

Background Papers for 19/00291/FULL

External

23 April 2019	Dr Kirsty Mann
26 April 2019	Allan O'Neill
26 April 2019	Sarah Field
26 April 2019	Dr.Honghua SANG &.Yikai ZHANG
27 April 2019	Peter and Henrietta Fudakowski
29 April 2019	Dr Kirsty Mann
30 April 2019	Mr Timothy Parker
30 April 2019	Rosemarie Hutchinson
01 May 2019	Michael Harris (GHL)
03 May 2019	Dragan Zadro
03 May 2019	Mr Jonathan Bird
05 May 2019	Noel Chun
06 May 2019	Darren Shapland
07 May 2019	Toby Brown
17 May 2019	Henrika Priest
17 May 2019	Dr Kirsty Mann
29 July 2019	Allan O'Neill
29 July 2019	Henrietta Fudakowski
29 July 2019	Mrs.Sang and yikai Zhang
29 July 2019	Sarah Field
29 July 2019	Julie Downs
31 July 2019	Noël Chun
04 August 2019	Rosemarie Hutchinson
06 August 2019	Alexander Scurlock
07 August 2019	Dr Kirsty Mann
07 Aug 2019	Michael Harris
07 Aug 2019	Andrew Gavan
13 August 2019	Darren Shapland
13 August 2019	Jonathan Bird

13 August 2019	Tim Parker
14 August 2019	Henrika Priest
14 August 2019	Ian Yap
14 August 2019	Lorna Gradden
14 August 2019	Mike Murphy
15 August 2019	Madam Beng Choo Goh
15 August 2019	Toby Brown

Comments for Planning Application 19/00291/FULL

Application Summary

Application Number: 19/00291/FULL

Address: 10 Bolt Court London EC4A 3DQ

Proposal: Replacement of balustrading and installation of new decking at roof level.

Case Officer: Alison Hayes

Customer Details

Name: Dr Kirsty Mann

Address: Flat 19 6 Bolt Court City of London

Comment Details

Commenter Type: Neighbour

Stance: Customer objects to the Planning Application

Comment Reasons:

- Noise
- Other
- Residential Amenity

Comment: We understand that the proposal is to make an existing roof terrace safe. The works seem excessive for this purpose. I have lived here since 2010 and the space has never been used as a roof terrace; it has been used only for access to the facilities. It is to be anticipated that once the terrace is "safe" it will be used for far more extensive purposes, that is to say for social purposes. That use is seriously detrimental to nearby residents.

The current use of the area is mixed office and residential. We accept the natural incidents of that. But the proposed use of the new terrace is inconsistent with current use to the detriment, in particular, of residents. The works are presumably being done to facilitate social use by significant numbers of people; otherwise the applicants would not be proposing them. Such use leads to noise and light pollution. Requests to social users to keep noise down never works. Social gatherings will generate noise, which operates to the detriment of all nearby occupants, and particularly essential workers like me and my fiancée (we are doctors) who have to work nightshifts and sleep during the day.

The proposed roof terrace is directly opposite my living and bedroom accommodation and looks directly into me at very close range. Social use adversely affects my privacy and the privacy of other flats. This is unacceptable overlooking if the use is for anything other than occasional maintenance purposes. Occasional maintenance is within the normal sort of give and take that has to exist in a mixed urban environment. Significant numbers of people gathered for an extended period for social purposes is not.

The changes will detrimentally impact upon the eastern view from the North West corner of Bolt Court. This view is specifically listed as "a local view contributing to the character of the conservation area" in your document: City of London "Fleet Street Conservation Area: Character

summary and management strategy SPD" pages 19 & 20.

Flat 15
6 Bolt Court
City of London
EC4A 3DQ

Department of the Built Environment
City of London
PO Box 270
Guildhall
London
EC2P 2EJ

26th April 2019

Dear Alison Hayes,

I am writing to raise an **objection** to the planning application **19/00291/FULL** at 10 Bolt Court, EC4A 3DQ (alternative reference **PP-07614896**).

I understand that the proposal is to make an existing roof terrace safe. I have lived here since 2013 and the space has only been used for access to the roof-based facilities. It is to be anticipated that once the terrace is "safe" it will be used for far more extensive purposes, that is to say for social purposes involving significant numbers of people. That use is very detrimental to nearby residents.

Social gatherings will inevitably generate excessive noise, operating to the detriment of all nearby occupants as requests to social users of such spaces such to keep noise down never works.

The proposed roof terrace is directly opposite my living and bedroom accommodation and looks directly into my flat at very close range. Social use adversely affects my privacy and the privacy of other flats fronting on this terrace. This is unacceptable overlooking if the use is for anything other than occasional maintenance purposes. Occasional maintenance purposes is within the normal give and take that exists in a mixed urban environment such as this. Significant numbers of people gathered together for an extended period for social purposes is not.

Any cigarette smoking on the terrace will be a very short distance of the windows of some 6 Bolt Court residents like myself.

In addition, the alterations, including the new black balustrade, are likely to reduce the natural light into Bolt Court itself, and also into the south facing flats in 6 Bolt court. This view is specifically listed as "a local view contributing to the character of the conservation area" in your own City of London document "[Fleet Street Conservation Area: Character summary and management strategy SPD](#)", please see pages 19 & 20. Furthermore, the alterations are not in keeping with the historic buildings of the Fleet Street Conservation Area.

Yours Sincerely,

Allan O'Neill

Comments for Planning Application 19/00291/FULL

Application Summary

Application Number: 19/00291/FULL

Address: 10 Bolt Court London EC4A 3DQ

Proposal: Replacement of balustrading and installation of new decking at roof level.

Case Officer: Alison Hayes

Customer Details

Name: Mrs Sarah Field

Address: Flat 22 6 Bolt Court London

Comment Details

Commenter Type: Neighbour

Stance: Customer objects to the Planning Application

Comment Reasons:

- Noise
- Residential Amenity

Comment:

Department of the Built Environment

City of London

PO Box 270

Guildhall

London

EC2P 2EJ

23rd April 2019

Dear Ms Hayes,

We are writing to raise an objection to the planning application 19/00291/FULL at 10 Bolt Court, EC4A 3DQ (alternative reference PP-07614896).

We understand that the proposal is to make an existing roof terrace safe. The works seem excessive for this purpose. We are therefore assuming that the roof terrace will be intended to be used for social purposes involving significant numbers of people. That use will be seriously detrimental to nearby residents.

The current use of the area, into which we have all bought, is mixed office and residential. The assumed use of the new terrace is inconsistent with current use to the detriment, in particular, of residents. If it is intended that the refurbished roof terrace be used for social activities, the consequent noise and, perhaps, light pollution, will be adverse to us as residents. The roof terrace is opposite our living and bedroom accommodation and is at very close range. Social use would

adversely affect our privacy and the privacy of other flats fronting on this terrace. In addition, any cigarette smoking on the terrace will be occurring within a very short distance of the windows of some 6 Bolt Court residents - this is a public health concern, particularly as some residents are asthmatic.

The proposed alterations, including the new black balustrade, are likely to reduce the natural light into Bolt Court itself, and also into the south facing flats in 6 Bolt court. The changes will detrimentally impact upon the eastern view from the North West corner of Bolt Court. This view is specifically listed as "a local view contributing to the character of the conservation area" in your own City of London document "Fleet Street Conservation Area: Character summary and management strategy SPD", please see pages 19 & 20. Furthermore, the alterations are not in keeping with the historic buildings of the Fleet Street Conservation Area.

Yours Sincerely,

Sarah and Chris Field
Flat 22
6 Bolt Court
City of London
EC4A 3D

Flat 7
6 Bolt Court
City of London
EC4A 3DQ

Department of the Built Environment
City of London
PO Box 270
Guildhall
London
EC2P 2EJ

26 April 2019

Dear Alison Hayes,

I am writing to state our **objections** to the planning application **19/00291/FULL** at 10 Bolt Court, EC4A 3DQ (alternative reference **PP-07614896**).

We understand that the proposal is to make an existing roof terrace safe. I have lived here since 2010 and the space has never been used as a roof terrace; it has been used only for access to the roof-based facilities. It is to be anticipated that once the terrace is "safe" it will be used for far more extensive purposes, that is to say for social purposes involving significant numbers of people. That use is seriously detrimental to nearby residents.

The current use of the area, into which we have all bought, is mixed office and residential. We accept the natural incidents of that. The proposed use of the new terrace is inconsistent with current use to the detriment, in particular, of residents. The works are presumably being done to facilitate social use; otherwise the applicants would not be proposing the works. Such use leads to noise and, perhaps, light pollution, which is adverse to us as residents. Requests to social users of the terrace to keep noise down never works. Social gatherings will generate noise, which operates to the detriment of all nearby occupants, and particularly essential workers like myself and my fiancée (we are doctors and our flat is directly opposite the terrace) who have to work night shifts and sleep during the day.

The proposed roof terrace is directly opposite my living and bedroom accommodation and looks directly into me at very close range. Social use adversely affects my privacy and the privacy of other flats fronting on this terrace. This is unacceptable overlooking if the use is for anything other than occasional maintenance purposes. Occasional maintenance purposes is within the normal sort of give and take that has to exist in a mixed urban environment such as this. Significant numbers of people gathered together for an extended period for social purposes is not.

Any cigarette smoking on the terrace will be occurring within a very short distance of the windows of some 6 Bolt Court residents - this is a public health concern, not to mention my partner is asthmatic.

In addition, the alterations, including the new black balustrade, are likely to reduce the natural light into Bolt Court itself, and also into the south facing flats in 6 Bolt court. The changes will detrimentally impact upon the eastern view from the North West corner of Bolt Court. This view is

specifically listed as “a local view contributing to the character of the conservation area” in your own City of London document “[Fleet Street Conservation Area: Character summary and management strategy SPD](#)”, please see pages 19 & 20. Furthermore, the alterations are not in keeping with the historic buildings of the Fleet Street Conservation Area.

Yours Sincerely,

Dr.Honghua SANG &.Yikai ZHANG

From: [Henrietta Fudakowski](#)
To: [PLN - Comments](#)
Subject: 10 Bolt Court Development
Date: 27 April 2019 09:21:29

Dear Alison Hayes,

I am writing to raise an **objection** to the planning application **19/00291/FULL** at 10 Bolt Court, EC4A 3DQ (alternative reference **PP-07614896**).

I understand that the proposal is to make an existing roof terrace safe. It is to be anticipated that once the terrace is "safe" it will be used for far more extensive purposes, that is to say for social purposes involving significant numbers of people. That use is seriously detrimental to nearby residents.

The current use of the area, into which we have all bought, is mixed office and residential. The works are presumably being done to facilitate social use; otherwise the applicants would not be proposing the works. Such use leads to noise and, perhaps, light pollution, which is adverse to us as residents. Requests to social users of the terrace to keep noise down never works. Social gatherings will generate noise, which operates to the detriment of all nearby occupants.

The proposed roof terrace is directly opposite my living and bedroom accommodation and looks directly into me at very close range. Social use adversely affects my privacy and the privacy of other flats fronting on this terrace. This is unacceptable overlooking if the use is for anything other than occasional maintenance purposes. Occasional maintenance purposes is within the normal sort of give and take that has to exist in a mixed urban environment such as this. Significant numbers of people gathered together for an extended period for social purposes is not.

