

Dear Democratic Services Team,

I have been invited to attend the virtual planning meeting on 25th January considering applications 20/01717/LBC and 20/01716/FUL. I do not wish to attend given the limited time available for speakers, which I am sure will be more than used up by other objectors.

Here therefore is a short statement for the panel as per the invitation, which states that:

> *The Council will accept a written copy of a short statement from registered speakers who do not wish to or cannot join the virtual Meeting or are unable to.*

(If it is necessary, I can send a separate email requesting to register to speak, and then follow up with a second copy of this short statement.)

(At time of writing, the attached documents have disappeared from these planning applications so I am unable to add more detailed references to them below.)

SHORT STATEMENT

There is widespread concern from local residents living in the Bugle Street area about the plans to host events rather than simply converting this heritage building to flats or a hotel (as previously proposed). A summary of the concerns shared with me is given below, together with comments on deficiencies in the planning papers provided. These are in three areas: Noise Impact, Site Security and Fire Safety, and Disabled Access. I therefore believe that the application should be rejected, or delayed until improved planning papers are submitted which address these deficiencies.

Noise Impact

The noise impact assessment discusses the likely noise levels of wedding ceremonies and celebrations. Can the planning committee enforce such a restriction? If not, the panel must consider the impact of other events, including louder parties such as a 21st birthday celebration. Any music should cease by a defined time such as 10pm to prevent nuisance to nearby residents. I believe that the suggested licensing hours given in the licensing plans (up to midnight midweek and 2am at the weekend) are wholly unacceptable and inappropriate. The Dancing Man over the road does not have such extended hours, neither for music nor drinking, and it is inevitable that some of their patrons will seek to move over the road if later hours are granted to 1A Bugle Street. Given the likelihood that event organisers may need to stay for a while after their party has finished, I believe it would be wise to impose earlier closing on 1A Bugle Street of the Dancing Man.

The noise impact statement appears to have assessed the impact of late night amplified music from the basement level only. Likewise the noise impact statement assumes the windows and doors of 1A Bugle Street remain closed. Can the planning committee enforce such a restriction? If not, then the impact of late night amplified music with open windows and doors must be considered.

The noise impact statement also assumes that "management will be required to control live/amplified music to acceptable levels". There is however no discussion in the site management plan concerning this point and it is not clear how acceptable levels will be enforced, nor that it is practical or possible to require doors and windows to be closed. If there are no employees on site, party-goers may bring their own equipment, thereby by-passing the "tamper-proof" limits enforced by the on-site equipment.

The noise impact statement moreover makes reference to the basement space being used up from 11pm until 7am in the morning, which is entirely unacceptable in a residential street. There is no doubt many party-goers will leave by taxi (particularly after midnight when few buses are running). There is no consideration in the noise impact statement of the impact on neighbouring properties of large numbers of people arriving or leaving in the middle of the night, and these highly

probable impacts are not considered in the transport document either. The transport document states that Mayflower Park has the closest parking spaces, but this is only open to cars during daylight hours. The transport document also refers to loading and unloading, which are not considered in the noise impact assessment. It is vital for nearby residents that all these potentially noisy on-street activities are restricted to reasonable hours such as 8am to 10pm.

Because of the deficiencies noted above, I believe the application should be rejected, or at least delayed until a new noise impact statement is completed, the site management plan updated to match its requirements, and the transport report extended to consider other on-street sources of late night and early morning traffic movements, noise, and other associated nuisances. Likewise the transport report should consider when loading and unloading may reasonably occur, and propose appropriate time limits.

Site Security and Fire Safety

None of the plans discusses site security. What are the safe numbers of guests, and how will these be enforced? Who will monitor and manage entrance to the building while events are occurring? It is inevitable that passers-by and patrons of the Dancing Man or Kutis just over the road will be attracted by music and some will seek to gate-crash.

Likewise there seems to be little consideration of fire safety. What fire alarms and other protection systems will be installed? How will occupants evacuate in case of a fire, and will they be able to do so from the basement, given that the two fire escape routes from the underground event space are less than 5 metres apart. Sadly the last time the city allowed one of its heritage buildings to be used as a night club, fire broke out and destroyed it.

Because of the failures to consider security, safety, and fire risk, I believe the application should be rejected, or at least delayed until these are incorporated in the building and site management plans.

Disabled Access

The access and heritage statement claims the site is highly accessible, but it is in fact very awkward for a wheelchair user, who is unlikely to be able to access the ground floor, let alone the basement, garden or higher levels of the property. The document also claims that the garden will remain the same, which I believe is also untrue.

Because of the failures to consider access by disabled users and to specify what planting may be permitted in the garden, I believe the application should be rejected, or at least delayed until these are incorporated in the access and heritage statement, and the building and site management plans.

Best wishes, Andy Gravell, Old Town Residents Association