

Subject:

FW: planning permission objection

From: Davey Miracco

Sent: 11 September 2014 00:46

To: Heather, Christopher

Subject: Re: planning permission objection

Dear Christopher, Heather

I would like to submit to you some history and evidence that I believe will give credence to not granting planning permission for sub basement building on 23 Rochester road NW1.

I have owned the leasehold on the top floor flat since 1992 and have an understanding of the history of the building and surrounding properties.

The property has often fallen into neglect as the freeholder has never willingly maintained it and as a result it has been left to me to fight legally to protect it.

I wish to note a case in point.

In 1995 structural damage began to appear in various parts of the building and after much negotiation, with Marksglade Ltd (freeholder) Eagle Star insurance appointed loss adjusters "mclarens Toplis of Maidstone, Kent branch (case ref: 188/960526/SGH/LAA) to carry out structural reports and monitoring which continued through 1996 to 1999, when it was finally concurred that substantial subsidence had occurred to the front and rear of the house as well as to the drainage system.

Considerable works were then undertaken to underpin, remove trees, repair roof, renew drains and repair internal & external cracks throughout the property.

Through this five year period the movement was so excessive that a crack at the rear of the property connecting the added 1975 extension to the original 1890's building was one and a half inches wide.

I could see daylight through the side wall and roof joins resulting in water damage and damp which I had to cosmetically repair while awaiting the loss adjusters 5 year verdict.

I have numerous correspondences from the loss adjusters as well as the full schedule of the works carried out by Archer-Hoblin Ltd, of west hampstead (case ref: T1499/DM.nt)

I therefore conclude that it would be a foolhardy decision to build under such an unstable property causing not only damage to this property but also of surrounding properties as the effects of such works may not be immediately evident.

Suffice to say that I would personally be afflicted with great financial loss my greater concern is the stress of another drawn out legal wrangling that will not only involve myself but numerous other parties inclusive of neighbours.

I understand the planning regulations are very stringent and many guidelines are to be adhered to as well as the process of your own surveyors and engineers so I hope this information may be of some use.

Awaiting your conclusion on this matter and if I can be of any further use please do not hesitate to contact me,

Regards,

Mr.D.Miracco

Christopher Heather

Senior Planning Officer

Regeneration and Planning

Culture and Environment

London Borough of Camden

Telephone: 020 7974 1344

Web: camden.gov.uk

Second Floor
5 Pancras Square
London N1C 4AG

Please consider the environment before printing this email.

On 5 Sep 2014, at 10:42, "Heather, Christopher" <Christopher.Heather@camden.gov.uk> wrote:

Mr Miracco,

Thanks for the email and it will be considered when a decision is made. Please follow the link below to see details of the planning application, and if having reviewed this you wish to make further comments then by all means do so.

<http://planningrecords.camden.gov.uk/Northgate/PlanningExplorer17/GeneralSearch.aspx>

Regards,

Christopher Heather
Senior Planning Officer

Telephone: 020 7974 1344

From: davey miracco [REDACTED]
Sent: 05 September 2014 10:24
To: Heather, Christopher
Subject: planning permission objection

Dear Mr.Heather,

Following our conversation i wish to make a formal objection of planning permission to 23 Rochester road NW1 case no: 2014/4559/P.

I am a leaseholder ,of the top flat,in the same house of proposed sub level extension.I have been a leaseholder since 1992 and have in my time been witness to structural movement in the house to the extent that the rear of the property was moving away from the original structure to the point that from inside you could view directly outside through the wall to daylight.

This case was taken up with the freeholder and insurer and took many years to negotiate to settlement inclusive of surveyors and structural engineers reports.

I do not want a repeat of this and so wish to object to any sub level extension which will effect in any way the movement of ground,foundations and structural integrity of a building built in 1890 with insufficient foundations on a clay base.
I believe that this would be foolhardy and effect the value of numerous surrounding properties.

If there are any further processes that i need to take up to object to this case can you please in form me.

Yours concerned,

Mr D Miracco
23 Rochester Road NW1

This e-mail may contain information which is confidential, legally privileged and/or copyright protected. This e- mail is intended for the addressee only. If you receive this in error, please contact the sender and delete the material from your computer.