

From: Vanessa Frank
Sent: Tue Oct 08 12:40:05 2024
To: Planning
Cc: [REDACTED]
Subject: Re: Sent on behalf of Gary Martin and Thomas Smart - objection
Importance: Normal
Attachments: IMG_9905.jpeg

Microsoft Exchange Server;converted from html;
[REDACTED]

For clarity this is an objection regarding planning application
2024/0382/P for 50c Red Lion St

On Tue, 8 Oct 2024 at 12:34, Vanessa Frank <[REDACTED]>

Dear Planning Department,

I'm forwarding this on behalf of Mr Gary Martin and Mr Thomas Smart - Flat 7 Omnium Court, 20 Princeton Street, London, WC1R 4BE.

Mr Smart is now in St Barts having required two consecutive emergency heart surgeries. We believe there are multiple factors leading to this including the dust, noise and stress of the badly managed building work at 50C Red Lion St.

Mr Martin is Mr Smarts partner and carer (and lives with severe epilepsy via brain injury) and has therefore asked me to forward their objection to you.

Yours faithfully,

Dear Planning Team,

I'd like to register an objection to the planning application for 50c Red Lion Street. Failing to address the issues in the objection will amount to a failure to apply your own policies and protect our amenity.

I'm concerned about how accurate the application is. It shows a solid door replacing the fire door onto Omnium Court land. This has actually been built with a window. This creates overlook into all of our bedrooms and our open space. As do the new windows on the rear elevation which replace smaller ones, covered by vegetation for at least the past 24 years (see images provided by previous owner to your team and still on your website)

The same door which was originally put in place as a yearly re-agreed fire exit for the previous resident opens less than a metre from and into the path of the main fire exit for Omnium Court.

The drawings submitted in the application show said vegetation in place. This vegetation (a 50 year old rose) was unnecessarily destroyed at the behest of Ms Boyd to repoint a wall. Your own policy (Local Plan & Amenity appendix) states that protection of Green amenity is key (Local Plan A2 & A3) and that reducing heat gains by addition of green walls is a focus (Amenity 7.18) We believe a clear plan to replace biodiversity and remedy overlook must be added. The loss of these amenities saw my ■ year old partner (Mr Thomas Smart) who has severe COPD and is currently undergoing risky heart surgery in tears, his hobby is birdwatching. He also suffering several severe COPD attacks.

There is no right of way for 50c across Omnium Court Land (as per the land registry.) The current owner of 50c has been clear she will not accept this (see plans submitted to you) and has demonstrated continually she believes she can trespass. Therefore accepting this plan fails to address risks of anti social behaviour. This contravenes your own policy; Camden Plan 2.31 ... aspirations for the Holborn area include... improving community safety, including opportunities for crime and anti social behaviour. Mr Smart is under constant stress as his quiet enjoyment of the garden and right to have the boundaries of his home respected is constantly breaches.

The land registry plans and timeline of registrations/ exchanges also show clearly that part of the freehold to 50C is Owned by the Owner of Omnium Court (now known as Riverside Housing Association) Given this is public information we would ask why this information which has actively been shared with the council hasn't been noted by Camden? The cellars of Omnium Court, used daily as storage/ workshops and to check the blocks utility meters housed there are in the basement floor of said space.

Given there are issues which have caused distress and real harm to vulnerable tenants we would also ask why the council hasn't engaged in proactive consultation with our Landlord?

We would urge this and facilitated mediation prior to this application going to the decision making panel. The current plans state there will be no variance to the newly installed roof. There are some three dimensional renderings which show a very different relationship/ impact between buildings than that which is apparent from inside Omnium Court - see Photos below. The occupant of the flat most impacted has had her windows blocked by what looks like a third. The occupant is an OAP and has sight problems. Your policy states that guidance on this is taken from the BRE daylight and sunlight report. The BRE report is clear that the 25 degree rule is only a "ready reckoning" tool. There are clear statements that the detailed light level targets must be assessed/ met if the resident is older (at home more) or sight impaired. The UK caveats to the document state that given real drivers these stipulations may be waived. An OAP with sight impairment has been traumatised to provide a luxury dressing room and a third bathroom. There are no positive policies in the Local Plan which state addition of a walk in wardrobe and third bathroom are key policy aspirations. Therefore if you allow this planning application without stipulating changes to the roof plan you are failing to protect a

vulnerable residents amenity.

Your own policies also state requirements for appropriate Construction Management (Amenity Annex .5) The two buildings are nested. There has been persistent vibration and noise to an extent that items were regularly falling from shelves. Decibel meters recorded daily peaks of 90+ decibels and regular peaks of over 100 decibels. Hearing loss, extreme distress for terminally ill residents have been two outcomes. My partner who suffers from COPD was hospitalised several times during the build and neighbours who's children have dust allergies noted flare ups. Examples of poor building management have been: There has been sanding of exterior walls with no scaffolding wrap and at the same time excessive dust on windows and in the air was obvious. My partner was then hospitalised with yet another COPD attack. The number of attacks suffered in the building period was extraordinary.

A carbon monoxide flue at face level by the Omnium Court exit to garden and bins. This was clearly covered by 50c's builders when working near it but is deemed acceptable for Omnium Court residents?

We saw working at height directly above us with no cordon and were hit with debris. We note that the first application which was approved but lapsed had a building management plan stipulation. When we queried why the previous retrospective application did not we were told it was due to the fact it was retrospective. Yet the issues described above happened after planning was granted. You will fail in your duties to residents if retrospective planning isn't used as a "loophole" to allow poor practice, setting bad precedents and creating risk for all Camden residents. The council has a clear responsibility to prevent this. Please note that should mediation (to find a sensible design which serves everyone) be offered we would gladly attend and work to find a solution.

Yours faithfully , Gary Martin & Thomas Smart Flat 7 Omnium Court WC1R 4BE

