

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2023/2051/P	Burnell	14/07/2023 15:40:18	OBJ	<p>With reference to the Planning Application 2023/2051/P at NW6 4SR please note this application is not only to expand flat 8 but actually also includes flat 7 and would be a major, not minor development to create a maisonette, complete with new plumbing.</p> <p>The houses at 148 and 150 Abbey Road were built by Victorians as two dwellings against a party wall, semi-detached.</p> <p>In the 1950's property developers divided these homes into 16 small studio flats and made a killing. Now in a Conservation Area this is an attempt to maximise income from renting, or profit from selling, by joining two studio flats at the top of the house, knocking through a partition wall, installing a staircase and making the limited loft space into a 3rd bedroom. With scaffolding up to repair the roof those proposing this plan have modified the application to maximise their gains, and probably assume permission is a foregone conclusion, with builders already on site.</p> <p>It may well be that history is repeating itself: this has happened before and it's likely that the Freeholder, the Leaseholders of the top flats 7 and 8 and the Managing Agents are one and the same or at least related financially. In which case other Leaseholders who would be affected by this plan would have no say in the matter. I sympathise with the other Leaseholders in 150, and wonder if they have been consulted. The public notice referring to this proposed plan is not immediately outside the property and had been obscured during the consultation period.</p> <p>Leaseholders of 148 and 150 have suffered the threat of over development several times before, when the previous Freeholder and the Leaseholder of the top floor flats and the managing agent were one and the same. What's more they were Estate Agents and failed to advertise at least one flat on the open market and bought the Lease well below the market value, for cash. This is akin to insider trading where no one else gets a look in.</p> <p>A similar plan was rejected, permission declined in 2017, ref 2017/1056/P on the grounds of overcrowding.</p> <p>The roof lights proposed would be visible from Quex Road.</p> <p>The roofs of these houses with proposed alterations would have been visible from the street if planning permission had been granted, but permission was declined in 2015, ref 2015/5545/P. by reason of their appearance and siting would detract from the appearance of the building to the detriment of its character and appearance and as a consequence would undermine the character and appearance of the group of properties which it forms part and this part of the Priory Road Conservation Area</p> <p>I am against the setting of a precedent for fear of similar applications affecting the Leaseholders of other flats in the block, and possibly reducing the relative value of those on the top floor of 148 if successful in the future.</p> <p>There are no floor joists to support a new room in the loft, the attendance of a building inspector would be essential and Land Registry would have to be consulted on the creation of new boundaries.</p> <p>I am generally against wealthy land owners or venture capitalists developing modest dwellings for their own</p>

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

Comment: **Response:**

profit when what is needed in this area is affordable accommodation for the less well-to-do, not more expensive accommodation for the wealthy.

I oppose this plan also because it is not meant to improve the quality of life for the majority of Leaseholders of 150, and by inference of 148, but to maximise the income of those seeking planning permission, who hold a privileged position.
