to my property, along with several other residents, are in extremely close proximity to the proposed terrace (approximately 1 meter away). My bedroom window sits next to, and slightly down from, the proposed terrace. The effect of this is indisputably that the terrace will overlook my property causing an extreme loss of privacy. I strongly disagree with the assertion that due to the terrace sitting between two floors, the chances of overlooking are reduced (claimed at [d] p6 of the Design & Access Statement). To say so is a gross misstatement and is very misleading. The angle between my windows and the terrace means that there is a direct line of sight between the two. People would be able to see straight into my bedroom and my living room, resulting in a total loss of privacy. It is absolutely not just to allow such an application to proceed, on this ground alone.

Smells:

It is common and obvious that terraces are used for people to smoke throughout the day. This will cause extreme smell and discomfort that will inevitably impact my property. My window is a mere meter away from the terrace and so the smell will impact my flat and that is unavoidable. I really would find this offensive and unpleasant. I do not believe it is reasonable or fair to impose this on residents of Beaconsfield. Once again, I

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2022/3289/P	Alice Head	20/09/2022 21:29:14	OBJ	<p>believe it would be disproportionate to do so when there is no clear purpose or benefit to approving the application.</p> <p>Other:</p> <p>The reason for the application is cited as being “to encourage a healthy and COVID safe working environment”. I find it frankly offensive that COVID is being scapegoated as a reason to develop what is seemingly going to be used as a social and recreational space. The development of a terrace would in no way ensure a COVID safe working space, and it is absurd to suggest otherwise. There are hundreds of thousands of offices throughout London that promote COVID safe spaces with absolutely no access to outside space. If this is the true intention behind the application, then there are much simpler and less intrusive ways to achieve this. The same effect would be achieved by opening a window, for example. The use of the word “healthy” is incorrect in this context and redundant in meaning.</p> <p>Ultimately, I can see no valid reason whatsoever for this application to be permitted. The harm and damage it will inevitably cause to the residents of Beaconsfield is wholly disproportionate to any perceived benefit. The only reason cited for this application is offensive, incoherently worded and therefore redundant.</p> <p>I very much appreciate your consideration of my objection. I would be grateful if you could confirm safe receipt of this letter.</p> <p>Kind regards, Resident of Beaconsfield, the neighbouring residential block.</p>
				<p>I write to communicate my objection to the planning application 2022/3289/P submitted for 39-40 Eagle Street, London, WC1R4TH. I am a leaseholder of a flat within the neighbouring building ĳ Beaconsfield, 64 Red Lion Street, WC1R4PA. I wish to wholeheartedly echo and support the objection submitted by the tenant of my property (Flat 7). The grounds on which I object are as follows: overlooking and loss of privacy; noise and disturbance resulting from use; smells; and other.</p> <p>I believe that the approval of this application would adversely impact the lives of the residents at Beaconsfield. On the flip side, there appears to be very little (to no) benefit to allowing this to proceed.</p> <p>Kind regards, Leaseholder of Flat 7, Beaconsfield.</p>