

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

2022/3337/P	Clare Coffey	09/01/2024 09:59:06	OBJNOT	Dear Sir/Madam
-------------	--------------	---------------------	--------	----------------

I have a number of concerns that I would like to bring to the attention of the Council in response to the belated application for planning permission for the installation of refrigeration and cooling plant machinery and an acoustic mitigation unit for the commercial property at 185-187 Haverstock Hill.

Concerns about the application

1. On pages 2 and 6 of the PR REAR ELV document, the applicant fails to share that the proposed space into which the machinery and acoustic unit will be sited is in the entrance to the residential flats at 187. It identifies the entrance to 185, but not to ours. The flats at 187 are in fact the most adversely affected by the installation of the machinery and unit. The applicant fails to identify and acknowledge this in its proposal.
2. There are no depth measurements on the proposal that I can see. The siting of the unit would be in the entrance to the residential flats at 187. This is the only exit for these flats and is indeed the only fire exit. The width of this space is just under three metres (around 290cm). I am concerned about the encroachment of this space from a depth and width perspective. It appears from the drawings that this would be a large installation which will completely change the entrance to our residential flats, taking up the majority of the space in what was a communal yard and residential entrance way.
3. There appears to be little in the application that would ensure that the acoustic unit would be in accordance with the stringent aesthetic standards set out by the Belsize Park Conservation Area. Indeed, the application describes an aluminium enclosure. It is unclear if this is still proposed in the revised proposal. If it is, this is unacceptable and completely out of keeping with the area. Its scale also appears to be at odds with anything else observed in our locality. Given that it would be seen from the street and when we look out of our bedroom windows at the back of properties at 187, I am fearful that this would be a huge and unsightly addition to our immediate vicinity.
4. The applicant has a history of distorting or offering an incomplete acoustic report for the noise output of the proposed plant machinery. I dispute and have serious misgivings about the veracity of these data. Indeed, I commissioned my own acoustic report by an independent company to monitor the impact of the noise on the dwellings at 187 Haverstock Hill. Data were collected continuously for 24 hours over the course of seven days. I offer this as additional evidence to this consultation. If the Council is minded to approve this application, then it must ensure that the noise levels are always compliant with its Local Plan. The residents at 185, 187 and 189 and indeed at Hillfield Court have spent the past two years fighting the noise pollution from the applicant's unauthorised development. We cannot be expected to return to the unsupportable position we have suffered.

Additional resident concerns

5. The entrance to the residential flats has changed beyond all recognition since LA Foods/LIT Retail took possession of the commercial unit at 185-187 Haverstock Hill. I have lived at the property since June 2014 when the unit was occupied by the NatWest Bank. The bank and its employees never ventured into the entrance to the residential flats which is only accessible via a pin code. Since LA Foods/LIT Retail took possession of the commercial unit and indeed its parent company LA Properties (UK) Ltd bought the freehold to our building, they have acted with impunity, ignoring our requests and running roughshod over the clauses in our leasehold agreements. When we complain to their managing agents, we are told they own the freehold and can do whatever they like.

Application No: Consultees Name: Received:

Comment: Response:

6. There are many concerning issues with the changed use of the residential entrance at 187 Haverstock Hill. There is now a commercial bin in the entrance. This bin has been accommodated by changing the brick out house (which has always been there but unused) by bricking up the door and removing a wall for the bin to be wheeled into. The bin and area around it are filthy, which has resulted in the appearance of rats. It is a very unattractive entrance way now, having to step over rotting food left on the floor. Indeed, there have been numerous break-ins by people going through the bins looking for food. I personally have encountered men late at night and early in the morning in the entrance to our flats, having got in through the gate. This never happened before the arrival of the Nisa run by LA Foods/LIT Retail. In addition the shop has been using the entrance to our residential flats to store the cages for its retail products. See photos attached. Given the scale of the proposed development, should the commercial unit continue to use this space in this manner, I have serious concerns about the blockage of this small space which is our only means of exit. If there was a fire, I believe our ability to safely exit the building would be in jeopardy. When I raised this with the managing agents, they - again - told me that as the shop owns the freehold they can do what they like. Indeed, neighbours have already been unable to get out of our gates without the imposition of a development of this proposed scale and scope. I have reported the situation to the London Fire Brigade and I believe they have organised a fire audit.

7. I share these anecdotes by way of exposing the impact of the current situation on residents and a sincere, substantiated fear (based on precedent) of a further deleterious impact on the quiet enjoyment of the residential flats, particularly and most acutely at 187, but also for 185 and 189.

8. In summary, I object to the development based on its proposed scale, the aesthetic impact on the vicinity, the paucity of the acoustic reports, fears about our ability to exit the building in case of a fire, and based on the applicant's own poor record in being a good neighbour.

Yours sincerely
Clare Coffey
9th January 2024















