

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2024/5468/P	Lynn Kramer	24/01/2025 20:30:32	COMMNT	<p>There is no consensus about the addition of lifts. Currently there is at least 1 leaseholder in each block who is opposed to it. In block 3, there are 6 leaseholders out of 8 who are opposed to their installation. The installation of lifts would be an improvement rather than necessary maintenance so that each leaseholder would need to consent to their lease being varied.</p> <p>It makes little sense to graft lifts onto the back of a building in poor condition, including a serious drain issue which has been going on for years. When it rains, the basement becomes flooded, and now even the back entry/exit area of Block 2 has been flooded for weeks with the only access via a temporary bridge. There has been no assurance that every faulty drain will be replaced, as well as dealing with other remedial work here. Temporary fixes over the years have been employed, possibly because of the focus by some on lifts, and will no doubt now cost a great deal of additional money which many of us here do not have. I understand that even the lifts cannot be fully costed until work actually begins.</p> <p>I am a ground floor leaseholder aged 80 and am very concerned that if lifts were installed and, for whatever reason, were stuck or held up on an upper floor, the emergency services would not then have immediate access to someone who needed it. Like others here, I have a 'Rescue Pendant' which would enable Camden's Careline service to also access my flat in an emergency. A few years ago I suddenly became very ill and would almost certainly have died had not a relative been staying with me.</p> <p>Others have already made the point about the further loss of light from losing a window as well as loss of privacy, both of which are to some extent inevitable on the ground floor, but further reduction will be hard to tolerate.</p> <p>I also think it will be a daunting prospect to have to wait outside in all weathers for the lift to descend in order to re-enter my flat. The back road is often preferable for many reasons, including being less slippery and risky for older residents in bad weather than the front path.</p>

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2024/5468/P	Alison Weisselberg	24/01/2025 17:13:54	SUPPRT	<ol style="list-style-type: none">1. The discussion about platform lifts for Brookfield has been going on since the first successful planning application was made in 2016. Claims to a lack of consultation cannot be justified. On every occasion when a vote has been taken there has been a majority in favour of lifts.2. Lifts for Brookfield will provide step-free access where none currently exists, even for the flats at the ground floor. Installation will meet modern legal requirements.3. Platform lifts are considerably more reliable and quieter than any alternative lift type and speed over three floors for two flats per floor should be a minor consideration when stairs remain readily available but are denied to those with disability for whom waiting is not an over-riding consideration. The lift design allows for a conventional lift on replacement if preferred in the future4. Payment for the replacement of the balconies incorporated in the design is lessees' responsibility, payment for the lift is optional. Incorporation of the lifts within the replacement balcony structure reduces the individual cost for all residents.5. Walk-through lifts remain open at ground level at all times unless in use. In case of fire Brookfield has two doors per stairwell, front and back; residents therefore have a choice of exit. In the unlikely event of a platform lift being stuck above ground, [and much less likely than a conventional passenger lift] residents still have a safe exit.6. In the event of fire all residents are required to exit from the front door unaffected by the lift scheme and need to congregate in the front garden with escape access to the Heath. For fire fighters platform lifts provide ground floor access at all time because there is no pit below and the floor is continuous.7. Where a stairwell lift door might be blocked for any reason, use of one of the other three doors apart, there exists a gate that is available to all residents from the service road to the front garden that does not require access through the building.8. Light loss to the little corridor windows is claimed when most residents have bars, obscured glass or blinds. These remain closed most of the time for privacy and security. The windows are rarely opened into the stagnant air circulating within the recess. The air coming in the new outward facing window will be much fresher and brighter.9. The original 1905 design for Brookfield had two goods lifts per stairwell. The modern replacement requires only a single lift.

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2024/5468/P	Susan Budd	26/01/2025 16:13:10	INT	<p>I have lived in a first-floor flat at Brookfield for 25 years. Whilst providing lifts at the rear is undoubtedly a convenience, I am concerned about this proposal for several reasons.</p> <p>The proposed structure will greatly reduce natural light on the stairwell and in my entrance hall, and will reduce the flow of cooler air from the rear alley into my flat. We must now assume that we are increasingly likely to have spells of very hot weather, some of the flats can already become unpleasantly warm. This change especially affects elderly women like me.</p> <p>Financially, the proposal to renew the balconies and tidy up the rear of the building is not only very overdue but paying for it is clear; all leaseholders must contribute to it equally. Could not level access to the ground floor be provided at this stage in any case? We have little idea of the additional sum involved in providing lifts, and many may reasonably object to paying for the extra cost of their installation and maintenance since they don't particularly benefit.</p> <p>To me, many aspects of the building need more urgent repair and routine maintenance; I have lived with an unsightly crash deck over the rear entrance for several years now, onto which nothing has fallen. The roof, the brickwork, the water pressure, and now the sewers are in urgent need of attention.</p>

2024/5468/P	Caroline Mustill	26/01/2025 12:11:50	OBJ	
-------------	------------------	---------------------	-----	--

A further comment sent in the light of others posted:

Re Accessibility:

Although – and perhaps because - a design for a lift at one end of the block which had had planning permission and a stair-lift at the other which satisfied all relevant buildings' and fire-risk regulations, were both voted down by residents and leaseholders in 2012, the proposal some years later that lifts for all be considered, met with little opposition and none from myself.

However, the length of time this has taken and the comments posted here bear witness to the unexpected complexity of this proposal, given the peculiarities of the site and the difficulty successive architects have had in producing a design that is practicable, affordable, and fulfils the purpose of accessibility for all without significant loss of light, ventilation or privacy, while remaining in character with the existing building. To give one small example, regarding accessibility: were the lift unavailable to my stairwell, the ambulant disabled would have to walk back down the service road and round to the Highgate Road to gain access to their flat via the path through the front garden. This compares badly with the immediate access we have at present.

In his comments, one of the proponents of this scheme states that their proposal "provides.... accessibility at no cost for those who do not at present value it". Yet it is hard to see what he means, given the absence of either a proper costing or a funding agreement.

While initially in favour of exploring the possibility of installing lifts at Brookfield, for all the reasons given by residents in their comments, with whom I have much sympathy, I have become convinced, with regret, that, for this building, there is no good option. Nevertheless, should the Council be minded to grant permission for this development and if the true motivation of the application is to make the building accessible to all residents and visitors alike, rather than as previously proposed, only on an exclusive basis to some residents, the Council must impose as a condition of the development that the lifts are, unconditionally, so accessible.

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2024/5573/P	John Bott	27/01/2025 00:01:17	OBJ	<p>I am the owner of West Cottage, 21 Hampstead Lane. I am the direct neighbour to the east of the application site. I wish to object to the application.</p> <p>I have read online the proposal and all available correspondence. I agree with and support the objections raised by other neighbours as well as the comments made by CAAC. In particular, that the cumulative impact of the approved application 2023/5037/P should be considered in relation to the current application.</p> <p>It does not appear that the new application is meaningfully different or improved from the refused application 2023/5407/P. Although the proposed building has been pushed back by a nominal 50-60 centimetres from the main house, this is more than offset in it's intrusive effect on neighbours by raising the apex of the roof from the previous flat 2.46m height to 3.97m, an increase of over 1.5m, which extra height has been used to increase high level glazing overlooking the neighbours to both sides. The effect of this would be most oppressive, both to my house and to no. 25 where the building appears to abut their garden wall.</p> <p>Although the proposal gives description and photo of a timber clad construction, in reality the drawings show virtually fully glazed openable doors/ windows to three sides of the building, with the obvious problems for neighbours of noise, light pollution, visual amenity and loss of privacy.</p>
