

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2024/3048/P	Mo Abudu	09/08/2024 01:03:05	OBJ	<p>As the owner of Flat 3 Kings Court, I strongly object to the approval of application 2024/3048/P for the following reasons:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Lack of Structural Assessments: The building, constructed in 2010, was not designed for additional floors. No structural evidence has been provided to show that the building can support the load of an extra storey, let alone two. This raises serious safety and feasibility concerns.</li> <li>2. Impact on Building Character and Surrounding Area: I oppose the two-storey addition, as it would disrupt the visual harmony of the building and its surroundings. The building was designed to match the area's character, and the proposed extension does not align with this intent, particularly in the sensitive Finchley Road Corridor.</li> <li>3. Insufficient Refuse Management Capacity: Adding three more units to the building, which currently has 11, would increase the number of households by nearly 30%. The existing waste management facilities are already inadequate, and there is no capacity to accommodate more units, compromising residents' rights to proper amenities.</li> <li>4. Amenity Impact on Neighbours: The proposed development would lead to a loss of light and privacy for neighbouring properties. Some rooms in nearby properties would still be negatively affected despite the Daylight and Sunlight Assessment revisions.</li> <li>5. Parking and Congestion Issues: The proposal includes a car-free agreement, but the lack of on-site parking will increase congestion. The suggested cycle spaces are insufficient and no clear location has been identified for them. The building is already at full capacity.</li> <li>6. Profiteering Concerns: The proposal prioritizes the freeholder's financial gain over leaseholders' interests. The freeholder's risk is minimal compared to the potential negative impact on leaseholders. This development threatens the property's value and integrity.</li> <li>7. Insurance and Indemnity Concerns: Another critical issue is who will indemnify us against any loss or damage to our property. Has the leaseholder secured insurance to cover all foreseeable and unforeseeable damage that these additional floors could cause to our property? This is a significant concern that needs to be addressed.</li> </ol> <p>In conclusion, I believe the Council should not approve a planning application lacking structural assessments, misaligned with the building's aesthetics and the surrounding area, where amenities cannot support expansion, and where neighbours would lose light and privacy.</p>

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2024/3048/P	Nooshin Lewis	07/08/2024 18:09:31	OBJ	<p>I wish to raise an objection regarding the Erection of single story rear extension (6m length x 4m height and 3m high at the eaves) and Erection of a two storey upward extension, to create 3 x residential units.</p> <p>I would like to object to the planning proposal for the same reasons as put forward by the response from Marcus Hill on 01/08/2024, copied below, as well my own and all others' reasons stated last year against the rejected application 2023/2262/P, including all points raised in the related decision letter.</p> <p>Firstly, I am very concerned regarding the proposed increased elevation, shape and the detrimental impact such an extension would have to the surrounding visual character of the area. The proposed height of this 2-storey extension will be significantly taller than any other building in the vicinity, and the increased elevation would protrude to the rear such that it would be clearly visible to those walking up Parsifal road (a conservation area) before entering Finchley road. The shape of the proposed building will be unlike anything else in this part of the street, and from across the road front facing would create an incongruous skyline with a design that does not fit with the aesthetics of the adjacent buildings.</p> <p>In the design and access statement, it states "The proposed extension will be set back so as to not be seen from the street scene and/or adversely impact visual amenity". I strongly disagree with this statement regarding the addition of a second new floor in which this application proposes.</p> <p>It is impossible to make a 2-storey extension on this building and at this part of Finchley road not look totally out of character, out of proportion and destroy the visual harmony of the surroundings in comparison to the adjacent buildings and backdrop, no matter how far you try to stagger and set back the frontages of the additional floors back from the front of the building, as from across the road, the angle of setback can never be acute enough to make the significant height difference compared to adjacent buildings visibly very obvious and completely alter the street scene on this section of the Finchley road corridor. Even a short distance away from the building, given the angle of the setback, this additional second floor the landlord is trying to push through will always be obvious front facing, an eyesore rear facing and in conflict with the current street-scene from multiple viewpoints. For the same reasons the rejected application 2023/2262/P failed, specifically point 7 of the officer final report, this application and any subsequent application for a 2-storey extension on this building fails to appreciate the significant alteration of character and street scene on the Finchley road corridor any further upward extension would have on top of the extant permission for a single storey upwards extension.</p> <p>Secondly, I am concerned of the effect this would have on the residents at No 525 Finchley Road regarding loss of light and sense of enclosure they would face, specifically the top floor flat facing the west side of the building with a window facing the building in which a significant amount of light the apartment receives will be directly facing the additional storeys. This application still faces the same issues as the rejected application 2023/2262/P, specifically point 9 of the officer report final regarding loss of light, sense of enclosure and the out of character nature and scale in relation to the surroundings. Yet again, I fail to see how this issue can ever be overcome with any additional upward extension in addition to the extant permission for a single storey upwards extension.</p> <p>Finally, I have a concern with the stretch on already stretched building amenities regarding waste and refuse, and where an additional 6 bicycle spaces will be erected without impeding utility of the car park and ease of movement. Adding an additional 3 households waste whilst using existing facilities that are already struggling</p>

