

From: Hari Jayaram
Sent: 05 August 2023 21:15
To: Planning Planning
Cc: Madhavi Jayaram; Raymond Bryk
Subject: Re: Comments/Objections- 2023/1789/P and 2022/5329/P
(FAO Lauren Ford 3040)

Importance: High

[EXTERNAL EMAIL] Beware – This email originated outside Camden Council and may be malicious. Please take extra care with any links, attachments, requests to take action or for you to verify your password etc. Please note there have been reports of emails purporting to be about Covid 19 being used as cover for scams so extra vigilance is required.

Dear Ms Ford / Camden Planning Team,

We would like to register an appeal against this planning decision.

We raised our objections to this application which have not been addressed nor logged online and have not been consulted or communicated with regarding these. Only one planning notice was placed outside the property which was for the initial application (2022/5329/P). As residents, **we were given no warning of the revised application (2023/1789/P) with no notice having been placed outside the property.** We only found out about this when another neighbour noticed this after searching online.

We live in the property directly above and object to the single storey extension for the reasons outlined in the email below.

In addition I am not aware that the freeholder has given permission for the single storey extension works to proceed as there is a dispute over payment for the lease extension/permissions according to emails we have received.

Please can someone contact us urgently so we can understand our rights and advise us on how to proceed. The owner of the flat below has emailed us to inform us that the work will commence in a few weeks. No reference has been made to how the potential impact of excavation impacting our property will be mitigated against, how it affects the freehold and shared buildings insurance and liabilities.

I have copied in Mr Colin Bridgewater who owns the adjacent ground floor property that will be impacted by any deep excavation and Mr Raymond Bryk who is the owner of the freehold of

I would be grateful for a response to this issue to be prioritised.

With kind regards,

Dr Hari & Mrs Madhavi Jayaram

On 2 Jul 2023, at 08:27, Hari Jayaram

wrote:

Dear Ms Ford,

We were not aware of this re-application until informed by an adjacent neighbour as no new sign was posted outside the property.

This is a re-application of a very similar poorly thought out application (2022/5329/P) made last year.

Our concerns remain unchanged from the earlier application as below:

Major Concerns

1) We had been made aware of internal refurbishments planned by the new owner. We were kindly warned of some potential noise disturbances over the coming months. We were not made aware of nor consulted about a single storey extension to the property which may have significant material impact to our property.

2) Excavation to create the new foundations for an extension is very likely to cause movement to the main building which has the potential to impact the interior of our property (walls, plastering, décor etc). This risk needs to be evaluated by an appropriate independent professional (chartered surveyor, structural engineer) based upon the architectural and excavation plans, with an assessment both before and after the work, with any remedial costs to be met by the applicant. The cost of the surveyor/structural engineer also needs to be met by the applicant.

3) There is a shared sewer/drain in the centre of the proposed extension site. We are concerned about the impact of excavation and building around this shared sewer and how this may impact

our property. This risk again needs to be evaluated by an appropriate independent professional (chartered surveyor, structural engineer) based upon the excavation plans and existing sewerage layout with an assessment both before and after the work, with any remedial costs met by the applicant. The cost of the surveyor/structural engineer also needs to be met by the applicant.

4) A single storey extension will involve working on the structural external wall that supports the rear of our property. This again requires evaluation by an appropriate independent professional (chartered surveyor, structural engineer) based upon the architectural and building plans with an assessment both before and after the work, with any remedial costs and legal costs needed for any party wall agreement met by the applicant. The cost of the surveyor/structural engineer also needs to be met by the applicant.

5) Both our property and Flat A are leasehold properties. We would like to ensure that the owner of the freehold (Mr Raymond Bryk) is fully aware of the proposed plans and has given his consent. We are not aware that consent of the freeholder has been obtained.

6) We currently share the buildings insurance for the property (organised by the freeholder) which is split equally between our property and Flat A. We are concerned about how the extension and potential future problems relating to this might affect the buildings insurance for the property and how this can be addressed without impacting us.

With kind regards

Dr Hari & Mrs Madhavi Jayaram