

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2024/3296/P	Susanne Hirschbuhl	15/08/2024 12:18:05	OBJ	<p>Objection to Planning Application number 2024/3296/P Application Type: Full Planning Permission Site: 8 Basement Flat, King Henry's Road, London Camden NW3 3RP "Lower Ground Floor extension with green roof, bin store to front amenity space"</p> <hr/> <p>From: Susanne Hirschbuhl, Second Floor Flat ,8 King Henry's Road, London Camden NW3 3RP</p> <hr/> <p>14th August 2024</p> <p>Dear Sir, dear Madam,</p> <p>As the owner /occupier of the top floor (or 2nd floor) and one of the freeholders of the building number 8 King Henry's Road I strongly object to the above application which was registered 08/08/2024 without any prior notification to me or to the owner of the ground floor flat and the first floor flat.</p> <p>On the application form, Certificate of ownership-certificate B the applicant has ticked the box and certifies that the applicant has given the requisite notice to everyone else (as listed above) notice served 02/08/2024 : ground floor flat/first floor flat and second floor flat.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • This is NOT accurate. I have not received any such notice nor has the owner of the other two mentioned flats. <p>I do NOT support this application. Nor does the owner of the two flats below mine.</p> <p>To the question "Is the site currently vacant?" The answer ticked is no.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • This is NOT accurate. The basement flat has been left unoccupied and untended to since 31/07/2023 when the ownership changed. <p>The applicant has ticked a box selecting EXEMPTION: development subject to the de minimis exemption (development below the threshold).</p> <p>The reason for selecting exemption: small development</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • This is NOT accurate . This is NOT a small development or (as stated in the letter attached to the above planning application) a minor reconfiguration of internal room layout <p>This is major work involving significant structural alterations to the basement of the building.</p> <p>It involves knocking down/removing almost all the internal load bearing walls and all the external walls at the rear of the house.</p> <p>I am, quite frankly, terrified at the thought of so many load bearing walls being knocked down and rebuilt in new positions and the effect this might have on the structural integrity of the whole house..</p> <p>The building has already been weakened after it had to endure many years of HS2 construction of the korridor running right below No.6 and underneath part No. 8's garden. No 8 has a party wall with no. 6. The frequent vibrations were felt and heard here in the top floor flat as crockery and pots rattled in the kitchen.</p> <p>In addition no. 8 is the first house (part of the Victorian Terrace that ends with no. 20) and the closest to the 4 railroad tracks running above ground and right outside the garden of no. 8. There are two more tracks a bit further towards Adelaide Road. The garden is 'shorter' than the gardens further up and our building absorbs a lot of sound and vibrations.</p> <p>Any plans submitted to show extensions to houses further up can't really be compared with the situation at no. 8 (their gardens are longer and some of the tracks disappear in tunnels thus lessening vibrations). As for No. 10 they just have a free standing conservatory connected with a door to the rear of the building.</p> <p>The proposed changes to the internal layout and use of the rooms in the basement flat is bound to have a negative impact and might easily create problems and friction between the occupants of the house.</p> <p>Moving the kitchen and creating a second bathroom on the opposite side of the basement flat below the</p>

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
				<p>bedrooms above might put an additional strain on the old Victorian plumbing and drainage system and also occasionally reduce the water supply going up to the rest of the house.</p> <p>I do not support this planning application.</p> <p>I strongly object to such brutal and un-necessary configuration.</p> <p>Yours sincerely,</p> <p>Susanne Hirschbuhl</p> <p>Resident freeholder, 8 King Henry's Road, NW3 3RP</p>

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2024/3296/P	Helen Dauris	15/08/2024 16:17:10	OBJ	<p>I object strongly to this application for planning permission to extend the lower ground floor flat at 8 King Henry's Road.</p> <p>This planning application is not, as described in the Application Form, a "minor reconfiguration of internal room layout". Rather it is an application for a significant reordering of living space and the positions of rooms in the flat, involves the construction of an extension that will significantly increase the footprint of the flat, and involves the removal of structural walls. The way in which the proposed works are described significantly misrepresents the nature, extent and impact of the work for which permission is sought.</p> <p>The house at 8 King Henry's Road comprises four, vertically organised, flats, the lowest of which is the flat for which the planning permission is sought. The application for planning permission 2024/3296/P is not supported by the leaseholders of any of the other three flats in 8 King Henry's Road in their capacities as leaseholders. Nor is it supported by them in their capacities as holders of shares in the freehold of the house.</p> <p>I own both the raised ground floor flat and the first floor flat at 8 King Henry's Road and lived in the house for many years. In the Application Form (dated 05/08/24) the Applicant certifies that he (the Applicant) served notice to me on 02/08/24. To date (15/08/24) I have not received any notice from him or on his behalf. Nor have I been informed by any of the owner of the lower ground floor flat, or the Applicant, or the Agent that an application for planning permission has been made. Each of them knows how to contact me.</p> <p>The current owner of the lower ground floor flat purchased the property a year ago. The lower ground floor flat has at no time been occupied since he purchased it. The other three flats in the house have all been, and are, occupied.</p> <p>Under the relevant Land Registry title, NGL 208473, no owner of any flat in the house is permitted to make any structural alterations to a flat without the previous consent in writing of the freeholders. The freeholders have not given their consent to the structural alterations that the Applicant is now seeking permission for, and have given the owner and the Applicant full and careful explanations of their reasons for not doing so.</p> <p>I am concerned that the proposed works would seriously damage the structural integrity of the house. The proposed lower ground floor flat extension and internal reordering of rooms involves the removal of significant lengths of original external and internal structural walls on which the house and the flats on higher floors all rest and depend. The removal of structural walls in old houses brings significant risks and associated problems. This is the more so in a house like this in which there is a history of seasonal differential movement between the 1971 extension and the original house.</p> <p>I am concerned that the construction of an extension into the garden would be seriously detrimental to the security of the house, in particular to the security of the raised ground floor flat (the flat immediately above the lower ground floor flat). The rear windows of the raised ground floor flat (from the kitchen and the bedroom) do not have, and have never required, security bars or other high security protection. The rear windows of the building are not visible from the road or from any other public place. The construction of a flat roofed extension just outside them would unavoidably and significantly increase the risk of burglary, theft and intrusion, in particular to the raised ground floor flat and its occupants. Having to have bars, grills, or other high security protection in place would be detrimental to the enjoyment of the flat.</p>

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
				<p>I am concerned that, if there were an extension, a green roof would be impossible, or at least very difficult, to maintain. Maintenance would require people regularly to climb onto the roof, which would be just outside the windows of the raised ground floor flat and involve a regular invasion of the occupants' privacy.</p> <p>I am concerned that the proposed rearrangement of rooms in the lower ground floor flat would lay the ground for serious, long-term disagreements between occupiers of the shared house. This is very undesirable. Flats in shared houses are always best organised in ways intended to minimise potential reasons for conflict. 8 King Henry's Road is no exception. When converted more than fifty years ago, flats in the house were arranged with living rooms at the front of the house and bedrooms at the rear, minimising the chance of conflict between some occupants wanting to sleep while others are wanting to party. The proposed planning application would see a new kitchen/dining/living room space created at the rear of the house, underneath the one bedroom in the flat directly above it. The proposed changes would inhibit the quiet enjoyment of all flats by their occupants. Additionally, in my experience sound-proofing is less good between the lower ground floor and the raised ground floor, than it is between other floors in the house (as I believe is often the case in houses of this age).</p> <p>In summary, I object strongly to this application for planning permission and ask that it should be firmly turned down.</p>

Total: 7