Application No:      Consultees Name:      Received:

Comment:

Response:

to cope with the current households could lead to significant waste overflow and vermin. The design and access statement does not address this issue at all and assumes that existing facilities will be able to cope. The design and access statement also doesn't shed light on where these Sheffield bicycle stands would be positioned in order not to obstruct and impede movement of vehicles in the already tight and fully utilised carpark. The building as a whole would suffer a significant issue with overcrowding and overburden on communal facilities, affecting quality of life for all residents.

In summary, I had no objection to the extant permission for a single upwards extension to this building as the proposal was of appropriate scale and proportion and will not have any major impact on the character and beauty of the surrounding streets and general area. However, this application fails for the exact reasons the last application 2023/2262/P failed, and completely fails to address the concerns raised prior in a 2-storey upwards extension. The building and area the building is located within cannot accommodate any 2-storey upwards extensions and be harmonious with its surroundings for the aforementioned reasons.

Finally, it is extremely disappointing that yet again, residents were not informed of this prior approval application or consultation regarding these proposed works. I understand that the leaseholder of the roof space is under no obligation to inform everybody that could be affected, but it is extremely poor practice not to inform significant stakeholders such as the residents in the building considering the day-to-day disruptions that residents could face with major works such as this.

---

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2024/3048/P	Christopher Lewis	07/08/2024 18:12:01	OBJ	<p>I wish to raise an objection regarding the Erection of single story rear extension (6m length x 4m height and 3m high at the eaves) and Erection of a two storey upward extension, to create 3 x residential units.</p> <p>I would like to object to the planning proposal for the same reasons as put forward by the response from Marcus Hill on 01/08/2024, copied below, as well my own and all others' reasons stated last year against the rejected application 2023/2262/P, including all points raised in the related decision letter.</p> <p>Firstly, I am very concerned regarding the proposed increased elevation, shape and the detrimental impact such an extension would have to the surrounding visual character of the area. The proposed height of this 2-storey extension will be significantly taller than any other building in the vicinity, and the increased elevation would protrude to the rear such that it would be clearly visible to those walking up Parsifal road (a conservation area) before entering Finchley road. The shape of the proposed building will be unlike anything else in this part of the street, and from across the road front facing would create an incongruous skyline with a design that does not fit with the aesthetics of the adjacent buildings.</p> <p>In the design and access statement, it states "The proposed extension will be set back so as to not be seen from the street scene and/or adversely impact visual amenity". I strongly disagree with this statement regarding the addition of a second new floor in which this application proposes.</p> <p>It is impossible to make a 2-storey extension on this building and at this part of Finchley road not look totally out of character, out of proportion and destroy the visual harmony of the surroundings in comparison to the adjacent buildings and backdrop, no matter how far you try to stagger and set back the frontages of the additional floors back from the front of the building, as from across the road, the angle of setback can never be acute enough to make the significant height difference compared to adjacent buildings visibly very obvious and completely alter the street scene on this section of the Finchley road corridor. Even a short distance away from the building, given the angle of the setback, this additional second floor the landlord is trying to push through will always be obvious front facing, an eyesore rear facing and in conflict with the current street-scene from multiple viewpoints. For the same reasons the rejected application 2023/2262/P failed, specifically point 7 of the officer final report, this application and any subsequent application for a 2-storey extension on this building fails to appreciate the significant alteration of character and street scene on the Finchley road corridor any further upward extension would have on top of the extant permission for a single storey upwards extension.</p> <p>Secondly, I am concerned of the effect this would have on the residents at No 525 Finchley Road regarding loss of light and sense of enclosure they would face, specifically the top floor flat facing the west side of the building with a window facing the building in which a significant amount of light the apartment receives will be directly facing the additional storeys. This application still faces the same issues as the rejected application 2023/2262/P, specifically point 9 of the officer report final regarding loss of light, sense of enclosure and the out of character nature and scale in relation to the surroundings. Yet again, I fail to see how this issue can ever be overcome with any additional upward extension in addition to the extant permission for a single storey upwards extension.</p> <p>Finally, I have a concern with the stretch on already stretched building amenities regarding waste and refuse, and where an additional 6 bicycle spaces will be erected without impeding utility of the car park and ease of movement. Adding an additional 3 households waste whilst using existing facilities that are already struggling</p>

