

PLANNING APPLICATION PUBLIC COMMENT

Application number: PP/20/04812
Site Address: 19 Mallord Street, LONDON, SW3 6AP
Proposal: Change of use of basement, ground and three upper storeys from former telephone exchange (Sui Generis) to new health and fitness club; creation of small single storey rear extension at basement level; excavation for a swimming pool at basement level; alterations to entrances and external paving; and other works and improvements to building.

Comment received: Dear Mr Woodhead,

I write on behalf of the owners of 28 Mallord Street, a Grade 2 Listed property which was formerly the home and studio of Augustus John. No. 28 is directly opposite the application site.

We were unaware of the application for no. 19 until 26th September, and are still reviewing the voluminous documents.

Perusal to date prompts the concerns set out below, I would welcome discussing them over the phone.

1. Noise and disturbance

Early sight of Environmental Health's consultation response on this application would be appreciated, particularly their analysis of the technical reports submitted with the application. Will the EH comments be uploaded by around 9th October?

In addition to secondary glazing, we trust that windows would generally be made non-opening - otherwise the benefit of sound-insulation measures would be lost.

Even if it were evidenced that noise would be contained within the building, there is still the issue of noise and disturbance as people arrive at and leave the premises.

2. Parking and highway safety

The Applicant's description of this as a "car-free" development does not stack up.

A S.106 could perhaps prohibit the issue of Business parking permits (i.e. to members of staff who live outside RBKC).

However, the vast majority of members of the Health Club would already have Residents Parking permits (as might many of the

staff). As RBKC Parking permits are borough-wide, the potential for those going to the Club to use bays in the vicinity of no. 19 appears unrestricted.

Surveys of car-use at other clubs run by the same operator but in different parts of London (where parking permits are for a very limited CPZ area only) are therefore of limited assistance for assessing the current planning application.

3. Overlooking and loss of privacy

We trust that obscured glazing is proposed on the Mallord Street frontage, so as to prevent overlooking of the residential properties opposite.

Similarly, use of the roof would have clear attractions for a Health Club operator - and inappropriate impacts for neighbouring properties.

Would you please confirm if the Applicant has accepted that Conditions to address these points would be acceptable to it.

4. Principle of the proposed use and scope for movement within Use Class

Whilst I recall D1 uses being considered potentially acceptable (in principle) for no. 19, the introduction of a D2 use (such as a health and fitness club) would in itself have given rise to concerns.

Furthermore, use as a "health and fitness club" appears to fall within (d) of the new Class E, being use for
"indoor sport, recreation or fitness, not involving motorised vehicles or firearms, principally to visiting members of the public"

Within Class E is a wide variety of uses, including restaurant.

It would be reassuring to see an acknowledgement by the Applicant that, should the Council be minded to grant consent, a tightly-worded Condition restricting movement within the Use Class would be appropriate.

5. Excavation for swimming pool

You will appreciate the various concerns prompted by this element of the proposals.

The applications documents indicate that the Council has accepted CL7 as not being applicable. Would you please clarify the position.

I note that no Construction Method Statement has been submitted

with the application. Has the Council previously been provided with evidence that the proposals have been signed-off by an appropriately qualified civil or structural engineer?

6. Heritage

The application documents mention external plant/services, including a lift over-run on top of the building. We look forward to reading the Conservation officer's thoughts on impacts to both designated and non-designated Heritage Assets.

I look forward to hearing from you.

Date of Comment: 04/10/2020
Comment type: Objection