

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2024/3048/P	Chris and Nooshin Lewis	19/08/2024 12:39:24	PETITNOBJ E	Further to our comments on 7/8/24, we would like to add reasons given by Robert Dallal and others on 8th Aug to our objection of this planning application, copied below:

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.

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.

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.

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.

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.

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

Page 29 of 35

Printed on: 09/08/2024 09:10:10

Application No:

Consultees Name:

Received:

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

Comment:

Response:

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.

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.

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.

We would like to reiterate reasons given by Judith Livingston, copied below:

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.

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.

Thank you