Any cigarette smoking on the terrace will be occurring within a very short distance of the windows of some 6 Bolt Court residents - this is a public health concern. In addition, the alterations, including the new black balustrade, are likely to reduce the natural light into Bolt Court itself. Furthermore, the alterations are not in keeping with the historic buildings of the Fleet Street Conservation Area.

Regards

Peter and Henrietta Fudakowski

Flat 16 Gough House
6 Bolt Court
London EC4A 3DQ
[REDACTED]

Henrietta Fudakowski
[REDACTED]
3 Colville Place

London W1T 2BH



From: Kirsty Mann
To: [PLN - Comments](#)
Subject: Re: application documents 19/00291/FULL Objection
Date: 29 April 2019 19:55:59

Dear Ms Hayes,

Re: planning application [19/00291/FULL](#) at 10 Bolt Court, EC4A 3DQ (alternative reference **PP-07614896**)

Thank you for your letter acknowledging receipt of my objection.

Having studied the application documents further, I would like to add the following to the comments I have already made.

The covering letter for the application states:

“Local Plan Policy DM 10.3 (Roof gardens and terraces) encourages high quality roof gardens and terraces where they do not immediately overlook residential properties, or adversely affect rooflines or roof profiles or impact on identified views.”

It does not go on to say whether any of the disqualifying facts are present. One of them is. Although the letter does not say so, the planning authority is presumably invited to infer that this development does not overlook residential properties. That inference would be completely wrong. This proposed terrace plainly does overlook residential properties, namely my flat at 6 Bolt Court and the other flats which face towards the building. It is surprising that this was not pointed out in the application. Whether by design or otherwise, the extent and nature of the overlooking is not apparent from the two photos of the existing balustrade in the “Roof Terrace Treatment” document. I have already commented on the level of intrusion that would be involved. To grant this application would therefore contravene this policy.

The letter goes on:

“The roof area is currently accessible by occupiers of the building for use as a terrace and therefore the proposals would not give rise to any new amenity impacts over and above the current position.”

This is misleading because it suggests that there is current material “amenity” use by occupiers of the building. There is none. There is only maintenance access (to which, of course, I do not object). The application documents make it clear that the purpose of the works is to facilitate a level of access that would not otherwise happen – that is to say, access for amenity. The suggestion that nothing new will happen if this application is granted is, I am sorry to say, positively misleading. To be clear – the occupiers apparently consider that the current state of the terrace makes it unsuitable for amenity access; they wish to make it more suitable; they can then make it available for uncontrolled amenity use; therefore the proposals will “give rise to new amenity impacts over and above the current position”. That is the whole point of the application.

I’d like to reiterate that in the nine years I have lived in Bolt Court, the roof has never been used as a terrace, an assertion which can be confirmed by other residents and by the porter.

Would you like to come and see for yourself? I’d be very to facilitate this. Do let me know. The roof is about 5 - 10m from my windows.

Yours Sincerely

Dr Kirsty Mann

Flat 19, 6 Bolt Court, London, EC4A 3DQ

On 26 Apr 2019, at 14:16, <PLNComments@cityoflondon.gov.uk>
<PLNComments@cityoflondon.gov.uk> wrote:

Dear Sir/Madam

Please see attached acknowledgement of your representation made on
planning application 19/00291/FULL (10 Bolt Court London EC4A 3DQ).

Kind Regards

Planning Administration
Department of the Built Environment
City of London

THIS E-MAIL AND ANY ATTACHED FILES ARE CONFIDENTIAL
AND MAY BE LEGALLY PRIVILEGED. If you are not the addressee, any
disclosure, reproduction, copying, distribution or other dissemination or use of
this communication is strictly prohibited. If you have received this
transmission in error please notify the sender immediately and then delete this
e-mail. Opinions, advice or facts included in this message are given without
any warranties or intention to enter into a contractual relationship with the
City of London unless specifically indicated otherwise by agreement, letter or
facsimile signed by a City of London authorised signatory. Any part of this e-
mail which is purely personal in nature is not authorised by the City of
London. All e-mail through the City of London's gateway is potentially the
subject of monitoring. All liability for errors and viruses is excluded. Please
note that in so far as the City of London falls within the scope of the Freedom
of Information Act 2000 or the Environmental Information Regulations 2004,
it may need to disclose this e-mail. Website: <http://www.cityoflondon.gov.uk>
<ufm2.pdf>

Comments for Planning Application 19/00291/FULL

Application Summary

Application Number: 19/00291/FULL

Address: 10 Bolt Court London EC4A 3DQ

Proposal: Replacement of balustrading and installation of new decking at roof level.

Case Officer: Alison Hayes

Customer Details

Name: Mr Timothy Parker

Address: Flat 21, Gough House, 6 Bolt Court London

Comment Details

Commenter Type: Neighbour

Stance: Customer objects to the Planning Application

Comment Reasons:

- Noise
- Other
- Residential Amenity

Comment: Although described as "Minor alterations at roof level including design improvements to existing balustrades and new decking associated with the existing office use" the application is in fact one seeking to alter the user of the roof space in question. This is inaccurate in the following respects:

(1) The roof space atop 10 Bolt Court is not, and has never been, used "for office use" - or indeed any use at all (save for occasional maintenance access). As shown in the application document, the space in question is actually not safe for the use now proposed. What is being put forward is a new user altogether, not an upgrade for existing user as claimed.

(2) The proposed use - as an outdoor terrace - cannot be described as "office" use. Its purpose will doubtless be as a smoking area and/or a place for social gatherings.

The proposal is further objectionable because:

(1) Bolt Court is an oasis of quiet just metres from the hustle of Fleet Street. Converting a roof area at its heart into a social gathering point will disturb residents, and detract markedly from the essential quality of the area, upsetting the fair balance between residential and office user currently struck.

(2) The privacy of residents directly opposite will be severely affected. Flats in Gough House (6 Bolt Court) are just metres from the roof space in question, and are overlooked by it.

(3) The design and materials proposed are out of keeping with the character of the area. The proposed balustrades - in black metal, perforated with small slits - will cut light to Bolt Court, and stand in stark contrast to the style of the buildings all around (which match the current format of the balustrades). The decking materials do not comport with the local character evident on the surrounding buildings and rooftops.

Given that the purpose of these changes would be to create a new space for the exclusive social (i.e. non-office) use of 10 Bolt Court occupants, I am strongly in opposition to them.

Comments for Planning Application 19/00291/FULL

Application Summary

Application Number: 19/00291/FULL

Address: 10 Bolt Court London EC4A 3DQ

Proposal: Replacement of balustrading and installation of new decking at roof level.

Case Officer: Alison Hayes

Customer Details

Name: Dr Rosemarie Hutchinson

Address: Flat 4 6 Bolt Court London

Comment Details

Commenter Type: Neighbour

Stance: Customer objects to the Planning Application

Comment Reasons:

- Other

Comment: Rosemarie Hutchinson

Flat 4

6 Bolt Court

London

EC4A 3DQ

Planning application 19/00291/Full

I wish to object to planning application for 10 Bolt Court:

"Minor alterations at roof level including design improvements to existing balustrades and new decking associated with the existing office use".

I do not consider the proposals to be of a minor nature.

The roof of number 10 Bolt Court is not currently in use as a roof terrace, it is a service area for access to air-conditioning and ventilation units. It is not currently possible to use this area as a roof terrace because the area would be deemed unsafe under Health and Safety regulations and building control since the balustrade is far too low. Thus this proposal is for a new use of a space and will require substantial alterations to make it suitable as an amenity space

I think that it is highly unlikely that the improvements suggested for the existing balustrade would be sufficient to meet health and safety regulations. The existing balustrade is too low to prevent an accidental, or indeed deliberate, fall from the roof terrace. It is vital that this point is addressed at

this stage. Clearly an application that requires a higher balustrade would be perceived to have a greater visual and structural impact.

The drawings suggest that the planting on the roof terrace may be "faux". This does not seem to me to be high-quality design or an enhancement to the conservation area in which number 10 Bolt Court is situated.

10 Bolt Court is directly opposite a residential building which is grade 2 listed (6 Bolt Court). Social activity on the roof terrace will be detrimental not only to the residential nature of this area but is detrimental to the historic ambience of Bolt Court. An amenity roof terrace space will generate noise and light pollution.

The proposed alterations are not in keeping with the traditional nature of the historic buildings of the Fleet Street Conservation Area. The purpose of the conservation area designation is to conserve the traditional and historic nature of the area.

Kind Regards
Rosemarie Hutchinson

From: Rebecca Bailey-Harris
To: [PLN - Comments](#)
Cc: [REDACTED]
Subject: FW: Planning Application 19/00291/FULL (alternative reference PP-07614896)
Date: 01 May 2019 11:22:44

I meant of course 10 **BOLT COURT**, not 10 Gough Square
MH

From: Rebecca Bailey-Harris [REDACTED]
Sent: 01 May 2019 10:19
To: 'PLNComments@cityoflondon.gov.uk' <PLNComments@cityoflondon.gov.uk>
Cc: [REDACTED]
Subject: FW: Planning Application 19/00291/FULL (alternative reference PP-07614896)

I also omitted to point up, as Dr Mann does so forcefully in her submission to Alison Hayes, that the building at 6 Bolt Court forms part of the Fleet Street Conservation Area. I would add to that that the building has been recognized as an important part of the patrimony of the City of London by the bestowal of A BLUE PLAQUE!

The proposed development clearly detracts both from the character of the precinct and its views and from the status of 6 Bolt Court as a building with the much-sought-after accolade referred to above.

Michael Harris

From: Rebecca Bailey-Harris [REDACTED]
Sent: 01 May 2019 09:58
To: 'PLNComments@cityoflondon.gov.uk' <[PLNComments@cityoflondon.gov.uk](#)>
Cc: [REDACTED]
Subject: FW: Planning Application 19/00291/FULL (alternative reference PP-07614896)

*I intended to say that my fellow director is Mr Eric Hutchinson who resides at Flat 4, 6 Bolt Court and who endorses what is contained in this representation.

Michael Harris

Director, Gough House limited

From: Rebecca Bailey-Harris [REDACTED]
Sent: 01 May 2019 09:54
To: 'PLNComments@cityoflondon.gov.uk' <[PLNComments@cityoflondon.gov.uk](#)>
Cc: [REDACTED]
Subject: Planning Application 19/00291/FULL (alternative reference PP-07614896)

I write in my capacity of *Director of **Gough House Limited (GHL)**, the owner of the freehold of the building at **6 Bolt Court EC4A 3DQ**. The building comprises some 21 flats, 19 of which are owned by proprietors with an equal share in that freehold. The owners of the two flats **who**

chose not to be part of the purchase of the freehold in 2008 by GHL continue to pay annual ground rent to GHL.

You have already received a number of objections from shareholders whose flats will be peculiarly affected by the proposed building works on the terrace of 10 Bolt Court. GHL has seen those objections and ***wholly supports them and endorses the reasons they advance for refusing the application.***

In terms of the particular attitude of GHL to the application, the first thing to observe is that in terms of its use as premises from which currently is conducted the work of a highly regarded firm of family law solicitors, a roof terrace can have no relevant function. It seems clear that the owners of 10 Gough Square, two well-known solicitors currently practising as Miles Preston, have in mind the ultimate, and perhaps imminent, sale of this valuable property and wish to enhance its potential sale price by this proposed change. GHL takes strong objection to such an opportunistic approach to maximising an asset to the detriment of our asset and its residents. Miles Preston well knows that 6 Bolt Court is a building with a special attraction for professional people working in the City of London because of its secluded situation and peaceful environment.

