

Dear Planning,

I concur with Ms Franks points below and would like to register the same objections.

Mr Gary Martin
No 7 Omnium Court

On Tue, 26 Mar 2024, 17:24 Vanessa Frank, wrote:

p

Dear Planning Team,

I wish to object to this application.

1. As documented in my email sent at 16.30 today we have serious concerns that your duty to consult and your own stated policies have not been executed [1 \(camden.gov.uk\)](http://camden.gov.uk)
2. The application refers to 50c as a dwelling house. This is factually incorrect, it is and has been used as a work studio with provisions for sleeping due to late working hours. There is a body of evidence to support this: The previous owners' tax returns refer to it as the business's office. A Google map search shows it as the business's studio and multiple magazine articles and online sources reference it as such. There are none referring to it as a home. Guardians by Occupation very often provide live in Guardians to empty offices to prevent squatters and damage etc. The young people who were the previous guardians used at least the ground floor as a studio and I believe the current owners previous planning application refers to it as such.
3. Your own response to a planning application made by previous owner Jocelyn Burton, refers to the west wall as grade II listed. I made Camden Planning and Ben Palmer aware of this. Local Councillors, residents and Jocelyn Burton herself all referred to it as listed. We have been asking for fencing to stop people entering the courtyard since the 1980's.
4. The application references new windows in the front elevation. The owner wrote to a neighbour and referred to the new house having entirely glass walls. Why the discrepancy? Is there a risk that the full scope of this plan is larger than stated? Will glass walls be in keeping with local architecture? Would clarity around the full scope take the application beyond this level of planning application?
5. 50c doesn't have a right of way across Omnium Court's courtyard. This had been confirmed by the Land Registry and indicated on plans they openly published. I've shared the documents with your team and with Ben Palmer. Jocelyn Burton was given a fire escape access only via an agreement with One Housing Group, all of which is fully documented with One Housing. This is particularly important because there is a crash door fire escape from Omnium Court adjacent to this 50c fire escape. This is less of an issue if only being used as fire escape, but clearly if a door from 50c opens outward and blocks the escape route it creates danger. This needs to be acknowledged and addressed as there is potential risk to life
6. The plans indicate a gas flu outlet on the Omnium Court side which was put in but not on the plans you authorized when executed by Jocelyn Burton. This is in a regularly used thoroughfare peoples faces. for tenants and regularly blows fumes in

7. Much of the demolition work flagged in the planning has been carried out already. Presumably on an understanding the plans will pass? This does appear to circumvent the entire planning process for the benefit of the new owner.
8. Given the genuine issues with development in a highly populated space why hasn't genuine community engagement happened to ensure the process is workable?

Kind regards,

Vanessa Frank