

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2024/2695/P	Mrs Hannah Turin and Dr Mark Turin	04/08/2024 20:51:32	OBJ	As co-owners of the Basement and Ground 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.

Having studied the proposed plans submitted by Adrian Woolfson and Danielle Lee, we are writing a personal objection on the basis of poor design and a form that is neither in keeping with the buildings in question nor the surrounding character of the street. These comments are offered in addition to the formal objection lodged by WEA Planning, a professional firm acting on our behalf.

We have lived at 58 Parliament Hill since 1981, owning the lower half of the house: the Basement and Ground Floors, including the garden. The garden and outside areas that surround our Basement level contribute substantively and substantially to our quality of life, certainly as Hannah ages (I am now 83 years old). 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.

Since moving in a number of years ago, Danielle Lee has undertaken major renovations to her flat. This has caused significant noise, mess and disruption to the other occupants of the house. While frustrating, we and the other owners and occupiers have accepted these activities as reasonable in order to ensure that Danielle Lee has a flat that meets her wishes. In the course of these renovations, we have reason to believe that Danielle Lee has added unauthorized constructions to 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 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 remain deeply concerned that substantial and structural (beyond cosmetic) roof work was undertaken by

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

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. 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. To be clear, we know that these unpermitted structures do not predate Danielle Lee's occupancy. In other words, these permanent and visible additions involving brickwork were not undertaken by the previous owner, Joseph Velosa, from whom Ms Lee purchased the property and with whom we were in good relation and regular contact throughout his residency in the house.

Finally, the proposed plans will involve a considerable amount of work, noise and disruption to the quality of our lives. As proposed, the works will likely require scaffolding to be erected in our garden and side alley for a protracted period, during which time we will not have easy use of any of the outside areas. 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. Hannah is a retired professional for whom the outside space and garden are central to her happiness and wellbeing, and these plans will be detrimental to her way of life and peace of mind.

By adding what is essentially a whole new floor to the property, Danielle Lee is proposing a development that is for her benefit alone, and one that does not take into account the lives of the other occupants and owners of our shared home. The disruption and unease that these large building works will entail, not to mention the costs associated with rewriting leaseholds to reflect the additional floorspace that is being added to the household, benefit nobody but Danielle Lee. In short, we find the negative consequences of this proposal to entirely outweigh the anticipated benefits, and do not believe that the plans are proportionate or appropriate.

Thank you for taking these objections and concerns into account as you work towards a decision on this file.

Yours sincerely,

Mrs Hannah Turin and Dr Mark Turin
