


Hi Matthew,

thanks for you help on the phone just now, much appreciated. Below is the email I sent to Raymond Yeung last week and which he confirmed he'd received on Monday 23rd March, five days ago. As I said, despite my daily calls it is still not on the comments page for the application above. If you could post it there this afternoon I'd be very grateful; I'm keen for neighbours to see it before they make their comments this weekend.



Thanks again for your help, and have a good weekend,


Michael.



Dear Raymond Yeung,

thanks for your help on the phone, and for your letter and details of the planning application at my address, **1, Kingdon Road, London NW6 1PJ**, ref **2015/0388/P**, which I have now viewed on Camden's website.

I confirm that I am the Leaseholder and occupier at Flat B, 1, Kingdon Road, living two floors above the proposed development, and that this is my sole, permanent home.



My comments and questions concerning material facts of the planning application are as follows:

1. The application is unclear as to who is the applicant and who is the agent; I would like clarification on this since Mary Mannering, the current owner, is not listed as either. Mr Shimshon Torn-Hibler is cited as both the agent and the applicant, with the architect Mrs Ronit Conforti-Brinkmann also cited as the agent.
2. My details on the application form are incomplete. My full address is Flat B, 1 Kingdon Road, London NW6 1PJ. Could these please be amended?
3. The plans look detailed, yet there is apparently **no kitchen** in the architectural drawings of the Lower Ground Floor flat. How would this be viable as a separate flat with no kitchen? Would the two proposed flats remain connected by the currently existing internal stairs?
4. Despite drawings of a wheelchair user in the plans, there is no disabled access to either flat, only several concrete steps up to the Upper Ground Floor Flat and the same down to the Lower Ground Floor flat. How would a wheelchair user access either flat?
5. Three toilets are proposed for the Lower Ground Floor (why so many in a 2 bedroom flat?), and two toilets for the Upper Ground Floor (in a 1 bedroom flat); a total of **5 toilets** and **3 bath and shower rooms**, yet the answer to Question 11 on the application form re how foul sewage would be disposed of is "Unknown". The question re connecting to the main drainage system is also answered "Unknown". How would foul sewage from 5 toilets, and waste water from 3 bathrooms, plus 1 or 2 kitchens, be disposed of?

6. Currently only one water main serves the whole building, with very low water pressure being experienced by both upper floors, even without any water being used on the Ground and Lower Ground floors. Is there a guarantee that the proposed works would include a **dedicated main for each** of the new flats, and that the pressure of the existing supply to the building would not be compromised in any way?

7. Question 16 on the application form claims that would be no "trade waste or effluent" from the proposed works. How would such an extensive development produce no waste?

8. The answer to Question 15 on the application form claims there are no trees or hedges on or near the development site. This is **incorrect**, and elsewhere in the application, including the plans, removal of the mature chestnut tree in the garden is clearly stated. **I strongly object** to the removal of this healthy and mature tree; it is a long-standing part of the natural landscape, provides shade and shelter on sunny and windy days, produces valuable oxygen and is home to birds, squirrels and other wildlife. Removal of this tree with its mature root structures, as confirmed in a year 2000 **Tree Surgeon's report**, could cause **significant damage** to the foundations of 1 Kingdon Road, the party wall with Dene Mansions, and Dene Mansions itself. Could the tree be trimmed/pollarded instead? Why would it have to be removed? No argument has been put forward. Is a new, independent tree survey to be carried out?

9. The answer to Question 18 re loss or gain of non-residential floorspace is answered no. How can this be correct when a significant part of the existing garden would have an extension built on it?

10. Question 24 re the site being visible from a public footpath or land is answered "no". The site is clearly visible from the garden and paths of Dene Mansions next door. Does this constitute public land?

11. Question 25 re Certificates: I have not received notification from the applicant, Mr Torn-Hibler, only from the architect Mrs Conforti-Brinkmann, and I am grateful to her for this. This may relate to my question above as to who is the applicant and who the agent. I have emailed Mr Torn-Hibler, via the suggested Cedar Estates who are handling the property, and I am grateful to Mr Torn-Hibler for allowing me to contact him. I have not heard back from him as yet, but I said in my email that if he did not want to reply that would be fine.

12. Whether or not these proposed works would in any way be a continuation of the abandoned 2012 works, I would like an independent, full structural survey to be carried out to ascertain the condition of the entire building before any work might start. Also, would the current Buildings Insurance from The Prudential cover the building during the proposed works?

13. Would Camden Building Control oversee the **entire** works from start to finish, and would all companies and individuals involved in such works have full public liability insurance? The 2012 works were not properly overseen, were chaotic and disruptive, and a gas main was severed, putting the entire building and street in great danger.

14. Would all new windows and doors match those existing on the whole building, and would any external masonry repairs, plastering and painting be extended to the whole building to match?

In conclusion: I am not against something positive and beneficial happening to the maisonette, it has been empty and derelict for far too long and is an eyesore and a security liability, but before I decide whether or not I am in favour of this proposed development I need responses to all the above comments and questions please.

I would also like it noted that I bought my flat in this building in the knowledge it comprises just three flats, as do all the surrounding converted houses. The change to four flats, an exception in Kingdon Road, could have a detrimental effect on my quality of life through noise pollution, extra car parking required, refuse disposal, demand on water and drainage services as mentioned above, as well as the noise and inconvenience of the works themselves.

I am also concerned about the inaccuracies and inconsistencies in the application itself, and particularly the threat to the mature, healthy chestnut tree; the removal of which could cause serious and irreparable damage to the building. No argument in favour of the tree's destruction has been put forward.

I ask that my comments, questions and concerns are given careful consideration before a decision is made on the application. I would also be grateful if you could send me an acknowledgement that this email has been received by you, and that it was received within the 21 day period of consultation.

Many thanks, and with kind regards,

Michael.

Michael Jenn
Flat B,
1 Kingdon Road,
London NW6 1PJ.