

---

**From:** Harriet King  
**Sent:** 03 January 2025 12:39  
**To:** Planning  
**Subject:** Application reference 2024/5468/P

**[EXTERNAL EMAIL]** Beware – This email originated outside Camden Council and may be malicious Please take extra care with any links, attachments, requests to take action or for you to verify your password etc.

Comments on Application number: 2024/5468/P

### **The Planning Statement**

The statement is incorrect in some respects:

The application is made by the Brookfield Lift Consortium who comprise a minority of the leaseholders (approximately one quarter) of the 32 flats. BMFL is the landlord and is the quoted applicant in the other application (2024/5494/P). Only BMFL can implement the proposal and cannot do so without the agreement of the leaseholders.

Figure 4 represents a walk through lift, however this isn't consistent across all light wells as some have walk round and some walk through lift arrangements.

### **Consultation**

The installation of lifts has indeed been discussed in outline at each AGM but detailed plans were not circulated to all residents by the lift consortium or comments sought; outline schemes have been presented, rather than consulted. Comments made after drawings were circulated shortly before the application was made have not been taken into account. It is true that the majority said they would in principle like to benefit from lift access but no details were provided when this was voted on and it would be bizarre for anyone to vote against such a proposal in principle. The Planning Statement quotes guarantees of necessary funding. Whilst it is true funding support has been offered, the cost of the proposal is not yet known and there has not yet been a consultation with each resident in enough detail to obtain the agreements necessary to each resident's lease to enable the proposal to be implemented.

As a resident and leaseholder, my views were not sought on the detailed design before the application was made even though I raised a number of issues.

### **Access**

A platform lift from ground to 3<sup>rd</sup> floor is proposed for all 4 stairwells, each with 8 flats (2 flats/floor). At ground level the lift doors open directly to the outside with a ramp up to the service road.

Passenger or evacuation lifts rather than platform lifts would be more appropriate, where these are feasible.

It is proposed that two stairwells have walk through lifts, the other two to have a foot passage round one side of the lift. Walk through lifts were rejected by leaseholders in 2018: if the lift breaks down, the lift doors lock for safety and there is no direct access to vehicles or bins, or in an emergency. This will also occur if the doors are held open at an upper level. In addition, everyone coming from the service road, including all deliveries, will have to use the lifts which are slow and not designed for frequent use. The access road is also ramped locally (as clearly shown in the Inclusive Design Statement); this is awkward for parking and for pedestrians.

The other two stairwells have a foot passage round one side of the lift. The footway is at the height of the sill and very close to the sash window of the neighbouring flat, reducing the resident's privacy. Some windows become internal.

Access for the fire brigade, and other emergency services is along the service road. Drawing A800L incorporates a Fire Safety statement. Paragraph 6 is misleading, access through a lift with locked doors, or round a passageway, must be more difficult than through one entrance door.

In some respects, the proposals restrict or limit ease of access.

### **Design**

The existing elevation has large central sash windows at each storey vertically above the entrance door with direct access to the service road. The proposed infill is of brick with small sash windows with high sills (higher than all other sills on this elevation) on both sides of the central brick lift enclosure; it mimics rather than complements the existing building. This is not a 'lightweight intervention', nor is it 'low visibility' as referenced in the Planning Statement. A modern lift door is inappropriate as is the semi concealed narrow side passage of the walk round option, compared with the existing direct, central entry door.

The lightwells were designed to bring daylight and air into the flats and the stairwells. The proposed small sash windows only provide light and ventilation to the storerooms behind, not to the flat entrance halls or the stairwell which lose daylight and natural ventilation. I note the daylight assessment has been redacted.

The Heritage Statement (paragraph 5.12) references the consent given to the front block (on Highgate West Hill); that scheme did not incorporate lifts or enclosures but simply rebuilt the balconies with an elegant steel structure. The planning statement also references 61-63 Cartwright Gardens (2023/1760/P). This is a hotel, backing on to the London School of Hygiene and Tropical Medicine; the proposed lift is accessed from inside the hotel and does not restrict access to the road or services.

In my opinion, the design does not preserve or enhance the appearance of building.

Harriet King