It cannot be in doubt that when the building is sold with a roof terrace, the purchasers will want to use that area in a way which will represent a radical change to the way in which life is currently lived at 6 Bolt Court. As Dr Kirsty Mann observes in her letter of objection to Alison Hayes: "The proposed use of the new terrace is inconsistent with current use (mixed office and residential) to the detriment, in particular, of residents". Everything she says about noise, light pollution, requests for modification of behaviour inevitably falling on deaf ears etc. is absolutely right and together constitute an unimpeachable case for refusing this unmeritorious application.

GHL has a duty to protect the economic value of the building at 6 Bolt Court. It is unarguable that the proposed roof terrace has the potential to reduce the value of our building if the entirely predictable adverse consequences so eloquently outlined by Dr Mann come to pass as they inevitably will if the permission sought is granted. We accordingly urge the City of London to reject this unwelcome and unworthy application. If granted it will effectively be creating a very high risk of a nuisance to the residents of 6 Bolt Court, especially those flats directly facing the proposed terrace.

I shall be grateful if you will acknowledge receipt of this objection and keep me informed as to the progress of the matter through your planning process.

Yours sincerely,

Michael Harris
Flat 9
6 Bolt Court

London EC4A 3DQ



From: Dragan Zadro
To: [PLN - Comments](#)
Subject: Fwd: Planning application 19/00291/ Full objection
Date: 03 May 2019 13:43:47

----- Forwarded message -----

From: **Dragan Zadro** [REDACTED]
Date: Fri, May 3, 2019 at 1:27 PM
Subject: Planning application 19/00291/ Full objection
To: <PLNCcomments@cityoflondon.gov.uk>

Dear Ms Hayes

I am writing regarding the proposed new roof terrace at 10 Bolt Court. I have worked as a concierge to 6 Bolt Court for 12 years, and I manage several flats within the building. During this time the roof at number 10 has never been used as a terrace. A few weeks ago, I was told by a resident that men were seen inspecting the roof, so I went into the offices to enquire and was reassured that no work was planned. I take great care to manage the courtyard of Bolt Court, I sweep and clean it regularly (including the base of number 10) and I am concerned that a new roof terrace will produce litter and debris, for example from cigarettes.

Kind Regards

Concierge Dragan Zadro
6 Bolt Court
London EC4A 3DQ

Comments for Planning Application 19/00291/FULL

Application Summary

Application Number: 19/00291/FULL

Address: 10 Bolt Court London EC4A 3DQ

Proposal: Replacement of balustrading and installation of new decking at roof level.

Case Officer: Alison Hayes

Customer Details

Name: Mr Jonathan Bird

Address: 6 Bolt Court Flat 18 London

Comment Details

Commenter Type: Neighbour

Stance: Customer objects to the Planning Application

Comment Reasons:

- Noise
- Other

Comment: Dear Alison Hayes, I wish to object to the planning application 19/00291/FULL at 10 Bolt Court, EC4A 3DQ

I am concerned by the changes proposed to the roof terrace at 10 Bolt Court and the potential impact on the quality of life for residents of Number 6. As far as I'm aware the roof area is only used for access at present, but the addition of barriers and new flooring obviously means further social use is intended.

The single glazed windows provide of 6 Bolt Court offer nothing by way of protection from noise. We already have a problem with smokers from neighbouring office buildings congregating outside number six with all the noise, nuisance and litter this generates, often until late at night. There will also be privacy issues as the flats at the front of Number 6 will be directly overlooked.

Given so much redevelopment in the area recently the historic buildings and Courts of the Fleet Street Conservation Area are a small oasis of calm in an extremely urban environment, it would be a shame if this was to be spoiled.

From: No?l Chun
To: [PLN - Comments](#)
Subject: 19/00291/FULL
Date: 05 May 2019 18:22:30

Hello,

Re: 10 Bolt Ct

Please be informed of my strong objections to the proposed building works @ 10 Bolt Ct. I live at 6 Bolt Ct directly facing #10 & I am already quite fed up with the incessant cigarette smoking in the joint courtyard area between the buildings, with smokers sitting on the steps of my building, hanging around the railings, & leaving the area littered with cigarette butts.

The proposed building works would be inducive to noise disturbance, carousing, & particularly augmented cigarette smoking at all hours of the day & night, all of which are grave public nuisances & health hazards. I would be very grateful for your careful consideration to cancel the proposed building works and thus protect us and our property from further grievance. Many thanks.

Kind Regards,

Noel Chun
Flat 3
6 Bolt Ct
London
EC4A 3DQ

I

Comments for Planning Application 19/00291/FULL

Application Summary

Application Number: 19/00291/FULL

Address: 10 Bolt Court London EC4A 3DQ

Proposal: Replacement of balustrading and installation of new decking at roof level.

Case Officer: Alison Hayes

Customer Details

Name: Mr Darren Shapland

Address: Flat 6 Gough House - Bolt Court City of London

Comment Details

Commenter Type: Neighbour

Stance: Customer objects to the Planning Application

Comment Reasons:

- Noise

Comment: Having looked at the plans and development which will face our building (and my flat as it's to the front) will overlook both our building which is in close proximity and create excessive noise

Flat 10
6 Bolt Court
London
EC4A 3DQ



Corporation of London

Re: 19/00291/FULL

Dear Sir or Madam

I write to strongly object to the planning application 19/00291/FULL in relation to 10 Bolt Court, EC4A 3DQ (alternative reference PP-07614896).

My interest in this application is that I live in a flat facing 10 Bolt Court and have done so since 2011. I have worked as a barrister nearby since 2007.

I want to start by highlighting that the application is misleading in suggesting that 10 Bolt Court already has a roof terrace used by its occupants. It has no such thing. In my 7 years living metres opposite 10 Bolt Court, it has never been used as a roof terrace by its occupants.

The reasons I object are as follows:

First, the proposal is out of character for this historic area, which it will detrimentally affect. Bolt Court, being part of the Fleet Street Conservation Area, is a very small but important part of London's heritage, being part of a limited number of remaining pedestrian alley ways and court yards dating back into history. In this case the area is closely associated with Dr Johnson who lived in Bolt Court in addition to Gough Square.

Second, the proposal will block the light reaching 6 Bolt Court flats (which is already limited given the proximity of surrounding buildings), as well as affecting the privacy of those living in the flats given the view people on the roof terrace will have of the flats.

Third, the proposal, assuming it is indeed intended to allow socialising on the roof terrace, will undoubtedly create noise and litter (including cigarette butts). Notwithstanding its proximity to Fleet Street, Bolt Court is quiet area, particularly in evenings. Myself and other residents of 6 Bolt Court facing 10 Bolt Court will be particularly affected by noise disturbance because we have single-glazed historic windows protected by the Grade II listing.

Finally, to the extent that the planning application might otherwise be determined on the papers in favour of the Applicant, I request that it be considered at a public hearing at which we residents may be able to attend and make oral representations.

Thank you for considering my objection.

Yours sincerely,

Toby Brown.

Comments for Planning Application 19/00291/FULL

Application Summary

Application Number: 19/00291/FULL

Address: 10 Bolt Court London EC4A 3DQ

Proposal: Replacement of balustrading and installation of new decking at roof level.

Case Officer: Alison Hayes

Customer Details

Name: Mrs Henrika Priest

Address: Flat 3 101 Fleet Street London

Comment Details

Commenter Type: Councillor/Ward Member

Stance: Customer objects to the Planning Application

Comment Reasons:

- Noise
- Other

Comment: I'm writing to object to the planning application 19/00291/FULL at 10 Bolt Court, EC4A 3DQ.

My understanding is that the roof of 10 Bolt Court has never been used as a "roof terrace" but only to access and service the various air conditioning and ventilation units situated there. The sentence: "Minor alterations at roof level including design improvements to existing balustrades and new decking associated with the existing office use" is extremely misleading as I can only conclude that this much work could only mean one thing and that is that the area is being prepared for other usages, ie social gatherings, coffee breaks, etc something which I think the accompanying visuals clearly demonstrate!

Thus, the proposed changes would have a severe detrimental effect on the lives of the residents in 6 Bolt Court, as follows:

1. Residents would be completely overlooked with loss of privacy given the very close proximity between the buildings - anyone on the terrace can look straight into the flats. The tree between the buildings do not prevent a view into the flats.
2. Noise pollution: in this very small and confined area, any individual conversation at ground level can be clearly heard, so a new roof terrace used for social gatherings would most certainly bring severe noise pollution during the day and late into the evenings to both the residents in Bolt Court and surrounding businesses as the area acts like an echo chamber. The unpredictability of such noise would affect the residents' enjoyment of their own homes.

3. In addition, in my view, the materials proposed would not be in keeping with a Grade II listed building and not be a good fit with the other historic buildings in this small corner of the Fleet Street Conservation Area.

Given all of the above, I therefore strongly believe that this application is wholly unsuitable as it will negatively affect the residents of 6 Bolt Court.

Your sincerely

Henrika Priest

Common Councilman, Castle Baynard Ward

From: Kirsty Mann
To: [PLN - Comments](#)
Subject: 19/00291/FULL OBJECTION
Date: 17 May 2019 23:50:47

FAO Alison Hayes

Dear Ms Hayes

Re: planning application 19/00291/FULL at 10 Bolt Court, (alternative reference PP-07614896)

I understand that the applicants have amended their application to 'replacement of railings in association with the formation of a roof terrace'. The proposed amendment seems to me to reinforce clearly a point that I made in my previous objections, namely that this is not just a case of cosmetic changes, it is a change of use. The area in question has never previously been used as a roof terrace. This change of use is material.

I repeat my previous objections, which should still be taken as standing in relation to the amended description of the works, and would like to add the following:

1. 10 Bolt Court have made no attempts to liaise with inhabitants of 6 Bolt Court with respect to this planning. Moreover, their employees denied planned work. After seeing/hearing men inspecting the roof on several occasions this year, I went in to the offices twice to enquire if any works were being planned to the roof. I was specifically told that there were no works planned. My concierge, Mr Dragan Zadro, did the same, with the same answer given. We are very concerned that we should have been misled by neighbours. This behaviour does not give any confidence that use of the roof terrace would be co-operative and reasonable. It rather suggests a cavalier attitude which betokens the opposite.
2. 6 Bolt Court is a Grade II listed building and therefore we are unable to protect ourselves from noise from the new roof terrace with double glazing or otherwise.
3. The tree that stands between the subject building and my block does not provide adequate visual screening when in leaf, and absolutely none when not in leaf. And obviously it provides no protection from noise.

In all the circumstances, the proposed change of use will introduce a use which should be viewed as unreasonable and unacceptable in this area.