Application No:      Consultees Name:      Received:

Comment:

Response:

to cope with the current households could lead to significant waste overflow and vermin. The design and access statement does not address this issue at all and assumes that existing facilities will be able to cope. The design and access statement also doesn't shed light on where these Sheffield bicycle stands would be positioned in order not to obstruct and impede movement of vehicles in the already tight and fully utilised carpark. The building as a whole would suffer a significant issue with overcrowding and overburden on communal facilities, affecting quality of life for all residents.

In summary, I had no objection to the extant permission for a single upwards extension to this building as the proposal was of appropriate scale and proportion and will not have any major impact on the character and beauty of the surrounding streets and general area. However, this application fails for the exact reasons the last application 2023/2262/P failed, and completely fails to address the concerns raised prior in a 2-storey upwards extension. The building and area the building is located within cannot accommodate any 2-storey upwards extensions and be harmonious with its surroundings for the aforementioned reasons.

Finally, it is extremely disappointing that yet again, residents were not informed of this prior approval application or consultation regarding these proposed works. I understand that the leaseholder of the roof space is under no obligation to inform everybody that could be affected, but it is extremely poor practice not to inform significant stakeholders such as the residents in the building considering the day-to-day disruptions that residents could face with major works such as this.

---

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2024/3048/P	Robert Dallal	08/08/2024 14:05:47	OBJ	<p>I am the owner of Flat 9, Kings Court. I strongly object to the approval of application 2024/3048/P on the following grounds:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1) NO STRUCTURAL ASSESSMENTS. The building was not designed for additional floors. The building was only constructed in 2010. If the developers had the ability to construct additional storeys they would surely have done so at the time. Absolutely no structural engineering work has been advanced by the current or previous freehold owners to evidence that the building can accept the load of an additional one, let alone two storeys. This omission raises significant concerns about the safety and feasibility of the proposed development.</li> <li>2) IMPACT ON BUILDING CHARACTER AND SURROUNDING AREA. I object to the proposed two-storey addition to the building, as the aesthetic mismatch between the existing structure and the prefabricated extension would compromise the overall visual harmony and cohesiveness of the existing property and the surrounding area. Once again, the building was custom designed and constructed only in 2010. Its height is generally in keeping with the surrounding structures. Having been constructed so recently and indeed with pitched/triangular pointed windows for the top floor it was clearly not contemplated that the building should have additional floors added above. The proposed materials and design changes since the previous application 2023/2262/P do not sufficiently mitigate the visual impact, particularly given the building's location within the Finchley Road Corridor, which is sensitive to changes in scale and massing.</li> <li>3) NO CAPACITY FOR ADDITIONAL REFUSE MANAGEMENT. I object on the grounds that the building simply cannot accommodate an additional 3 units. The building currently contains just 11 units, so that is an almost 30% increase in the number of households. The capacity of the common elements, including but not limited to storage for dry recycling, food waste and residual waste, is already failing to meet the needs of the existing 11 units and this has been a consistent issue over the years. There is absolutely no spare or additional capacity to accommodate the proposed units. By approving such plans the Council will be compromising existing and new flat owners' rights to proper amenities within the building.