

Application N	Consultees Name	Recipient Address	Received	Comment	Response
2025/1489/P	Farbod	Flat 12 Alban House 5 Sumpter Close London NW3 5JR	07/05/2025 18:12:47	OBJ	<p>I am the owner and resident of Flat 12, Alban House, on the third-floor front directly facing Holy Trinity Church. I write to OBJECT to this application. In addition to the serious policy breaches, the latest plans introduce further unacceptable impacts—roof-level plant, overlooking, security risks from fixed ladders, uncontrolled bell noise (new addition), fire-safety failures (now critical since Alban House is a registered High-Risk Building), and inconsistent, obstructive parking proposals. This is a full redevelopment, not a refurbishment, and the church has repeatedly ignored our noise complaints in the past.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Overlooking &amp; Loss of Privacy (Policy A1) <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. The church proposes a bank of oversized skylights angled directly into our primary rooms—our bedrooms and living room—effectively turning our home into a display for worshippers and staff. This blatant invasion of privacy is wholly unacceptable.</li> <li>b. Their new first-floor recording studio sits almost cheek-by-jowl with our living spaces, eroding any sense of personal sanctuary and flagrantly breaching our right to quiet enjoyment.</li> <li>c. A PV maintenance walkway and additional rooflight apertures create permanent elevated sightlines into our windows. There's not a single louvre, fixed screen or privacy measure shown to stop prying eyes.</li> <li>d. Worse still, the enlarged roof footprint pushes toward Alban House, breaking the established rear alignment set by 120 Finchley Road and Lief House—and crushing what little seclusion we have left.</li> </ol> </li> <li>2. Security Risk from Fixed Ladders (Policy A1) <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. The introduction of permanent external ladders and an open roof walkway effectively bridges Holy Trinity Church's roof to the balconies of our front flat, creating a direct route for unauthorised access. In this area—identified as high-crime on the Metropolitan Police map—this is nothing short of a security hazard. Yet the plans show no locked hatches, no gated enclosures and no controlled access protocols to protect residents. (Annex 1)</li> </ol> </li> <li>3. Uncontrolled Bell Noise (Policy A4 &amp; BS 4142) <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. The church currently has no bells, yet now proposes to install one on the side elevation directly above our entrance path—subjecting us to peak levels in excess of 80 dB(A) at 10 m whenever it rings. There are no restrictions on ringing hours, no acoustic attenuation specifications, nor any removal-if-breached clause—totally unacceptable given the church's long history of ignoring our noise complaints made to Camden in the past.</li> <li>b. This uncontrolled bell installation flagrantly violates Alban House residents' right to peaceful enjoyment of their homes and undermines our basic amenity.</li> </ol> </li> <li>4. Roof-Level Plant Noise &amp; Proximity (Policy A4 &amp; BS 4142) <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. Immediate proximity to living spaces The ASHPs and AHUs are shown within 10 m of our bedrooms and living rooms, yet the application provides no predicted façade noise levels, no enclosure drawings and no attenuation specifications. Without this, there is no certainty these machines will meet even daytime limits—let alone protect residents' peace.</li> <li>b. Borderline assessment ignores night-time and ageing The submitted noise report claims plant noise would sit just on the border of acceptability, but it studiously avoids any assessment of night-time operation when background levels drop. Worse, there is no consideration of wear-and-tear: as these units age, their noise output invariably rises, meaning they will quickly breach Camden's limits and leave us with a persistent nuisance.</li> </ol> </li> </ol>

