

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2023/3644/P	alison worster	20/12/2023 19:02:19	OBJ	OBJECTION

I strongly object to this application.

I do not understand how this application has been allowed to get so far as to allow the owners to develop and live in a property while claiming 'no change of use.'

Camden will have been aware that the property was to be owner occupied when the first application 2021/5802/P was refused. The members briefing pack of documents states -

'1.4 Originally, the application proposed a change of use from HMO to single dwelling house and a deeper (approx. 6.5m deep) full width single storey rear extension. The change of use from HMO was considered to be contrary to policy H10 (Housing with shared facilities 'Houses in Multiple Occupation') of the Local Plan and the extension was considered by Officers to be too deep and harmful to the appearance of the site and the Conservation Area. The proposal to change the HMO to a single house was omitted and the proposed single storey rear extension was reduced to 5.5m in depth beyond the main rear elevation.'

How can Camden possibly approve this retrospectively?

This could be seen as a legitimate route to 'land grab'. If Camden approve this, it will set a precedent for other private developers to buy a property at well below single dwelling market price, profit from any eventual sale, deprive the community of affordable housing and gain approval, by omitting change of use, for an extension far bigger than allowed under permitted development, and possibly bigger than would be permitted if the property was actually a single dwelling. Has Camden changed its housing policies to favour private developers?

I am also concerned that, if this is approved, the owners will further develop the property and deprive my aspect of even more loss of light and overcrowding.

I am not objecting from a Shropshire based appeals legal experts point of view, as the owners of no.62 have, but from the person on the streets perspective. I have lived and worked in Camden borough for almost thirty years, I have a faith in the law and my local council, and can not understand how non-residents can buy a property, breach planning and then claim 'homelessness' if any action is taken. This is utterly shameful when the owners are valuing the property at £2m. and 'real' homeless die on the local street outside Barclays as Maris Lidia did earlier this year. Neither the Shropshire legal advisers nor the owners would know this, not being Camden residents.

Camden need to act on this to prevent loss of public faith in the system, and to prevent others from doing the same. This property is 'unauthorised development'.

National planning policy framework 2021

'59. Enforcement- Effective enforcement is important to maintain public confidence in the planning system.

This should set out how they will monitor the implementation of planning permissions, investigate alleged cases of unauthorised development and take action where appropriate.'

Camden Replacement Unitary Development Plan 2003

'3. Anyone applying for planning permission or commenting on a planning application should first look in the UDP for the relevant policies. This will give an idea of whether the proposed development is likely to get planning permission.'

'Development that takes place outside planning control can undermine the implementation of the Council's aims and policies and cause harm to the public interest.'

No.62 was never a small C4 HMO, as stated on the application , it was Sui Generas and has a repeated history of being refused for change of use, the latest refusal for Certificate of lawfulness in 2014.

The application 2008/2960/P for change of use in 2009 use was refused at appeal-

Application No: **Consultees Name:** **Received:****Comment:** **Response:**

Appeal decision by Gyllian D Grindey MSc MRTPI Tech. Cert. Arb.

'4. Policy H61 (Protection of Houses in Multiple Occupation) of the Camden Replacement UDP states that the Council will not grant planning permission for a change of use or conversion that would result in the loss of housing in multiple occupation of an acceptable standard unless it is replaced by permanently available affordable housing.

10. My concern is that allowing the appeal in these circumstances would not accord with the fundamental objectives of the relevant policy and hence would most certainly not be in the wider public interest. I am firmly of the view that the scheme should be judged against H6. The appellant argues that 'H6 is not applicable as the house was declared not to be of an acceptable standard'. But one glance at the explanatory text supporting policy H6 elaborates that the Council will generally resist the loss of HMOs of an acceptable standard i.e. which complies with or is capable of reaching the appropriate standards under environmental health legislation (my emphasis). This is a HMO – it is occupied by tenants who do not form a single household but who share some basic facilities – and the policy is applicable in my view because, with modification to bring the premises up to standard, could continue to be occupied as such.'

Nothing had changed to the property, or the properties status, when the current owners bought it. To now claim that they have been living there over two years as a C3 dwelling is not accurate, they developed an oversized extension for eighteen months and have been in occupation for six months, in breach of planning. [See attached supporting documents].

I do not see how this morally wrong application can be approved.