Regards

Kirsty Mann
Flat 19, 6 Bolt Court, London EC4A 3DQ

From: [Allan O'Neill](#)
To: [PLN - Comments](#)
Cc: [Allan O'Neill](#)
Subject: 19/00291/FULL OBJECTION
Date: 29 July 2019 10:14:24

Sent to: Alison Hayes, Planning Officer

Department of the Built Environment City of London
PO Box 270
Guildhall

London EC2P 2EJ

29th July 2019

Dear Alison Hayes,

I am writing to raise an **objection** to the revised planning application **19/00291/FULL** at 10 Bolt Court, EC4A 3DQ (alternative reference **PP-07614896**).

Could you please confirm receipt of this email and that the contents of my objection have been noted and included in the planning process.

I understand that there is now an amendment to the proposal for a roof top terrace refurbishment in that there is now a request for daily access 9am - 8pm with a late licence until 11pm on 15 nights a year.

This increases significantly my original concerns about the roof terrace refurbishment leading directly to **regular alcohol fuelled social gatherings that will generate excessive noise and pollution which will be to the extreme detriment of all nearby occupants. I would like to clearly state that the proposed roof terrace is directly opposite my living and bedroom accommodation and looks directly into my flat at very close range (no further than 12 feet).**

The proposed social use will adversely affect my privacy and the privacy of other flats fronting on this terrace. This is a completely unacceptable use of the roof space.

There is an abundance of good bars and venues in the local vicinity where 'professional / social gatherings' can be arranged; and so the negative affects caused to the residents of 6 Bolt Court are completely disproportionate and unnecessary.

What is even more certain is that 'requests to the social users' of such licensed roof top social spaces to keep noise down and within permitted hours of usage never ever work and always end in bitter dispute and so we can expect that parties go on into the early hours with residents being robbed of their sleep and privacy on a very regular basis.

In addition, the alterations, including the new black balustrade, are likely to reduce the natural light into Bolt Court itself, and also into the south facing flats in 6 Bolt court. This view, which is incidentally a 'blue plaque building' is specifically listed as "a local view contributing to the character of the conservation area" in your own City of London document "[Fleet Street Conservation Area: Character summary and management](#)

[strategy SPD](#)", please see pages 19 & 20. Furthermore, the alterations are not in keeping with the historic buildings of the Fleet Street Conservation Area.

I would urge you strongly to reject this planning proposal in full.

Yours Sincerely,

Allan O'Neill

Resident of Flat 15 6 Bolt Court City of London EC4A 3DQ

[REDACTED]

From: [Henrietta Fudakowski](#)
To: [PLN - Comments](#)
Cc: [Peter Fudakowski](#)
Subject: 19/00291/FULL
Date: 29 July 2019 09:41:15

Dear Planning Officer,
Please register my severe objections to this planning application.

It is even worse than the original planning application as it now makes plain that this proposed balcony will be used for social events on many occasions each year, and in such a way that the residents in the opposite building in Bolt Court cannot possibly enforce.

As my windows directly face this building this will effect me and my tenants in a very direct way.

There are plenty of venues in the vicinity which are geared up to controlling this open space use. Do not allow this office building to become a place of noise and smoking which will be to the detriment of the local inhabitants.

Kind regards
Peter and Henrietta Fudakowski

Henrietta Fudakowski
[REDACTED]
3 Colville Place
London W1T 2BH
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]

From: [桑红华](#)
To: [PLN - Comments](#)
Subject: Re: Application Consultation (19/00291/FULL)
Date: 29 July 2019 00:29:56

Dear Sir/Madam,

I object the plan of [19/00291](#) . The reasons are as follows:

1. It will generate noise and light pollution which operates to the detriment of all nearby occupants.
2. The proposed terrace will have a direct view into the south facing flats at close range and thus adversely affects our privacy. This overlooking occurs already due to the proximity of the buildings, but it becomes unacceptable if the roof is used for anything other than occasional maintenance purposes.
3. Any cigarette smoking will be occurring within metres of the windows of the south facing flats - a public health concern.
4. The alterations will detrimentally impact on the eastern view from the North West corner of Bolt Court - a "local view contributing to the character of the conservation area" as per the City of London's document on protected areas.
5. The alterations are not in keeping with the historic buildings of the Fleet Street Conservation Area.

Thank you for your kind attention

Mrs.Sang and yikai Zhang

发自我的 iPhone

在 2019年7月25日,19:19,"PLNComments@cityoflondon.gov.uk"
<PLNComments@cityoflondon.gov.uk> 写道:

Dear Sir/Madam

Please see attached consultation letter for planning application
19/00291/FULL (10 Bolt Court London EC4A 3DQ).

Kind Regards

Planning Administration
Department of the Built Environment
City of London

THIS E-MAIL AND ANY ATTACHED FILES ARE CONFIDENTIAL
AND MAY BE LEGALLY PRIVILEGED. If you are not the addressee, any
disclosure, reproduction, copying, distribution or other dissemination or use of
this communication is strictly prohibited. If you have received this
transmission in error please notify the sender immediately and then delete this
e-mail. Opinions, advice or facts included in this message are given without
any warranties or intention to enter into a contractual relationship with the
City of London unless specifically indicated otherwise by agreement, letter or
facsimile signed by a City of London authorised signatory. Any part of this e-

mail which is purely personal in nature is not authorised by the City of London. All e-mail through the City of London's gateway is potentially the subject of monitoring. All liability for errors and viruses is excluded. Please note that in so far as the City of London falls within the scope of the Freedom of Information Act 2000 or the Environmental Information Regulations 2004, it may need to disclose this e-mail. Website: <http://www.cityoflondon.gov.uk>

<ufm55.pdf>

From: [Sarah Field](#)
To: [PLN - Comments](#)
Subject: 19/00291/FULL OBJECTION
Date: 29 July 2019 15:08:48

Dear Ms Hayes,

We are writing to raise an objection to the planning application [19/00291/FULL OBJECTION](#) at [10 Bolt Court, EC4A 3DQ](#) (alternative reference PP-07614896).

We lodged an objection to the original proposal but now we understand that there is a new / modified proposal to allow socialising on the proposed roof terrace every working day until 8.00, as well as until 11.00 on 15 nights of the year. These will no doubt all be during the summer when we will have to have our windows open. As we stated before, that use will be seriously detrimental to nearby residents. The current use of the area, into which we have all bought, is mixed office and residential. The proposed use of the new terrace is inconsistent with current use to the detriment, in particular, of residents. The noise from those socialising on the terrace will be extremely invasive. The roof terrace is opposite our living and bedroom accommodation and is at very close range. Social use would also adversely affect our privacy and the privacy of other flats fronting on this terrace. In addition, any cigarette smoking on the terrace will be occurring within a very short distance of the windows of some 6 Bolt Court residents - this is a public health concern, particularly as some residents are asthmatic.

The proposed alterations, including the new black balustrade, are likely to reduce the natural light into Bolt Court itself, and also into the south facing flats in 6 Bolt court. The changes will detrimentally impact upon the eastern view from the North West corner of Bolt Court. This view is specifically listed as "a local view contributing to the character of the conservation area" in your own City of London document "Fleet Street Conservation Area: Character summary and management strategy SPD", please see pages 19 & 20. Furthermore, the alterations are not in keeping with the historic buildings of the Fleet Street Conservation Area.

Yours Sincerely,

Sarah and Chris Field
Flat 22
6 Bolt Court
City of London
EC4A 3D

From: [Julie Downs](#)
To: [PLN - Comments](#)
Subject: 19/00291/FULL OBJECTION
Date: 29 July 2019 19:58:32

Dear Sir/Madam,

Following the recent letter that I received as occupier of Flat 20, 6 Bolt Court, London, EC4A 3DQ I object in full to the proposed planning to replace existing balastrading, installation of new decking and planning at roof level in association with the formation of a roof terrace for use by occupants of the building between 9am to 8pm with the exception of 15 times a year when this would be extended to 11pm.

I object to this deeply as my flat is at eye level with this particular roof terrace and individuals that would be on the terrace would be able to see directly into my flat, which is both the lounge/kitchen and the bedroom. I believe that this will be an intrusion of my privacy and also I should be expected to have quiet enjoyment of my property without being directly overlooked and that peaceful enjoyment being only available from 8pm most nights and on some occasions through to 11pm, which will actually mean that by the time the people have vacated the building will stretch to past midnight.

I firmly believe that this will have a detrimental impact on the enjoyment of my flat and object to these plans.

Regards,

Julie

Julie Downs
Flat 20
6 Bolt Court

Wells, Janet (Built Environment)

From: PLN - Comments
Subject: FW: 19/00291/FULL OBJECTION

From: Noël Chun
Sent: 31 July 2019 19:09
To: PLN - Comments <PLNComments@cityoflondon.gov.uk>
Subject: 19/00291/FULL OBJECTION

Re: 10 Bolt Ct

To Whom it May Concern:

Please be informed that I vehemently object to the revised proposed building works at 10 Bolt Ct. I live at 6 Bolt Ct directly facing #10 & I am already massively fed up with the incessant cigarette smoking in the joint courtyard area between the buildings, with smokers sitting on the steps of my building, hanging around the railings, & leaving the area strewn with cigarette butts and food rubbish. The proposed terrace would be akin to having a pub 10ft away from our windows, and the noise disturbance, carousing, & additional cigarette smoking and litter would be extremely detrimental to our well-being and peace of mind. If anything needs to be done with the terrace I would suggest a NON-SMOKING tranquil garden space, which would also be more in keeping with green schemes put forth by the COL. The historic area of Dr. Johnson needs to be protected and preserved, not converted into another habitat of public nuisance and hazard to health!! I would be very grateful for your careful consideration to cancel the proposed building works.

Kind Regards,

Noel Chun

Wells, Janet (Built Environment)

From: Rosemarie Hutchinson <rosemariehutchinson@gmail.com>
Sent: 04 August 2019 14:03
To: PLN - Comments
Subject: Planning Application 19/00291/FULL. Object

Rosemarie Hutchinson
Flat 4
6 Bolt Court
London
EC4A 3 DQ

I object to planning application 19/00291/FULL

My objections are:

Bolt Court is a quiet and historic thoroughfare and part of the Fleet Street conservation area. The historic ambience and environment is protected. Any form of out door socialising, on a regular basis, will be detrimental to this. Particularly if the permitted hours go into the evening, and on occasions, very late into the evening.

It will be impossible to control the number of persons using the facility, the noise levels emanating and indeed the number of occasions when it is used. The residents of 6 Bolt Court are facing the prospect of a real detriment to the enjoyment of their homes.

This area is already under considerable threat by street socialising. The quiet nature of Bolt Court with a pleasing historic ambience, away from traffic and the hustle and bustle, has made it an attractive venue for smokers, picnickers and day time drinkers. There is a balance to be made with the amount of street socialisation that is compatible with the aims of the preservation of the historic character of this conservation area.

Kind Regards
Rosemarie Hutchinson

Wells, Janet (Built Environment)

From: PLN - Comments
Subject: FW: 19/00291/FULL OBJECTION

-----Original Message-----

From: A Scurlock
Sent: 06 August 2019 13:20
To: PLN - Comments <PLNComments@cityoflondon.gov.uk>
Subject: 19/00291/FULL OBJECTION

19/00291/FULL OBJECTION

Dear Sir/Madam

I wish to object to the planning application number 19/00291 which has been submitted for 10 Bolt Court EC4A 3DQ.

