

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2024/2695/P		06/08/2024 00:24:11	OBJ	<p>Comments by Dr Nick Owen and Professor Shamima Rahman regarding Planning Proposal for Flat 2nd And Attic Floor, 56 Parliament Hill, London, NW3 2TL, and Flat 2nd And 3rd Floor, 58 Parliament Hill, London, NW3 2TL</p>

To whom it may concern,

As co-owners of the First Floor Flat Floor flat at 58 Parliament Hill, one of the two properties directly impacted by the proposal, we are writing to object to application 2024/2695/P as submitted to Camden.

We have studied the proposed plans submitted by Adrian Woolfson and Danielle Lee, and we write to object to the project on the grounds of : 1. Poor design, 2. Plans that are completely out of keeping with the original design and form of Nos 56/58 Parliament Hill and the surrounding character of the street, 3. The potential impact of the work on the structure of the house in an area prone to subsidence, and 4. The impact of the extent and longevity of the proposed work on quality of life, security and privacy of the other occupiers of the house.

Our objection is sent in conjunction with a formal objection lodged by WEA Planning, a professional firm acting on our behalf, and objections made by our co freeholder Mrs Hannah Turin.

We have owned and lived in the first floor flat in 58 Parliament Hill since 1996. The Flat is currently occupied by a member of our family.

The three flats that comprise 58 Parliament Hill share the freehold equally, with each flat holding its own leasehold. Historically, some basic house maintenance and upkeep activities have been divided into thirds for each flat to share the costs, while most other costs have been divided based on percentage share of the property.

Below are two extracts from the Camden document 'Conservation area statement South Hill Park' about Parliament Hill, which state:

'This part of the Conservation Area is also characterised by substantial semi-detached houses, overwhelmingly in the Victorian Gothic Revival style. Influenced by Ruskin's "The Stones of Venice", this style is typified by elaborately carved foliage in artificial stone, as well as various combinations of steeply pitched roofs, Tudor chimneys and rustic porches...'

'...Generally, the character and hierarchy of spaces in this Conservation Area have derived from steep terrain and historic field pattern, the prevailing architectural style and importantly, by the relevant Building Acts and Regulations in force in the late 19th century.'

The proposed work would significantly detract from the appearance of the house that Mrs Turin and we are co-owners of.

The distinct appearance of the square turrets from the vantage of Parliament Hill will be lost. The harmonious south facing brick frontage would be topped by a stark glass and metal development on the current flat roof, that would be visible from Tanza road.

Application No: Consultees Name: Received:

Comment: Response:

Since moving in to 58 Parliament Hill several years ago, Ms Lee has undertaken significant renovations to her flat.

We are concerned that in that period, unauthorized construction work may have occurred on our shared roof. These include increasing the height of the wall between our roof and the roof at No 56; increasing the height of the wall on the Tanza Road side of the house; and, perhaps most notably, a new brick structure – essentially a new wall – that runs from the turret to the chimney breast and is parallel to the front elevation of the house. This last construction is clearly visible from the street in Parliament Hill.

We draw your attention to the Heritage Report, logged as an objection on 29/07/2024 at 09:22, and filed on behalf of Edward Docherty at 61 Parliament Hill, which also identifies these additional constructions:

Page 4:

“The proposal is for a pair of roof extensions and associated roof terraces on the east side of Parliament Hill on the semi-detached Nos 56 and 58. At present there are a number of accretions at roof level, some of which were erected without planning permission. The proposal does not seek to simply regularise these unauthorised works but to capitalise upon them with more extensive proposals that alter and raise the front pitches of the houses (and other key historic features such as chimneys and party walls) and introduces extensive alien design elements such as aluminium framed glazing and doors and a standing seam clad element to the roof. All are visible from other properties and from street level within the conservation area.”

Page 16:

“The above builds on contested previous roof alterations that have resulted in vertical screens being erected at No 58. These are visible on the front and flank of No 58. Their history is disputed but includes the refusal of a lawful development certificate in January 2023 and subsequently the granting of such a certificate in October 2023 (2023/3642/P). In retrospect, these prior changes appear a prelude to the ambitions of the current application.”

We are very concerned that previous structural (beyond cosmetic) roof work was undertaken by Danielle Lee as preparation for the current proposal, and that this was done without the explicit consent and agreement of other freeholders at 58 Parliament Hill and also without appropriate planning permission. Moreover, these unpermitted structures have already added substantial weight to the property — an older Victorian house already compromised by possible subsidence issues — and we are increasingly worried about the further impact of additional weight on the roof for the structural integrity of the house as a whole.

It seems clear that these unpermitted permanent and visible additions involving brickwork were undertaken during Ms Lee’s ownership and not undertaken by the previous owner, Joseph Velosa, from whom Ms Lee purchased the property.

Finally, the proposed plans will involve a considerable amount of work, noise and disruption to the quality of

Application No: **Consultees Name:** **Received:**

Comment: **Response:**

our lives.

As proposed, the works will likely require scaffolding to be erected in the garden and side alley (belonging exclusively to the ground floor/basement) for a protracted period, during which time the ground floor and basement occupants will not have easy use of any of the outside areas. Long term scaffolding also has serious implications for the security and privacy of the occupants of the ground and first floors. Based on our experience of previous building works conducted on the roof and top floor property, we anticipate a considerable amount of brick dust and other debris falling on our property. The occupants of the first floor work at home for several days each week and the proposed work will be very disruptive.

Ms Lee is proposing a significant development that is for her benefit alone, adds nothing to the common parts of the house and, with no consideration for the other occupants and co-owners of No 58 Parliament Hill, will cause huge disruption and inconvenience to them.

We feel strongly that the negative consequences of this proposal entirely outweigh any anticipated benefits, and do not believe that the plans are proportionate or appropriate.

Thank you for taking these objections and concerns into account.

Yours faithfully,