Application N	Consultees Name	Recipient Address	Received	Comment	Response
					<p>c. Unmodelled uses exacerbate cumulative impact Worship amplification, café activity and the proposed recording studio are entirely excluded from the noise modelling. Our living rooms already shudder with early-morning service noise on Sundays—our only full day off—and the risk is that these new plant installations will simply amplify an already intolerable level of disturbance. Without enforceable mitigation measures or post-installation testing conditions, this amounts to a licence to flood our homes with sound.</p> <p>d. Skylights as noise conduits The very rooflights intended to boost daylight will also act as acoustic funnels, channelling church noise directly into our flats. No studies have been provided to demonstrate their impact—or even whether they are fixed or openable. With loud services early on Sunday mornings, openable skylights would be disastrous for any hope of rest.</p> <p>e. In short, the combined effect of ill-sited plant and untested noise sources represents a serious threat to the quality of life of front-facing flats, including my own. Without full noise-breakout assessments, robust attenuation designs and binding post-installation testing conditions, this element of the proposal must be refused.</p> <p>5. Failure to Safeguard the Legal Right of Way</p> <p>a. The G+0 Proposed Plan aggressively encroaches on the narrow side-passage that is our sole eastern fire-escape route—yet the application makes no mention of this critical right of way, includes no land-registry plan or ownership certificates, and offers no protection for our access. This glaring omission breaches the Town &amp; Country Planning (Development Management Procedure) Order 2015.</p> <p>b. The church has already demolished our secure, permanent steps and substituted them with unstable scaffold steps, flagrantly ignoring basic health-and-safety obligations and placing every resident at risk.</p> <p>c. They now propose to cram this vital escape corridor with oversized bin stores and bicycle racks, further narrowing the route and creating a life-threatening obstacle in the event of fire or medical emergency.</p> <p>6. Daylight, Sunlight &amp; Right to Light (Policy A1 &amp; Camden Amenity SPG)</p> <p>a. By raising the parapet to 63.73 m FFL and punching six 1.5 m×1.5 m skylights into the roof, the proposal will cast deep shadows over our rear flats—robbing us of natural light and breaching BRE guidance. Yet there isn't a single BRE-compliant daylight/sunlight report or 25° -sky-angle diagram included to demonstrate that our homes won't be plunged into perpetual gloom.</p> <p>7. Scale, Massing &amp; Visual Impact (Policy D1 &amp; Camden Design Guidance)</p> <p>a. The bulky three-storey infill at the Finchley Road corner and soaring parapet walls loom over our homes and dominate the street scene—yet there is no Heritage or Townscape Impact Assessment to justify such overbearing massing.</p> <p>b. Vast expanses of off-white render and full-height glazing will cast harsh glare into our windows on sunny days, but the application provides no solar-gain or anti-glare study to show how this risk will be mitigated.</p> <p>c. By pushing the building line forward beyond 120 Finchley Road and Lief House, the extension shatters the established rhythm of the block and sits jarringly out of sync with its neighbours.</p> <p>d. There is no maintenance or cleaning plan for the pristine white render—on one of London's busiest junctions, it will rapidly stain, streak and decay, turning into a grubby eyesore that drags</p>

Application N	Consultees Name	Recipient Address	Received	Comment	Response
					<p>down the character of the streetscape.</p> <p>8. Construction Management &amp; Public Safety (Policy A1)</p> <p>a. The Construction Management Plan remains a blank pro-forma—with no contractor details, no phasing schedule, no hoarding layout and no pedestrian-diversion strategy to protect the side-passage. We have zero confidence that our sole fire-escape route will remain clear and safe throughout demolition and construction.</p> <p>9. Transport, Servicing &amp; Cycle Parking (Policies T1, T2 &amp; A1)</p> <p>a. Only six long-stay staff cycle spaces are proposed; there are no short-stay stands for visitors, worshippers or café users. This will force ad-hoc parking along the narrow side-passage, obstructing our legal right of way and creating a trip hazard for residents and delivery personnel.</p> <p>b. Bin stores and servicing bays are tucked immediately alongside this same passage without any swept-path drawings or safety management plan. These bulky installations will block vital pedestrian access, endangering residents—especially during emergency evacuations or urgent medical call-outs.</p> <p>10. Parking Discrepancy &amp; Emergency Access Obstruction (Policies A1 &amp; T2)</p> <p>a. The application repeatedly claims there is no on-site parking, yet elsewhere admits to leasing two spaces and even owning two bays. This glaring inconsistency destroys any confidence in the accuracy—or honesty—of the submission.</p> <p>b. Those very parking bays are drawn immediately beside our entrance, blocking the fire riser and creating a lethal obstacle that would prevent fire engines or ambulances from reaching our building in an emergency. This directly contravenes safe-access requirements and puts every resident at unacceptable risk.</p> <p>11. Sustainability vs. Amenity Conflicts (Policies CC5 &amp; CC8)</p> <p>a. The proposed rooflights and PV array, while touted for energy gains, will act as conduits for noise breakout and create additional solar glare into our homes—yet the application provides no integrated acoustic-thermal modelling to demonstrate that these climate measures won't seriously erode our quality of life.</p> <p>b. There is no binding commitment to carry out post-installation verification of plant noise, glazing performance or rooflight sealing once the works are completed. Without enforced re-testing and recalibration clauses, there is zero guarantee that these systems will continue to meet both Camden's noise limits and the carbon-reduction targets over time.</p> <p>12. Fire Safety &amp; High-Risk Building Status (Building Safety Act 2022 &amp; Approved Document B)</p> <p>a. Since the Grenfell tragedy, Alban House has been officially designated a High-Risk Building under the Building Safety Act 2022. Any adjacent development must submit a comprehensive Fire Strategy, including riser locations, evacuation modelling, smoke-ventilation measures and formal liaison protocols with the London Fire Brigade.</p> <p>b. The side-passage is our sole eastern fire-escape route; the proposed extensions, unsecured ladders and exposed plant would physically obstruct and critically compromise emergency egress.</p> <p>c. Roof-plant equipment—particularly air-source heat pumps—introduces additional mechanical fire-risks immediately above residential flats. Yet there are no fire-rated enclosures, sprinkler interfaces or smoke-barrier designs, in clear breach of Approved Document B and Camden's Fire Safety Checklist.</p> <p>d. Heat pumps and similar plant carry a well-documented risk of electrical or refrigerant fires;</p>