The building faces directly on to the windows of the two bedrooms of my apartment at 6 Bolt Court, and the proposed changes to the roof terrace will allow people to look directly into both bedrooms from a distance of less than four metres. This is a gross invasion of privacy and I strenuously object to the proposal.

In addition, I would point out that due to the historic nature of the building, the windows of 6 Bolt Court are single glazed and the use of the roof terrace of 10 Bolt Court for social events will create significant noise pollution for all the residents of the building.

Yours sincerely

Alexander Scurlock

Flat 23
6 Bolt Court
London
EC4A 3DQ

Wells, Janet (Built Environment)

From: PLN - Comments
Subject: FW: 19/00291/FULL OBJECTION

From: Kirsty Mann
Sent: 07 August 2019 11:18
To: PLN - Comments <PLNComments@cityoflondon.gov.uk>
Subject: 19/00291/FULL OBJECTION

Dear Sir/Madam

Re: planning application 19/00291/FULL at 10 Bolt Court

As residents of 19, Bolt Court, directly opposite this proposed development, we wish to re-state our opposition to the development sought. Before the real purpose of the development was flushed out (it is now apparent that there is an intention to make the terrace a social venue, something that we suggested all along was the case but which was not acknowledged by the applicant in a manner which we suggest is misleading) we made our objections on a number of occasions. Rather than repeat them, we annex them below, and propound them again.

It is now apparent what the intention behind the plan is – to create a social venue in an area of residential and office accommodation. It does not redound to the credit of the applicant that that was not admitted at the outset and we wonder whether they should be rewarded for their concealment (surprising, coming from the London Diocesan Board) by a grant of the permission.

So far as the current proposal is concerned we add the following to what we have already said, sometimes by way of emphasis now that the proposal has become clearer.

We start by pointing out the level of intrusion that these landlord/developers wish to impose on their neighbours as it has now become apparent, and then move on to consider how that fits in with the Local Plan policies, so as to demonstrate that to allow this development would be so inconsistent with policy (and indeed fairness) as to be irrational.

So far as the facts are concerned, they are as follows.

1. The planned social gathering is invasive to our flat, being a few feet away and with a clear view into the flat.
2. Social gatherings will be noisy, even with the limited number of people suggested by some of the documentation. Even 12 people can make a lot of noise when in party mode, and it is not credible (or indeed proposed) that numbers should be so limited. One only has to walk past a number of pubs in the Fetter Lane area, where people are allowed to drink outside, to appreciate the noise people make in that environment. Social controls (asking people nicely to keep it down) just do not work.
3. The work proposed is obviously not being done for occasional use, and the proposed hours demonstrate that use is intended to be frequent. It is to be daily during the week (and, on one of the documents, perhaps on a Saturday), and on 15 occasions it is to be until 11pm, which translates to once per week if one assumes that that will happen in the summer months. That amounts to a lot of opportunity for intrusive behaviour.

We have wondered whether these proposed hours are deploying the standard developer's technique of asking for a lot with a view to getting permission for a cut down version. If so, we would urge the committee not to succumb to that. Even lesser usage will present all the intrusion and policing difficulties to which these objections refer.

4. I would like to remind those taking the decision on this development that my fiancé and I are doctors who work shifts. We are particularly vulnerable to partying during periods when we might be trying to sleep. That does not make us particularly sensitive; it makes us people with a legitimate interest for relative peace and quiet.
5. We are unable to protect ourselves with double-glazing because we are a listed building and it would not be allowed. And in any event we may need ventilation in the summer months. We should not be required to degrade our living conditions by having to have the windows shut.
6. The proposed controls are inadequate to protect the occupants of Bolt Court:

(a) The bar on "loud" music is something of a sop. It suggests music will be allowed, and what then becomes "loud" is not capable of policing. It is obviously intended to be audible, and that means it will be intrusive. Policing the "loudness" is in practice impossible. A party-goer's "loud" is very

different from a neighbour's "loud". By the time a complaint is made the music has stopped and the dispute will never be determined. In practice this is an empty suggestion.

(b) There is a degree of equivocation in the provision as to hours. The Management Plan provides for use on Monday to Friday. The letter of 22nd July 2019 provides for Monday to Friday, but not at any time on a Sunday or Bank Holiday. Why does it not say "not at any time on a Saturday"? This may be an error, but against the history of the application it does not encourage confidence in any neighbourly policing mechanisms.

(c) **No limit on numbers is proposed in the Management Plan.** The letter of 22nd July suggests that there would be no more than 12 users at any one time, based on an assumption that there would be 6 workers per floor, and they would be the only people using it. That is surely fallacious reasoning. These works are not being done so that just 12 occupants can use the terrace for social purposes, and up to 15 times per year up to 11pm. No restriction to occupants is proposed in the management plan, and it is obvious that the use will be for a lot more than that. They will have their own invitees, and for all we know may let out the space for non-occupiers. Unless the applicants really propose a condition that the terrace will be used only by occupiers, and by no-one else, that paragraph in the 22nd July letter becomes positively misleading. In any event, such a condition would in effect be unpoliceable. How are we supposed to know who the participants in noisy partying are?

(d) The history of this application, and the lack of straightforwardness in it, does not encourage any confidence that the applicants, so far as they are capable of doing so, could or would control the situation. They have never consulted their neighbours at 6 Bolt Court and continue to go ahead with their application despite clear consternation from us – they have not shown any evidence that they will be considerate in their use of this new terrace. In any event, the applicants would not be users. The users would be the tenants. A complaint to the applicants (landlords) would not be to the persons holding the party, so we would have to rely on the applicants first taking the point seriously, and second applying serious pressure on their tenants (assuming they extract a relevant covenant in the first place). This chain of control/complaint just won't work.

(e) There is a phone number offered on the application for neighbours to call if any problems arise – but that number is for the head office of Cluttons and does not work after 5:30pm.

7. There are plenty of places for socialising in the area (whereas we have only one place to live and sleep). It is not necessary, and unbalanced, to allow this one on a building where the sound will travel straight across to the direct detriment of residential occupiers.

We now turn to policy matters. All this is contrary to Local Plan Policy DM 21.3:

"1. The amenity of existing residents within identified residential areas will be protected by: Resisting other uses which could cause undue noise disturbance ... *[This development will inevitably do so]*

2. Noise-generating uses should be sited away from residential uses, where possible... *[This development is not sited away from residential uses.]*

3. All development proposals should be designed to avoid overlooking and seek to protect the privacy, day lighting and sun lighting levels to adjacent residential accommodation." *[This development is not and cannot be so designed so far as privacy is concerned.]*

This theme is taken up in the Draft Plan Policy HIC3:

"1. Developers must consider the noise and lighting impacts of their development.

2. A noise assessment will be required where they may be an impact on noise-sensitive uses. The layout, orientation and use of buildings should ensure that operational noise does not adversely affect neighbours, particularly noise-sensitive land uses such as housing, hospitals, schools, nurseries and quiet open spaces."

We are not aware of any noise assessment having been carried out. We are not aware that any consideration has been given to the noise impact – in fact we suggest that none has really been given apart from the token "loud music" provision.

Policy DM 10.3 is to encourage "high quality roof gardens and terraces". This terrace hardly qualifies as such, but in any event the policy explicitly does not allow even terraces with that quality to overlook residential premises.

These policies are, in part, intended to resolve conflicts between the sort of development the City needs, that is to say primarily offices for commerce (see Local Plan para 3.12.15), and residential needs. If an office is to be built and operated, then it needs to be done in a manner which fulfils the policy guidelines. That affects design choices, and developers will be expected to design round the policies. If they cannot then one would expect permission to be refused. Residential interests are not to be trampled upon.

But this development is not even an office development (nor is it necessarily ancillary to an office usage), and allowing it does not fulfil one of the needs of the City. It is an entertainment development. As such it deserves less sympathetic treatment when applying the policies and resolving conflicts. An office development would be expected to design round the needs of residential occupiers protected by the policies. These developers have made no attempt to do that. Indeed, it cannot be done, by the very nature of the development. Nothing can be done about the overlooking/privacy aspects, and noise nuisance cannot be satisfactorily ameliorated by the purported time restrictions and the "no loud music" proviso. The hours are long, and intrusion inevitable whatever the hours. No office development would be allowed which infringed privacy and created a noise intrusion to the extent of this terrace, and if that is right then it must follow that permission for this terrace, which is not even an office, must be refused. Anything else would be an irrational application of the policy provisions.

In short, this is an application to be allowed to create an intrusive party venue into a relatively peaceful office/residential mix. It is contrary to the City's policies, it upsets the balance, and we suggest it should not be allowed.

Regards

K Mann and M Yates

Previous submissions for your reference:

26th April 2019

We understand that the proposal is to make an existing roof terrace safe. The works seem excessive for this purpose. I have lived here since 2010 and the space has never been used as a roof terrace; it has been used only for access to the facilities. It is to be anticipated that once the terrace is "safe" it will be used for far more extensive purposes, that is to say for social purposes. That use is seriously detrimental to nearby residents.

The current use of the area is mixed office and residential. We accept the natural incidents of that. But the proposed use of the new terrace is inconsistent with current use to the detriment, in particular, of residents. The works are presumably being done to facilitate social use by significant numbers of people; otherwise the applicants would not be proposing them. Such use leads to noise and light pollution. Requests to social users to keep noise down never works. Social gatherings will generate noise, which operates to the detriment of all nearby occupants, and particularly essential workers like me and my fiancée (we are doctors) who have to work nightshifts and sleep during the day.

The proposed roof terrace is directly opposite my living and bedroom accommodation and looks directly into me at very close range. Social use adversely affects my privacy and the privacy of other flats. This is unacceptable overlooking if the use is for anything other than occasional maintenance purposes. Occasional maintenance is within the normal sort of give and take that has to exist in a mixed urban environment. Significant numbers of people gathered for an extended period for social purposes is not.

The changes will detrimentally impact upon the eastern view from the North West corner of Bolt Court. This view is specifically listed as "a local view contributing to the character of the conservation area" in your document: City of London "Fleet Street Conservation Area: Character summary and management strategy SPD" pages 19 & 20.

Furthermore, the alterations are not in keeping with the historic buildings of the Fleet Street Conservation Area.

17th May 2019

I understand that the applicants have amended their application to 'replacement of railings in association with the formation of a roof terrace'. The proposed amendment seems to me to reinforce clearly a point that I made in my previous objections, namely that this is not just a case of cosmetic changes, it is a change of use. The area in question has never previously been used as a roof terrace. This change of use is material.

I repeat my previous objections, which should still be taken as standing in relation to the amended description of the works, and would like to add the following:

1. 10 Bolt Court have made no attempts to liaise with inhabitants of 6 Bolt Court with respect to this planning. Moreover, their employees denied planned work. After seeing/ hearing men inspecting the roof on several occasions this year, I went in to the offices twice to enquire if any works were being planned to the roof. I was specifically told that there were no works planned. My concierge, Mr Dragan Zadro, did the same, with the same answer given. We are very concerned that we should have been misled by neighbours. This behaviour does not give any confidence that use of the roof terrace would be co-operative and reasonable. It rather suggests a cavalier attitude which betokens the opposite.
2. 6 Bolt Court is a Grade II listed building and therefore we are unable to protect ourselves from noise from the new roof terrace with double glazing or otherwise.
3. The tree that stands between the subject building and my block does not provide adequate visual screening when in leaf, and absolutely none when not in leaf. And obviously it provides no protection from noise.

