

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2024/2695/P		05/08/2024 23:36:31	OBJ	<p>As co-residents of the First Floor flat at 58 Parliament Hill, one of the two properties impacted by the proposal, we are writing to object to application 2024/2695/P as submitted to Camden. We object on the grounds of the disruptions that the substantive building works would cause to our quality of life as residents as well as the very design of the plans themselves.</p> <p>We live directly below the Second Floor flat owned by Danielle Lee and therefore would be directly impacted by the noise and disruption that the renovations would cause. The scaffolding that would be required for the works would have to be erected around the entire property, covering all of our windows. This would cause an extreme loss of light in our property (which already has no outside space), as well as massively reduce our privacy, which is particularly concerning for female residents. As residents of the First Floor, we are not accustomed to having other people able to see directly into our flat. Additionally, the constant noise from the building works would cause significant disruption to our daily lives - particularly when we both work from home. We are also extremely concerned about the constant noise given that one of us has moderate/severe hearing loss already and is advised to be very mindful of constant loud noise.</p> <p>Finally, the proposed plans are poorly designed in that they are not in keeping with the character of the street, which is situated in a conservation area. Other comments have gone into greater architectural detail regarding the flaws, so we kindly direct you to those comments for specifics which generally point to the change in outward design of the building.</p> <p>In summary, the proposed plans would not only significantly reduce our quality of life throughout the course of the renovations, but also reduce the future happiness of us and all local residents who would be subjected to looking at the eyesore.</p>
2024/2695/P		05/08/2024 13:02:50	OBJ	<p>We occupy the first floor flat at 63 Parliament Hill, directly opposite the properties concerned in this application. We atrongly object to the proposal, largely on the grounds contained in the report commissioned by Mr Docherty. Although there is quite a lot of variation in the architectural detail of the buildings from the original development of Parliament Hill, the overall impression as one goes up the street is of homogeneity. The building housing 56 and 58 Parliament Hill is a very striking exception, by virtue of the towers which frame the structure. Their visual impact is reinforced by the location of the building on the street corner. The current proposal has the effect of integrating the towers with the new, uninterrupted roof line of the building, thus diminishing the visual impact of the towers, the architectural quality of the building as a whole and its contribution to the variety of architecture in the area.</p> <p>We were surprised to learn that the erection of what appears to be a living wall at the top of 63 Parliament Hill has apparently received some sort of retrospective approval. We hope that this does not constitute a precedent for approving the more ambitious proposal now under consideration. Although the living wall is a very unwelcome addition to the outlook from our apartment, it is at least not visible at street level in Parliament Hill and is presumably capable of being easily removed, which would obviously not be the case were the current proposal to be implemented.</p>
2024/2695/P		05/08/2024 12:29:26	OBJ	<p>Comments submitted via email on behalf of Mrs Hannah Turin and Dr Mark Turin (Basement and Ground Floor, 58 Parliament Hill), and Dr Shamima Rahman and Dr Nicholas John Owen (Middle Floor, 58 Parliament Hill).</p>

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2024/2695/P		05/08/2024 18:54:00	OBJ	<p>I live at 63 Parliament Hill opposite the houses involved. I am writing to oppose strongly the above application. It will totally alter the aesthetic of the houses concerned in a way quite out of keeping with anything else around.</p> <p>Given the history of damage caused to many local properties by subsidence I have concerns that any additional building increases this risk.</p> <p>Although it might not be immediately pertinent we also have experience of flood damage in this area. Currently the local flood prevention group is trying to clarify which properties are most at risk. The planning application fails to address matters of water and sewage management.</p>
