

Application N	Consultees Name	Recipient Address	Received	Comment	Response
2025/1210/P	Eric Hayward & Adriano Tosi for & on behalf of LCRA	10 Lytton Court Barter Street London WC1A 2AH	09/04/2025 17:16:28	OBJ	<p>The freehold of this building was sold at auction at the beginning of December 2023. Shortly thereafter, 9 of the 11 tenants formed the Lytton Court Residents Association (“LCRA”) on whose behalf I now write. On 22nd May 2024, LCRA commenced Collective Enfranchisement proceedings against the freeholder (“F/H”) but, since then, we have experienced a succession of delaying tactics by F/H, seemingly intended to block, or at least delay, our right to buy the freehold. The latest such tactic is a claim that enfranchisement is not possible because the building is not “self contained”. The lack of such “containment” appears not to have precluded F/H from lodging this application. We await a date for a hearing at the High Court to oblige F/H to come to the table after an unnecessary delay of almost a year.</p> <p>The application itself is, at least in part, ‘economical with the truth’. Maddox Planning claim (Para C.5) that a meeting was held with leaseholders on 14th January 2025. To the best of my knowledge no LCRA member attended such a meeting. Personally, I was out of the country at the time and so informed F/H by e-mail dated 07th January 2025. By the same note, I requested a copy of the Minutes of the meeting: I received neither acknowledgement, nor any Minutes. Moreover, Maddox claims that consultation letters were sent to neighbouring properties on 19th February 2025. No such letters were sent to any member of LCRA. Indeed, the first indication we received of any proposed development was an Article 13 Notice from Maddox dated 18th March 2025. In light of the limited time and information available, we would ask that this representation be regarded as an initial response, with further detail to be provided as soon as possible.</p> <p>In the meantime, we would make the following observations on, and objections to, the planning application.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Our respective leases contain provision for “Quiet Enjoyment”. Can the removal of the entire roof and, in particular, the break-up of reinforced concrete floors at each level of the building (to provide a new smoke vent and thereby causing intolerable noise, dust and vibration), be considered as Quiet Enjoyment? 2. Can extension of the existing stair to provide access to the new 4th and 5th floors be completed without restricting the rights of the existing tenants to a Means of Escape in the event of fire? Following Grenfell, this matter is of paramount concern to the 3rd floor tenants who include 77-year-old Blue Badge holder and a one-month-old baby. 3. In light of the recent London Olympic Village fine of £432 million (for fire safety defects arising as a result of the rush for building without due consideration for the safety and long-term repercussions on peoples’ lives), we object that such matters are being overlooked in the current application. 4. Can a new lift genuinely be classified as a means of escape, even in exceptional circumstances? 5. Can the proposed 4th and 5th floors be provided without provision of a secondary means of escape?

Application N	Consultees Name	Recipient Address	Received	Comment	Response
					6. Can prospective tenants of the 4th and 5th floors satisfactorily escape whilst the door to the stairwell from the 3rd floor is open?
					7. Can full and complete coverage of a temporary roof structure be accomplished by way of scaffolding from only the West and North elevations? Support from the East elevation cannot be provided.
					8. Does the construction of a new 3-bedroom penthouse flat comply with LB Camden's policy of providing accessible housing?
					Further detail will be provided as soon as possible.