In all the circumstances, the proposed change of use will introduce a use which should be viewed as unreasonable and unacceptable in this area.

PLNComments@cityoflondon.gov.uk

Dear Sir/Madam

BOLT COURT PLANNING APPLICATION 19/00291/FULL OBJECTION

I write in my capacity of *Director of **Gough House Limited (GHL)**, the owner of the freehold of the building at **6 Bolt Court EC4A 3DQ**. The building comprises some 21 flats, 19 of which are owned by proprietors with an equal share in the freehold. The two flats which chose not to participate in the purchase of the freehold pay an annual ground rent to GHL.

You will already have received a number of objections from shareholders whose flats will be particularly affected by the proposed building works on the terrace of 10 Bolt Court. GHL has had sight of all these objections and **wholly supports them and endorses the reasons they advance for refusing the latest application.**

In terms of its own special interest in opposing this application, GHL would make the following observations.

First, the current application confirms the fear, voiced in our previous objection, that what is proposed involves a clear and radical departure from the way in which the premises at 10 Bolt Court have hitherto been used by its current occupant, the distinguished family law firm of Miles Preston. This is not surprising since it is self-evident that the provision of a roof terrace in premises devoted to a legal specialism has no obvious relevant relation to such work. What seems clear, therefore, is that the current owners (who we believe bought the building from Miles Preston who continue to lease the lower floors of the premises) have in mind some longer term goal for the building, which they perceive will add to its attraction for tenants, additional to than Miles Preston, occupying the upper floors. We would be surprised if Miles Preston knew, when they sold, of the purchaser's plans to open up a roof terrace which in any case had never been relevant to their occupancy. It is, moreover, the fact that GHL enjoys a most cordial, neighbourly relationship with Miles Preston who have always been aware that 6 Bolt Court has a special attraction for professional people working in the City of London because of its secluded situation and peaceful environment. We cannot think, in the light of that relationship, that they would have been comfortable with the current proposal, which radically undermines the expectations of residents of 6 Bolt Court.

Secondly, it cannot now clear beyond peradventure that the current owners of 10 Bolt Court are desirous of ultimately using/offering the roof terrace area for activity which will represent a major threat to the way in which life is currently lived at 6 Bolt Court. Indeed, as Dr Mann demonstrates in her latest objection, the current application represents an even greater threat to the enjoyment of life of residents of 6 Bolt Court and especially those whose flats are adjacent to 10 Bolt Court. These matters are fully and excellently covered in Dr Kirsty Mann's of letter of representations to and it would be otiose to repeat them. GHL is happy to adopt those arguments in their entirety. Everything she says about noise, light pollution, smoking, the futility of expecting those using the roof terrace for their enjoyment to take any notice of requests to moderate their inevitably offensive and disruptive behaviour so that we face an ongoing war between two incompatible sets of interests etc. is absolutely right and cumulatively constitutes an unimpeachable case for refusing this offensive and unwelcome

application. There is also the overarching point that the proposed use of the new terrace is quite inconsistent with current use (mixed office and residential) to the detriment of residents.

Next there is the important matter of the damage this change of user will do to this historic precinct. Dr Mann has rightly and forcefully pointed up in her letter to Alison Hayes that the building at 6 Bolt Court forms part of the Fleet Street Conservation Area. The proposed development if permitted would detract both from the character of the precinct and its views. She might also have added that this important heritage aspect is reinforced by the fact that our building has been honoured with a blue plaque, recognizing its importance to the patrimony of the City of London. This signal honour will we believe, be significantly devalued if this undesirable development is allowed to proceed.

Finally, GHL has a duty to protect the economic value of the building at 6 Bolt Court, a factor given prominence in our original objection to the now amended (for the worse!) application. It is unarguable that the proposed roof terrace has the potential to reduce the value of our building and the shares of members of GHL if the entirely predictable adverse consequences, eloquently outlined in Dr Mann's submission, come to pass as they inevitably will if the permission sought is granted.

We accordingly urge the City of London to reject this amended, but in reality more damaging to the interests of the residents of 6 Bolt Court, unwelcome and unmeritorious application. If granted, it will effectively *be authorising, or at least creating a very high risk of, a nuisance* to the residents of 6 Bolt Court, especially those whose flats directly face the proposed terrace.

I shall be pleased if you will acknowledge receipt of this objection to the amended application and keep me informed as to the progress of the matter through the planning process.

Yours sincerely,

Michael Harris

Director, Gough House Limited

Flat 9, 6 Bolt Court

London

EC4A 3DQ

*My fellow director is Mr Eric Hutchinson of Flat 4 at 6 Bolt Court who will confirm his endorsement of this objection.

Comments for Planning Application 19/00291/FULL

Application Summary

Application Number: 19/00291/FULL

Address: 10 Bolt Court London EC4A 3DQ

Proposal: Replacement of the existing balustrading, installation of new decking and planting at roof level in association with the formation of a roof terrace for use by occupants of the building between 9am and 8pm with the exception of 15 times a year when this would be extended to 11pm. (Amended Description, revised drawings and supplementary information).

Case Officer: Alison Hayes

Customer Details

Name: Mr Andrew Gavan

Address: Flat 14 6 Bolt Court London

Comment Details

Commenter Type: Neighbour

Stance: Customer objects to the Planning Application

Comment Reasons:

- Noise

Comment: I deliberately acquired my Flat at a distance from Ye Olde Cheshire Cheese, and am aware that the neighbours to that Pub have experienced difficulty in restricting noise in clement weather.

I therefore object to the proposed development as an inevitable intrusion into our current living condition.

From: [Darren Shapland](#)
To: [PLN - Comments](#)
Cc: [REDACTED]
Subject: 10 Bolt Court Fleet Street EC4A - Planning Application
Date: 13 August 2019 08:49:31

Dear Sir / Madam

Re - 10 Bolt Court Fleet Street EC4A - your ref 19/00291/FULL - OBJECTION

I received your notice regarding the above and sorry for the delay in response as we have been on holiday.

I have reviewed the revised plans and we want to object wholeheartedly.

The proposed plans now are even worse than the original ones. This building is a short distance (10 to 15 feet) from Gough House - 6 Bolt Court where we have a flat at the front of the building. What is being requested will cause a lot of noise and disruption for so called social events, gatherings, parties or whatever. The whole area is full of places for social events and any events, this is not needed and will cause a lot of disruption and disturbance.

As residents of the City we tried to find a place where it could be acceptable from a noise point of view, hence buying in a small quiet square, a building of interest and with character. We don't need a party floor now allowed just over the void, facing our block and spoiling the situation, please reject this revised proposal.

Thank you

Darren Shapland

On Behalf of Darren and Wendy Shapland - Flat 11 - 6 Bolt Court

Sent from my iPad

From: [Jonathan Bird](#)
To: [PLN - Comments](#)
Subject: Objection to Planning Application ref: 19/00291/FULL
Date: 13 August 2019 16:16:56

Dear Sir/Madam,

As a resident of 6 Bolt Court I wish to strongly object the to the revised planning application 19/00291/FULL for the new roof terrace at number 10.

The noise nuisance and loss of privacy for residents of 6 Bolt Court will be severe given the proximity of the proposed terrace to our building. There are numerous licensed premises nearby, including the recent development on Fetter Lane, and the noise generated by even a dozen or so drinkers can be extremely loud. This would be intolerable as a regular feature of life at Bolt Court and impossible to police. Use of the terrace is obviously planned to be frequent and includes late evening use which is completely unacceptable.

The current mixed office/residential use of Bolt Court contributes to the relative calm of the Fleet Street conservation area enjoyed by residents, visitors and local workers alike who are surrounded by an otherwise very urban environment. It would be a great shame if this is not protected.

I am also very unimpressed with the way the developers have conducted themselves to date. They have been less than transparent, and it does not give my confidence in future dealings with them.

These plans will have an even bigger negative impact than the previous application and I very much hope they will be judged unsuitable.

Yours faithfully,

Mr. Jonathan Bird
Flat 18, 6 Bolt Court, EC4A 3DQ

Sent from [Mail](#) for Windows 10

From: [Tim Parker](#)
To: [PLN - Comments](#)
Subject: Objection: 10 Bolt Court
Date: 13 August 2019 04:43:59

Dear Madam / Sir,

I am the owner of [REDACTED] Gough House, 6 Bolt Court. I write to object to the revised planning application relating to 10 Bolt Court.

The original application was made on 2 April 2019. In response to that application, on 30 April 2019, I wrote the following objection:

"Although described as "Minor alterations at roof level including design improvements to existing balustrades and new decking associated with the existing office use" the application is in fact one seeking to alter the user of the roof space in question. This is inaccurate in the following respects:

(1) The roof space atop 10 Bolt Court is not, and has never been, used "for office use" - or indeed any use at all (save for occasional maintenance access). As shown in the application document, the space in question is actually not safe for the use now proposed. What is being put forward is a new user altogether, not an upgrade for existing user as claimed.

(2) The proposed use - as an outdoor terrace - cannot be described as "office" use. Its purpose will doubtless be as a smoking area and/or a place for social gatherings.

The proposal is further objectionable because:

(1) Bolt Court is an oasis of quiet just metres from the hustle of Fleet Street. Converting a roof area at its heart into a social gathering point will disturb residents, and detract markedly from the essential quality of the area, upsetting the fair balance between residential and office user currently struck.

(2) The privacy of residents directly opposite will be severely affected. Flats in Gough House (6 Bolt Court) are just metres from the roof space in question, and are overlooked by it.

(3) The design and materials proposed are out of keeping with the character of the area. The proposed balustrades - in black metal, perforated with small slits - will cut light to Bolt Court, and stand in stark contrast to the style of the buildings all around (which match the current format of the balustrades). The decking materials do not comport with the local character evident on the surrounding buildings and rooftops.

Given that the purpose of these changes would be to create a new space for the exclusive social (i.e. non-office) use of 10 Bolt Court occupants, I am strongly in opposition to them."

Following this objection, it has come to my attention that a revised application was filed on 22 July 2019. I have carefully read that application and the accompanying materials. I **object to the revised plan**. My key reasons are as follows:

(1) It remains the case that what is proposed is a fundamental change of user of the space concerned. As the proposal itself points out, the space has always had non-compliant railings, demonstrating that:

(a) it has never been used for the new purpose proposed, i.e. a social gathering space for office users of the premises; and

(b) the owners or lessees can have had no expectation that the space was exploitable for commercial value - i.e. to provide a socialising and smoking space for office occupiers.

(2) The three objections stated in my original objection, above, all remain. I repeat them with appropriate modifications for the revised plan:

(a) Bolt Court is an oasis of quiet just metres from the hustle of Fleet Street. Converting a roof area at its heart into a social gathering point will disturb residents, and detract markedly from the essential quality of the area, upsetting the fair balance between residential and office user currently struck.

(b) The privacy of residents directly opposite will be severely affected. Flats in Gough House (6 Bolt Court) are just metres from the roof space in question, and are overlooked by it.

(c) The design and materials proposed are out of keeping with the character of the area. The decking materials do not comport with the local character evident on the surrounding buildings and rooftops.

