

Rob,

Following our conversation on the phone a few weeks back, please see below the thoughts and comments of my wife (Jo) and I. We will try not to repeat and labour the points that Iain has already highlighted.

For context, Jo and I own the top floor unit at 62 Haverstock Hill and Jo is also a director of the Right to Manage company for 62 Haverstock Hill.

We would like to echo Iain's sentiment and say that we are pleased that something is finally being done to remove the derelict building that has blighted the area for so long. That property has been derelict for many years and was inhabited on and off by squatters for extended periods. As you can imagine, the squatters were a considerable nuisance, particularly with their late night rooftop parties, which gave them the ability to look straight into our flat and was quite threatening.

However, we too have some concerns that we would like to raise with you, which I have summarised below:

1. Loss of light

Firstly, referring to Drawing No 5865-12, I do not see any mention of or calculations relating to window W1/103 (which I believe has been incorrectly labelled, as there is already a W1/103 on the front of the house Drawing No. 5865 -13). This window provides light to the staircase within our flat and it would be good to understand the impact that the proposed development would have on it.

Secondly, and by far the most important impact on our flat, is that of the proposed development on the light to window W3/103. It is clear that the proposal sees the development built right up to the same height as our building and the impact on the light to this window, as seen in the calculations, is extremely significant. A loss of VSC of 49.59%! The report seems intent on brushing this situation under the carpet with the following comment "W3/103 serves a living room on the third floor.....with multiple windows and as such will retain good levels of daylight". I'd like to point out that there are 2 windows in that room and reducing the light to one by 49.6% means that the total impact of light to the room is almost 25%! This is not insignificant in my opinion or in the opinion of what is reasonable, defined in the report itself.

What is difficult to stomach is that this proposal is yet another example of how the owner of 62 Haverstock Hill / 201 Prince of Wales Rd has a complete disregard for the neighbouring properties. Indeed, he was content to leave the property derelict and inhabited by squatters for years until the council threatened him with a compulsory purchase order, and now he has submitted plans that once again seem to bear little or no regard for our building. It seems to me as though the top floor of the proposed development contains only 1 bedroom, plus a balcony. Surely it would be possible for the owner to keep his building to a maximum height of the 1st floor and still achieve the 3 flats that he desires?

It goes without saying that the loss of amenity, and potential loss of value as a result of this on our flat, is material and self-evident.

2. Large external balcony

A major issue we had with the squatters was loss of privacy as they frequently held parties on the roof which allowed them direct line of sight from very close proximity into our living room. That is clearly undesirable and from the plans I have seen it appears that this issue has not been resolved by the Proposed Development. Again, this raises concerns as to material loss of amenity, loss of privacy and concurrent loss of value to our property.

3. Impact of Proposed Development

From the architect's drawings provided it is not clear how the building will actually look once built. Accordingly, its amenity and interaction with the neighbouring properties cannot be effectively determined. In particular, I would like to understand what materials, colour scheme, render etc. will be applied to ensure it blends in to the locale.

4. Party Wall Agreement

Despite the Council making it clear to the Applicant that a party wall agreement would be required, we have not been approached to date. In addition, despite the suggestion from the council previously that the Applicant seek to engage with the owners of 62 Haverstock Hill pre-submission of revised plans, this opportunity has not been taken. It would be welcomed.

Further, as previously advised by RedBrick Management (our property managers) to the Council and the Applicant, the perilous state of 201 Prince of Wales road had caused major structural damage to 62 Haverstock Hill, as it was effectively pulling the 2 properties apart leading to a visible gapping between the two buildings.

5. Loss of Value

Local estate agents have advised that the Proposed Development may lead to a loss in value to our property in the region of 5%. In particular as it is currently tenanted there will likely be a material loss of value for the duration of the construction works (of unspecified duration) and an ongoing loss of rental and capital value due to the potential loss of amenity described above.

Regards,
Hugh & Joanna Gibson