Application N	Consultees Name	Recipient Address	Received	Comment	Response
					<p>locating them directly above occupied bedrooms and living rooms massively increases the danger of fire spread into Alban House.</p> <p>e. The proposed height and proximity of this plant in front of our building are wholly unnecessary; all mechanical equipment can be accommodated elsewhere onsite without endangering our amenity or life-safety.</p> <p>Without these critical fire-safety measures—especially for a registered High-Risk Building—this application must be refused.</p> <p>Given these cumulative and intolerable impacts on our legal rights, daylight, privacy, noise, security, parking, visual amenity, public safety and fire-safety obligations, I therefore urge Camden Council to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Refuse this application outright; or</li> <li>• Require a complete redesign to remove rooftop plant, skylights, bell relocation, recording studio, fixed ladders, the three-storey infill and any obstructive parking;</li> <li>• Guarantee the side-passage right of way remains unobstructed, supported by accurate boundary plans and legal protections;</li> <li>• Mandate full BRE daylight/sunlight, BS 4142 noise, acoustic-thermal and glare performance reports;</li> <li>• Insist on a fully populated, site-specific Construction Management Plan that safeguards access, diversion routes and health &amp; safety;</li> <li>• Secure a robust Fire Strategy, evacuation modelling and high-service fire-safety measures compliant with post-Grenfell legislation.</li> </ul> <p>Without these fundamental amendments and enforceable conditions, this proposal must be refused to protect the amenity, security and very safety of Alban House residents.</p>

---

Application N	Consultees Name	Recipient Address	Received	Comment	Response
2025/1489/P	gillian brown	flat 7 Alban House Sumpter Close  NW3 5JR	07/05/2025 17:45:23	COMMNT	<p>G &amp; D McMillan, flat 7 Alban House NW3</p> <p>We have many concerns regarding the proposed Rebuild of Holy Trinity Church. These works will adversely affect residents established amenities. The dramatically increased roof height with its proximity to residents living rooms takes away privacy which was established in 1978. Additionally the skylights will look directly into residents living rooms. Preliminary discussions with the Church representative failed to mention the addition of a recording studio, roof proximity, permanent ladder access &amp; Bell right in front of our building with the inevitable loss of privacy &amp; associated noise problems. We already have outstanding noise complaints which havent been addressed.</p> <p>AH is designated as a high risk tall building (7 storey) yet we have issues with blocking &amp; dismantling our fire escapes &amp; even access to our own front is compromised by church vehicles parking directly in front of the fire hydrant leaving no access for buggies, wheelchairs or even ambulance service.</p> <p>The Church states it has no parking spaces yet further in the application they refer to parking spaces &amp; blocking our passage from/to Finchley Road. As we understand it the parking area is owned by Lief House, which also has plans to expand, thus impacting the lives of AH residents &amp; removing our rights of peaceful enjoyment as in original lease.</p> <p>Security is a major worry - see police reports - and yet the Church proposes to erect permanent ladders adjacent to entrance &amp; front flats &amp; balconies. The Church now wants to place a Bell right in front of AH. There's not been a bell since 1978 when original church was demolished. So AH will have skylights, a raised &amp; intrusive high roof, a recording studio &amp; bell in front of a building which was sold by the Church as a safe, quiet location off the busy Finchley Road, see original brochure.</p> <p>There's a worrying absence of Construction Management Plan which should be mandatory in a reconstruction of this size &amp; scale - its NOT a refurbishment as stated. As in their aborted 2017 planning application which was never ratified &amp; subsequently withdrawn many years later.</p> <p>We have always tried to be considerate neighbours, quite often cleaning the parking area at our own expense (to which we have a right of way) There are 24 flats in AH &amp; yet the impact on these many resident has not been addressed or considered.</p> <p>There's no detail on access to the proposed cycle park which abuts our land at Garage &amp; lower Garden level. Most importantly this area is a main Fire Exit from AH Garages &amp; Landings to the Finchley Road. Is the locked gate (fire access by keypad) to be used to access bike &amp; bin store? And will this area be used to store materials for the duration of the major rebuild?</p> <p>Without further consideration or detail (by Church) we ask that you reject this application. Please redact our personal details = email &amp; mob no etc</p>