(3) The supposed "Roof Terrace Management Plan" is fundamentally inadequate, *inter alia* for these reasons:

(a) Operating hours:

(i) the proposed permanent hours (9am - 8pm, Monday to Friday) illustrate that the proposed user is for this to become an outdoor socialising space. Doubtless it will be used as a venue for noisy drinks parties. That proposed user, at such close proximity to residential premises, upsets the fair balance between land uses that has subsisted in sleepy, peaceful Bolt Court for many many years;

(ii) this concern applies *a fortiori* in relation to the proposed extended hours - to 11 pm on 15 occasions per year;

(iii) there is no credible enforcement mechanism:

- It is said that "only tenants" would use the space. Who will be checking that, for example, guests or friends or relatives of the occupying business(es) will not be invited? Who will be ensuring that there is no smoking?

- It is said that the 15 occasions per year on which late functions would be held on the to-be-constructed terrace would be "agreed in advance with the managing agent". In other words, agreed between the occupier and its own agent, not agreed with those affected by these events (i.e. the local residents).

(iv) Noise control: The provision on noise lies at the heart of the problem:

- The noise control statement relates only to music. There is no general provision against excessive noise generated e.g. by the pub atmosphere of groups of people drinking and socialising on the roof.

- The statement that "loud music" will not be permitted (a) implies that music will be played there, which illustrates again the essential objection which is the upsetting of the fair balance struck in Bolt Court, and (b) is such a vague yardstick as to constitute no substantive rule whatsoever.

(v) Health and safety: it is said that there would "strictly" be no smoking. Again, this is effectively unenforceable since it involves self-policing by the occupier. Second, although a ban on "naked flames" is proposed, this would not preclude barbecuing on a gas or electric barbecue. That is again unacceptable.

(4) In sum, the "management plan" raises more questions than it provides answers.

For the above reasons, I object to the fresh planning application which would upset the long-held status quo in Bolt Court, with its essential characteristics of peace and quiet.

Yours sincerely,

Timothy Parker
Owner / Resident, 6 Bolt Court

[REDACTED]

From: [Priest, Henrika](#)
To: [PLN - Comments](#)
Subject: URGENT: Representation (19/00291/FULL)
Date: 14 August 2019 15:00:40
Importance: High

Dear Sir / Madam

Following the re-submission on 22 July of the planning application 19/00291/FULL for 10 Bolt Court, EC4A 3DQ, I'm writing again to strongly object to this application.

In my view, nothing has changed for the residents and I'm re-iterating my earlier comments as follows:

1. Residents would be completely overlooked with loss of privacy given the very close proximity between the buildings - anyone on the terrace can look straight into the flats. The tree between the buildings do not prevent a view into the flats.
2. Noise pollution: in this very small and confined area, any individual conversation at ground level can be clearly heard, so a new roof terrace used for social gatherings – with music – would most certainly bring severe noise pollution during the day and into the evenings to both the residents in Bolt Court and surrounding businesses as the entire area acts like an echo chamber. The unpredictability of such noise would affect the residents' enjoyment of their own homes.

I have a few further observations / questions to make to the amendment letter and the management plan:

Amendment Letter

"Based on this exclusivity it is anticipated that the future occupier would be a small professional business and those which you are likely to find in the local area such as lawyers or accountants. Both floor levels have capacity for around 6 office workers at a time meaning there would be no more than 12 users (max) of the roof terrace at one time in total."

"The roof terrace hereby permitted shall be used between the hours of 9am and 8pm Monday to Friday, with provision for 15 late night uses annually, and not at any time on Sunday or Bank Holiday, other than in the case of an emergency. Reason: To safeguard the amenity of the adjoining premises and the area generally in accordance with the following policies of the Local Plan DM15.7 and DM21.3."

- ⇒ I fail to see the what the rationale for going through the entire refurbishment of the roof terrace if this is only to be used by 12 users?
- ⇒ Again, "15 late night uses annually" – is that for the 12 users?
- ⇒ As this will be a social space, I make an assumption that alcohol will be served on the roof terrace but nowhere is there any mention of this and how this will affect the behaviour of people using the space and how the management plan will deal with this.
- ⇒ What is the maximum allowed number of people allowed on the roof terrace?
- ⇒ What is to say that the applicant won't increase the number in future from 12 in order to attract tenants to 10 Bolt Court?
- ⇒ It's very disappointing to read that the residents in Bolt Court are not made the specific reason for these amendments by the London Diocesan Fund.

"The hours of use of the exclusive terrace area are pertinent in attracting the highest

quality tenant for the third and fourth floor level of this existing office building and these should apply flexibly to accommodate the changing nature of office working. Again, this is in line with the City of London Corporation's ambition to protect and enhance existing office space."

- ⇒ I fail to understand the above comment: will there be a vetting process? And how is this related to flexible working?
- ⇒ Is this somehow to prove that this particular type of tenant won't be loud when drinking on the roof terrace?

Management Plan

The so-called management plan is brief to the point of being not fit for purpose. There is very little exact detail, for example: *"There will be no loud music permitted at any time"*. Whose definition of "no loud music" will be taking into account? Music of any level would be extremely intrusive and cause noise pollution regardless of the time of day.

In conclusion, despite the amendments to the planning application and the addition of the management plan, the reality is that this application to re-furbish the roof terrace to a social space is still wholly unsuitable for this area and will have a severe detrimental effect on the lives of the residents in 6 Bolt Court.

Your sincerely

Henrika Priest
Common Councilman, Castle Baynard Ward

From: [Ian Yap](#)
To: [PLN - Comments](#)
Subject: 19/00291/FULL OBJECTION
Date: 14 August 2019 18:17:55

Dear Sir/Madam

Ian Yap
Flat 8, 6 Bolt Court
London EC4A 3DQ

As residents of 6 Bolt Court, directly opposite this proposed development, we wish to re-state our opposition to the development sought. Before the real purpose of the development was flushed out (it is now apparent that there is an intention to make the terrace a social venue, something that we suggested all along was the case but which was not acknowledged by the applicant in a manner which we suggest is misleading) we made our objections on a number of occasions. Rather than repeat them, we annex them below, and propound them again.

It is now apparent what the intention behind the plan is – to create a social venue in an area of residential and office accommodation. It does not redound to the credit of the applicant that that was not admitted at the outset and we wonder whether they should be rewarded for their concealment (surprising, coming from the London Diocesan Board) by a grant of the permission.

So far as the current proposal is concerned we add the following to what we have already said, sometimes by way of emphasis now that the proposal has become clearer.

We start by pointing out the level of intrusion that these landlord/developers wish to impose on their neighbours as it has now become apparent, and then move on to consider how that fits in with the Local Plan policies, so as to demonstrate that to allow this development would be so inconsistent with policy (and indeed fairness) as to be irrational.

So far as the facts are concerned, they are as follows.

1. The planned social gathering is invasive to our flat, being a few feet away and with a clear view into the flat.
2. Social gatherings will be noisy, even with the limited number of people suggested by some of the documentation. Even 12 people can make a lot of noise when in party mode, and it is not credible (or indeed proposed) that numbers should be so limited. One only has to walk past a number of pubs in the Fetter Lane area, where people are allowed to drink outside, to appreciate the noise people make in that environment. Social controls (asking people nicely to keep it down) just do not work.
3. The work proposed is obviously not being done for occasional use, and the proposed hours demonstrate that use is intended to be frequent. It is to be daily during the week (and, on one of the documents, perhaps on a Saturday), and on 15 occasions it is to be until 11pm, which translates to once per week if one assumes that that will happen in the summer months. That amounts to a lot of opportunity for intrusive behaviour. We have wondered whether these proposed hours are deploying the standard developer's technique of asking for a lot with a view to getting permission for a cut down version. If so, we would urge the committee not to succumb to that. Even lesser usage will present all the intrusion and policing difficulties to which these objections refer.
4. I would like to remind those taking the decision on this development that my fiancé and I are doctors who work shifts. We are particularly vulnerable to partying during periods

when we might be trying to sleep. That does not make us particularly sensitive; it makes us people with a legitimate interest in relative peace and quiet.

5. We are unable to protect ourselves with double-glazing because we are a listed building and it would not be allowed. And in any event we may need ventilation in the summer months. We should not be required to degrade our living conditions by having to have the windows shut.

6. The proposed controls are inadequate to protect the occupants of Bolt Court:

(a) The bar on “loud” music is something of a sop. It suggests music will be allowed, and what then becomes “loud” is not capable of policing. It is obviously intended to be audible, and that means it will be intrusive. Policing the “loudness” is in practice impossible. A party-goer’s “loud” is very different from a neighbour’s “loud”. By the time a complaint is made the music has stopped and the dispute will never be determined. In practice this is an empty suggestion.

(b) There is a degree of equivocation in the provision as to hours. The Management Plan provides for use on Monday to Friday. The letter of 22nd July 2019 provides for Monday to Friday, but not at any time on a Sunday or Bank Holiday. Why does it not say “not at any time on a Saturday”? This may be an error, but against the history of the application it does not encourage confidence in any neighbourly policing mechanisms.

(c) No limit on numbers is proposed in the Management Plan. The letter of 22nd July suggests that there would be no more than 12 users at any one time, based on an assumption that there would be 6 workers per floor, and they would be the only people using it. That is surely fallacious reasoning. These works are not being done so that just 12 occupants can use the terrace for social purposes, and up to 15 times per year up to 11pm. No restriction to occupants is proposed in the management plan, and it is obvious that the use will be for a lot more than that. They will have their own invitees, and for all we know may let out the space for non-occupiers. Unless the applicants really propose a condition that the terrace will be used only by occupiers, and by no-one else, that paragraph in the 22nd July letter becomes positively misleading. In any event, such a condition would in effect be unpoliceable. How are we supposed to know who the participants in noisy partying are?

(d) The history of this application, and the lack of straightforwardness in it, does not encourage any confidence that the applicants, so far as they are capable of doing so, could or would control the situation. They have never consulted their neighbours at 6 Bolt Court and continue to go ahead with their application despite clear consternation from us – they have not shown any evidence that they will be considerate in their use of this new terrace. In any event, the applicants would not be users. The users would be the tenants. A complaint to the applicants (landlords) would not be to the persons holding the party, so we would have to rely on the applicants first taking the point seriously, and second applying serious pressure on their tenants (assuming they extract a relevant covenant in the first place). This chain of control/complaint just won’t work.

(e) There is a phone number offered on the application for neighbours to call if any problems arise – but that number is for the head office of Cluttons and does not work after 5:30pm.

7. There are plenty of places for socialising in the area (whereas we have only one place to live and sleep). It is not necessary, and unbalanced, to allow this one on a building where the sound will travel straight across to the direct detriment of residential occupiers.

We now turn to policy matters. All this is contrary to Local Plan Policy DM 21.3:

“1. The amenity of existing residents within identified residential areas will be protected by:

Resisting other uses which could cause undue noise disturbance ... [This development will inevitably do so]

2. Noise-generating uses should be sited away from residential uses, where possible...

[This development is not sited away from residential uses.]

3. All development proposals should be designed to avoid overlooking and seek to protect the privacy, day lighting and sun lighting levels to adjacent residential accommodation.”
[This development is not and cannot be so designed so far as privacy is concerned.]

