

NAME: RUTH RYAN

ADDRESS: UNIT D & C3, 1st Floor, Linton House, 39-51 Highgate Road,
London, NW5 1RT

EMAIL: ruth.ryan@niallmclaughlin.com

TEL NO: [REDACTED]

PLANNING APPLICATION NOS: 2014/4387/P, 2014/4533/P, 2014/4618/P,
2014/46120/P, 2014/4616/P, 2014/4619/P

I 100% do not support these applications or any change of use status. As a tenant in Linton House, I am flabbergasted that a building which is not only totally occupied but ideally suited to the creative businesses it currently homes, is being allowed to change its use and displace these businesses. They provide vital employment within the area and there is no other suitable alternative accommodation for them to relocate to.

In particular my objections are:

2014/4387/P - 'Like for Like' Window Replacements. Is this planning permission actually required? I think not. This is just another way for the landlord to try and intimidate the tenants he is trying to make leave. They are protected by the landlord and tenants act yet he continues with veiled threats that he will make their lives unpleasant by changing the windows etc. I am therefore concerned and skeptical that this application is just another part of his tactics – in other words to make a point.

2014/4533/P – Replacement of Windows. I see no difference between this application and the one above. My comments are therefore the same.

2014/4618/P for 1st Floor. This is an increase from the original Permitted Development application for the first floor from 11 to 13 units. I am extremely concerned that even in the original application, not enough consideration or assessment was given to traffic, flood risk and contaminated land risk. This increase therefore just raises more cause for concern. Given that the original application cannot be amended only fresh applications, should these concerns not warrant reassessment of the original Prior Approval.

Flood risk is of particular concern especially in light of recent proposals for dams at Hampstead Heath Ponds.

I understand these points are legitimate grounds for refusal.

2014/46120/P – 2nd Floor. This is an increase from the original Permitted Development application for the second floor from 11 to 13 units. I am extremely concerned that even in the original application, not enough consideration or assessment was given to traffic, flood risk and contaminated land risk. This increase therefore just raises more cause for concern. Given that the original application cannot be amended only fresh applications, should these concerns not warrant reassessment of the original Prior Approval.

Flood risk is of particular concern especially in light of recent proposals for dams at Hampstead Heath Ponds.

I understand these points are legitimate grounds for refusal.

2014/4616/P – 3rd Floor. This is an increase from the original Permitted Development application for the third floor from 11 to 12 units. I am extremely concerned that even in the original application, not enough consideration or assessment was given to traffic, flood risk and contaminated land risk. This increase therefore just raises more cause for concern. Given that the original application cannot be amended only fresh applications, should these concerns not warrant reassessment of the original Prior Approval.

Flood risk is of particular concern especially in light of recent proposals for dams at Hampstead Heath Ponds.

I understand these points are legitimate grounds for refusal.

2014/4619/P 4th Floor. This is an increase from the original Permitted Development application to 12 units. I am extremely concerned that even in the original application, not enough consideration or assessment was given to traffic, flood risk and contaminated land risk. This increase therefore just raises more cause for concern. Given that the original application cannot be amended only fresh applications, should these concerns not warrant reassessment of the original Prior Approval.

Flood risk is of particular concern especially in light of recent proposals for dams at Hampstead Heath Ponds.

I understand these points are legitimate grounds for refusal.

All in all, this is a 14% increase since the previous PD application. How the applicant can also suggest that traffic will not increase is beyond me. There are already very few parking spaces. The increased number of units and the increase in visitors to those units will surely put more demand on already stretched parking situation.

