

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2024/3296/P	Helen Dauris	01/09/2024 21:27:34	OBJ	<p>Please add the following objections to my previous objection (dated 15/08/24) to 2024/3296/P:</p> <p>The application states that the proposed extension will be 3.6m tall, calculated by reference to the height of other extensions along King Henry's Road (KHR). Using the information on the drawings, the roof of the proposed extension would be 40cm higher than the floor level of the raised ground floor flat. The creation of the proposed extension would result in significant water ingress from the roof of the extension into the wall of the raised ground floor flat.</p> <p>The application does not show the angle of the roof of the extension or how the rain on the roof of the extension would be managed.</p> <p>The existing rear elevation shows the downpipe from the roof gutter going down the back of the house, and into the ground drains. The proposal shows the downpipe being cut off at the top of the proposed extension, with no indication of any replacement downpipe, nor how the downpipe would get into the drains below ground. The owner of the basement flat does not have the right to block the gutter downpipe.</p> <p>The plans do not show the location of the soil downpipes, or the location of the existing manholes, so do not show how the ground drains would function.</p> <p>The application does not provide any information on how building work would be undertaken. To maintain the structural integrity of the building some long rolled steel joists (RSJs) would be required. However there is no access to enable such building materials to reach the basement flat. The access to the lower ground floor flat at 8 KHR is via the communal hall and then down a narrow staircase that includes a 90 degree bend. Access via the basement French windows in the front lightwell has a steep angle and long RSJs would not be able to passed through the basement flat to the rear.</p> <p>The design and access statement includes various statements that are not correct:</p> <p>The application states that the communal front garden is proposed to be refurbished. The scope of this work has not been agreed with the owners of the other flats who would be keen to include a provision for parking bicycles in this area.</p> <p>The application proposes to replace the bin store, but the bin store is not in the sole ownership of the basement flat. The other leaseholders have not agreed to the replacement of the bin store. The other leaseholders have now got larger wheelie bins provided by Camden Council (to replace the old black bins which fitted in the bin store). The proposed new bin store is not required to house these new wheelie bins.</p> <p>Moreover, the existing bin store has been obsolete since 2017 when new rules for collecting bins were implemented. Veolia stipulates that for bins to be collected they must be within 1m of the entrance to the property. The other leaseholders have already explained this to the applicant who has chosen to disregard their request to have bicycle parking instead of another "not fit for purpose" bin store at the far end of the entrance.</p> <p>The application proposes that the existing railings to the communal front garden are to "be repainted in black to match the neighbouring." These railings are already painted black and are not in the sole ownership of the</p>

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
				basement flat.