This theme is taken up in the Draft Plan Policy HIC3:

“1. Developers must consider the noise and lighting impacts of their development.

2. A noise assessment will be required where they may be an impact on noise-sensitive uses. The layout, orientation and use of buildings should ensure that operational noise does not adversely affect neighbours, particularly noise-sensitive land uses such as housing, hospitals, schools, nurseries and quiet open spaces.”

We are not aware of any noise assessment having been carried out. We are not aware that any consideration has been given to the noise impact – in fact we suggest that none has really been given apart from the token “loud music” provision.

Policy DM 10.3 is to encourage “high quality roof gardens and terraces”. This terrace hardly qualifies as such, but in any event the policy explicitly does not allow even terraces with that quality to overlook residential premises.

These policies are, in part, intended to resolve conflicts between the sort of development the City needs, that is to say primarily offices for commerce (see Local Plan para 3.12.15), and residential needs. If an office is to be built and operated, then it needs to be done in a manner which fulfils the policy guidelines. That affects design choices, and developers will be expected to design round the policies. If they cannot then one would expect permission to be refused. Residential interests are not to be trampled upon.

But this development is not even an office development (nor is it necessarily ancillary to an office usage), and allowing it does not fulfil one of the needs of the City. It is an entertainment development. As such it deserves less sympathetic treatment when applying the policies and resolving conflicts. An office development would be expected to design round the needs of residential occupiers protected by the policies. These developers have made no attempt to do that. Indeed, it cannot be done, by the very nature of the development. Nothing can be done about the overlooking/privacy aspects, and noise nuisance cannot be satisfactorily ameliorated by the purported time restrictions and the “no loud music” proviso. The hours are long, and intrusion inevitable whatever the hours. No office development would be allowed which infringed privacy and created a noise intrusion to the extent of this terrace, and if that is right then it must follow that permission for this terrace, which is not even an office, must be refused. Anything else would be an irrational application of the policy provisions.

In short, this is an application to be allowed to create an intrusive party venue into a relatively peaceful office/residential mix. It is contrary to the City’s policies, it upsets the balance, and we suggest it should not be allowed.

From: [Lorna Gradden](#)
To: [PLN - Comments](#)
Subject: 19/00291/FULL OBJECTION
Date: 14 August 2019 15:47:01

Dear Sirs

I write in my capacity as the owner of Flat 18, 6 Bolt Court, London EC4A 3DQ.

I wish to object strongly to the proposed works at 10 Bolt Court. If carried out, these will lead to a serious diminishment of the quality of life of neighbouring properties. Building density in this area is very high, and this can only be sustained by every building taking steps to minimise the nuisance it causes to its neighbours, for example by triple glazing to reduce noise output. The application here does the reverse - the works are intended to create a social or party area, rather than merely to refurbish or to improve environmental sustainability. A party space cannot effectively be policed for noise, there are no proposals to limit numbers, and there are many alternative bars, pubs and restaurants locally which are able to provide socialising space and are effectively licensed and monitored.

I would further draw the Corporation's attention to the fact that despite being close neighbours, we have not been consulted on this proposal by 10 Bolt Court. This evidences a lack of respect for the local area which strongly implies that they will not be considerate neighbours.

I therefore respectfully urge the Corporation to reject this proposal, and am available for further comment if necessary.

Lorna Gradden

Mr Mike Murphy
Flat 18
6 Bolt Court
London, EC4A 3DQ
michael@murphyz.co.uk
14 August 2019

Application Reference: 19/00291/FULL
To: PLNComments@cityoflondon.gov.uk
Commenter Type: Neighbour
Stance: Object

To whom it may concern

I am writing in my capacity as a new resident of the neighbouring premises of 6 Bolt Court and I wish to **object** to this application.

I chose to move to this location due to the proximity to my work and the unique characteristic of this area, primarily the fact it is a location where the noise after typical working hours is minimal.

My understanding of this application is that a new roof terrace would be in use by up to 12 tenants of the office and use would include any evening and some 'late' evenings during the week.

The original application states that hours of opening are not relevant to this proposal, however later supporting documentation indicates this is very much not the case and indeed proposes hours of opening. I am therefore led to believe that the original application was either purposefully withholding relevant information in the hope of proceeding unchallenged, or simply did not care about the eventual use of the roof terrace and how this would impact on neighbouring residents. I am therefore not optimistic that any great thought has gone into the Roof Terrace Management Plan, which has different hours of opening than those proposed by the agent in the accompanying letter sent on the same date, and feel that this was produced as a box ticking exercise to try and move this application along.

My objections are therefore aimed at the intended use of the roof terrace development and cover the following areas:

Privacy concerns

If we can see them, then they can see us.

It's unsettling to feel that you could be being watched within your own home and the London Plan supports the prevention of this by encouraging roof terraces only where they do not immediately overlook residential properties.

This roof terrace would certainly immediately overlook residential properties.

There is a tree in between my property and that of the applicant which may protect the privacy of some residents in my building, but not all windows are protected by that tree.

Noise and Light levels

This area of the City has a very characteristic network of streets and alleyways which features a Grade I listed building, a City of London Corporation blue plaque on 6 Bolt Court itself, and the only English Heritage blue plaque to be found in the square mile, just around the corner at Dr Johnson's house.

Part of this unique character is how quiet it is. Step out of Bolt Court to the south and you are on a very busy Fleet Street; to the East you get the noise of drinkers outside the Ye Olde Cheshire Cheese, and to the north of Gough Square the same noise disturbances from those drinking outside The Refinery.

By allowing the use of a roof terrace at this location and at night-time where sound is generally amplified, but especially so in an environment such as this where there are narrow streets, would have a detrimental impact on the character of this area.

Further, the residents of 6 Bolt Court, and particularly those who are facing directly on to the roof terrace and at the same height, would get the full impact of this noise. Properties within this periodic building are not double glazed and we need to rely on having windows open to let any cool air in, so we cannot simply shut out the sound that will come from our neighbours on the roof terrace, be it someone in that space making a phone call in the middle of the day, or a group of people who are socialising at night.

What is classed as 'loud music' is subjective, you only need to sit on public transport and hear the various levels of noise coming from personal headphones to understand that people listen to music at different levels and what may appear 'normal' to one person is 'quiet' or 'loud' to another. Music played at one level at 6pm in the evening would sound very differently, and louder, at 10pm in the evening as the ambient noise changes. The same can be said for speech, the sound levels for which I find typically increase with the introduction of alcohol and a group setting.

Therefore, *any* noise coming from this rooftop terrace will be a disturbance to the immediate area.

I appreciate the applicant has suggested no smoking to be permitted on the roof terrace (which I hope would extend to vaping as I personally find this more disagreeable due to the sheer volume of vape being emitted and the smells associated with various 'flavours') but, if respected, this would result in tenants going downstairs to smoke. From my observations, whenever alcohol is involved, and a group of people need to organise themselves to leave, noise levels escalate. At the minimum I would therefore expect unacceptable noise coming from the roof terrace at all times when in evening use, but I fear that this would also result in those tenants who remain on the roof terrace attempting to communicate with those leaving the premises or standing downstairs smoking – and that this would be done by shouting between the two locations.

Further, if the use of the roof terrace will be at night-time, which the Roof Terrace Management Plan indicates it would be, I am concerned by which lighting will be in place to support this. At the present time I don't see any harsh lighting in place at night, but lighting would be required should the roof terrace be used by tenants in the evenings. I do not see any indication in the plans as to the type of lighting that would be in use, where these lights would be located, nor how powerful they would be. I am therefore concerned that any lighting in use would be visible and offensive to those residents who currently have sight of the roof space.

I am concerned that if this proposal were to go ahead there would be a detrimental impact on the day to day living conditions of residents, myself included.

Negative Impact outweighs the Beneficial Impact

On a personal level I am dismayed that one of my first acts upon moving in to my new flat is to feel the need to object to the planning application of a neighbour, but overall it seems that this development will benefit the '12 users (max)' who are tenants of the offices and have use of this 'exclusive terrace area', and also the person or people who are renting this space and therefore able to charge a premium for the addition of a roof terrace.

The number of people this will negatively impact, as evidenced by the number of objections so far made to this application, far outweigh the number of people who this proposal would immediately benefit.

Kind regards
Mike Murphy

From: [beng_choo_goh](#)
To: [PLN - Comments](#)
Subject: 19/00291/FULL OBJECTION
Date: 15 August 2019 00:30:32

Dear Sir,

I am the owner of Flat 5, [6 Bolt Court, EC4A 3DQ](#). I am writing to express my objection to the proposed roof terrace at [10 Bolt Court](#) for the following reasons:

- The roof terrace will affect the privacy of our residents.
- The new proposal is at odds with several London planning policies
- There is no need for more pubs/socialising areas in this vicinity as there are already plenty.

Kind Regards

Madam Beng Choo Goh

Sent from my iPhone

From: [Toby Brown](#)
To: [PLN - Comments](#)
Subject: Fw: Letter of objection to 19/00291/FULL
Date: 15 August 2019 04:36:38
Attachments: [REDACTED]

Dear Madam or Sir

1. Thank you for your consultation letter of 25 July 2019 regarding the amendments to the planning application [19/00291](#)/FULL (10 Bolt Court London EC4A 3DQ).

2. I ask that my previous letter of objection which I have re-attached be taken into account on this amended application, and also make the following additional objections. As stated in my previous letter, I live at 6 Bolt Court directly opposite and facing where the roof terrace will be used.

3. The amended application reinforces that at least one intention of the application is to create a roof terrace for social use - in other words corporate entertainment, alcohol drinking etc. This was suspected by in respect of the original application, which misleading failed to disclose such an intended use.

4. However, the amended application's covering letter dated 22 July says at the outset in its second paragraph that "*The proposed development is essential for the upgrading of the terrace area for compliance with both building safety as well as improvements to the overall visual appearance of the roof terrace area*". If that is genuinely the purpose, then the applicant should not have any problem with the Corporation imposing a planning condition which imposes a restriction against any social/entertainment use of the terrace, and indeed against any use of the terrace after working hours (except for emergency works).

5. If permitted social/entertainment use of the terrace, this will be out of keeping of the character of the historic area and the quiet office and residential nature of Bolt Court. Even if limited to 15 late night evenings per year, this will still be seriously disturbing to local residents. This is especially so given the proximity of my flat (and others at Bolt Court) to the roof terrace, and since we cannot add double glazing to our historic listed building. To put the matter in my personal context, I am a barrister working locally, and, without exaggeration, sleep affected by anti-social noise has the real potential to disrupt my ability to properly represent my clients in court.

6. Without wishing to lengthen this objection further, I also refer to and repeat the policy submissions made by Kirsty Mann in her email of objection to the Corporation dated 7 August 2019 at 11:18 on page 2, with which I agree.

7. Finally, may I repeat the request in my previous letter that I would ask for the opportunity to make oral submissions before the planning committee should the application proceed.

Yours faithfully,
Toby Brown.

Flat 10, 6 Bolt Court

Begin forwarded message:

On Sunday, May 5, 2019, 10:48 pm, Toby Brown <[REDACTED]> wrote:

Please find attached letter containing my objection. I would be grateful if you could confirm receipt.

Thank you.

Kind regards

Toby Brown.