

## Dike, Darlene

---

**From:** Miller, Hugh  
**Sent:** 03 September 2014 15:07  
**To:** Planning  
**Subject:** FW: Ornan Court 2014/4206/P  
**Attachments:** RE: Ornan Court 2014/4206/P

Please log to M3

Hugh Miller  
Planning Officer

Telephone: 020 7974 2624

---

**From:** Currie, Tom (Councillor)  
**Sent:** 02 September 2014 10:43  
**To:** Miller, Hugh  
**Cc:** Markwell, Jonathan; Stark, Stephen (Councillor)  
**Subject:** Ornan Court 2014/4206/P

Dear Hugh,

I am writing in objection to the above proposed development at Ornan Court. As per the attached email, I have been informed by Jonathan Markwell that, as you were on holiday during the consultation period, any objections submitted during week beginning 1<sup>st</sup> September would be taken into account before you reach your decision.

I understand that the current class usage of the building is C4 (a house in multiple occupation), and not a C3 dwelling house, which is the class usage on the submitted application. The application is therefore flawed from the outset.

The applicants made the boreholes for the groundwater measurement during the time of year when rainfall is at its lowest. I believe that Ornan Road was flooded in 2002, and so it is irresponsible to take measurements when the water level is not at its peak. The applicant should be made to take borehole measurements during the winter months, when rainfall is at its highest. I also understand that, during renovations to flat 1 of Rosslyn Court (the neighbouring building), an underground spring was discovered. This makes proper measurement of the water level all the more imperative.

The Victorian foundations of Ornan Court are not stable. Cracks are noticeable throughout the building, caused by movement that is not long-standing. During previous works to the building, further cracks were created, although the developers naturally denied all involvement and the residents had to make repairs at their own cost.

The Lifetime Homes Assessment states that "Car parking will be provided via permit spaces on the street". This is in clear breach of Camden's own car-free development policy, and indicates that the developers do not understand the planning rules in the borough.

Finally, and perhaps most worryingly, the Design & Access Statement states that "Ornan Court is red brick double fronted mansion block comprising four storeys plus a mansard roof." Ornan Court has **five** storeys plus a mansard roof. Such an elementary error in the planning application is extremely troubling, and the basis of the applicant's evidence must be drawn into doubt on this

point alone. If they have based their findings on an incorrect number of floors in the building, then it could have potentially disastrous consequences.

Several residents have submitted objections to this scheme, and have gone into great detail on the flaws of the BIA alone. My predecessor, Chris Knight, also objected to the previous basement development in Orman Court, which was so similar as to be identical. There are too many questions not answered, and the fact that the boreholes were drilled during the dry months; that there are already cracks in the building; that the applicant does not understand the car-free development rules in Camden; and that the applicant is unable to even count the number of storeys upon which they make their entire assessment, must bring the application into disrepute.

I would encourage you to reject the application.

Kind regards,

Tom

**Councillor Tom Currie**  
**Hampstead Town Ward**  
**Conservative Party**  
Camden Town Hall  
Judd Street  
London WC1H 9JE

Tel: 07783 401 129

