



London NW31LD
27th September, 2014

Camden Planning Consent
Planning Office, North West Team,
Camden Council

Dear Sir / Madam

**Planning Application - 2005/4439/P – renewal application about to be made 2014
Site Address Flat 1 30 Redington Road London NW3 7RB**

I have been advised that a renewal application for the extension is about to be lodged. I own the flat above the proposed development and will be severely and adversely impacted by the development.

The property development company owners are aware of the objections of the remaining flat owners in the building. They are also aware of the grounds for objection. I will set them out here in order that you may consider them fully in your appraisal for the renewal of planning consent.

Please take this letter as a formal objection to the proposed planning consent renewal application about to be lodged.

The grounds for the objection are:

- 1/ Overcrowding of a space designed for fewer buildings and occupancy.
- 2/ Spoiling the nature and character of the area due to excessive building.
- 3/ The height of the building extension would impact would be to deny the security of other flats in the levels above by allowing easy access to burglars from the ground level direct access to windows and doors of the flats above. This creates a severe impact on the use of the flats above by causing a persistent breach of the sense of peaceful enjoyment by the creation of a sense of insecurity not previously existing.
- 4/ The size of the extension would reduce the amount of garden area in sacrifice to more buildings area impacts the use of surrounding flats by creating a sense of overcrowding. This would be a significant change in the environmental sense of space and calm the flats immediately above and around currently enjoy.
- 5/ Blocking access for firefighters to the back garden in the event of fire at the upper back levels of the premises.
- 6/ Photographs of the pile drivers which are required to construct the buildings have been produced. This will create excessive and unbearable noise.

7/ The normal building works and noise and disturbance from plant and machinery will blight the land for the period of the building. This will mean that the flat above will not be available to let. This will deny the rent from letting. The flat above is currently let and the loss of income will be in the region of £50,000 per year. The loss is substantial and is a severe impact.

8/ The dust raised from the building works will be substantial and have a severe impact on the use of the flat above. This will lead to illness in the baby and young child occupying the flat above.

9/ The act of building itself is a non residential use of the building. Flat 1 is occupied by a tenant and has been for some years. The building work is not undertaken by a resident. It is undertaken by a non resident development company. This is a breach of the use of the premises for residential purposes. The act of building is clearly commercial.

10/ The use of the new building would be to allow more residents to occupy the site. This would put a strain on the drainage for the building. This was badly impacted some years ago when the drains became blocked. Inspection showed that this was due to mal use. Also it would increase the demand on space for refuse disposal, which is limited at the front of the house.

11/ Builders, decorators and potentially others for different uses will have access to the roof of the proposed extension (as well as potential burglars, see 2 above). This will have a negative impact on the privacy of the flats above as there will be a view into the flat immediately above.

12/ The design of the building is inconsistent with the surrounding environment in that it takes up too much space. Whereas the surrounding environment is designed to provide a sense of space and openness.

13/ The design of the building is too modern.

14/ The use of pile drivers has been explained previously. The idea is to drive the piles within inches of the existing building. This will severely impact the foundations and walls of the building leaving them unsafe.

15/ the building would be unlawful. This is because the headlease requires that the extension requires the FULL discretionary consent of the other flat owners. Note, there is no clause relating to REASONABLENESS. I am advising you that you have hereby received notice that the majority of flat owners have and continue to withhold consent. Thus, with consent being withheld it would be unlawful to proceed with the extension. Providing planning consent would be to aid an unlawful act and would therefore be unlawful in itself and therefore it should not be possible for consent to be granted in such circumstances.

For all these reasons, please confirm that you will reject planning consent for the renewal of the application.

Kind regards,

Yours faithfully,

Peter Corner