</li> <li>4) AMENITY IMPACT ON NEIGHBOURS. I object to the loss of light and loss of privacy imposed to the neighboring properties (521 and 525 Finchley Road). The revised Daylight and Sunlight Assessment indicates that while most rooms comply with BRE guidelines, there are still transgressions affecting certain rooms in neighbouring properties. This includes reductions in daylight and sunlight that impact the amenity of these properties. The potential loss of light and privacy has not been fully mitigated.</li> <li>5) PARKING AND CONGESTION ISSUES. The proposal includes a car-free development agreement, but the lack of on-site parking means the increase in residents would undoubtedly exacerbate parking stress and congestion in the area. The proposed cycle spaces, while conceptually beneficial, will not fully address the transportation needs of future residents and in any case no location for such cycle spaces has been proposed, because there is no obvious location for same. The building is at capacity... if the Council is in doubt I suggest you pay a visit.</li> <li>6) PROFITEERING CONCERNS. The proposal prioritises the financial gain of the freeholder over the interests of current leaseholders. The risk to the freeholder is minimal at a purchase price of just £200,000 compared to the potential negative impact on leaseholders who purchased their units in good faith in a building constructed only in 2010. The Council must consider that the freeholder's financial risk is less than</li> </ol>

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
				<p>half that of any single leaseholder in the building. Therefore there is an extreme mismatch of financial incentives vs. risk. The proposed development undermines the integrity and value of the existing property, which leaseholders rely upon.</p> <p>For reference the previous freehold owners Elmdon Real Estate LLP – who secured the original approval from the Council for a one-storey extension (application 2020/3511/P) without any notice to, or consultation of the leaseholders in the building, then took that approval and used it to sell a synthetic freehold to the current freehold owners (essentially they sold only a roofspace development right). By approving these applications the Council is merely enabling profiteering by one bad actor after another at the expense of leaseholders. May I remind that each of those "leaseholders" in fact paid a full price to "own" their flats only to find they have no rights to prevent this sort of profiteering at their expense. The system is broken and the Council enables this sorry state of affairs to continue in the name of a housing shortage that no longer exists, as evidenced by the fact that values of flats like ours have already been driven down to below 2012 levels. And that is before a totally unnecessary (save for the motive of making a profit for a single individual) pre-fabricated development gets added to the roof of the building constructed in line with building regulations as recently as 2010. I see absolutely no reason why the Council should be allowing exceptions and additions to such a recent construction now.</p> <p>Overall I strongly believe the Council should NOT be approving planning applications for which there is no detailed structural engineering work, which isn't in keeping with existing aesthetics of the building or those of the surrounding area, where building amenities cannot accommodate the sought-after expansions and where neighbours will suffer loss of light and privacy. Thank you.</p>
2024/3048/P	Judith Livingstone	08/08/2024 17:29:53	COMMNT	<p>I am the owner of Flat 7 and I strongly object also to this planning application. I agree completely with the points made by Robert Dallal and by Marcus Hill, and I refer back to the refused planning application from last year. The proposed application is even worse than the application that was refused last year and for the same reasons.</p> <p>In addition, the sewerage from the flats is removed by a pumping system with storage chamber. The pumping system cannot cope with the current level of waste, and is frequently blocked, necessitating frequent visits from the engineers. It is not able to deal with any additional waste and this would become a health hazard to the occupants.</p>