

| Application No: | Consultees Name: | Consultees Addr: | Received: | Comment: | Response: |
|-----------------|------------------|---|---------------------|----------|---|
| 2015/1849/P | LORNA FOWLER | 4 PRINCESS ROAD LONDON NW1 8JJ | 19/05/2015 22:28:50 | OBJEMPER | <p>This is a Conservation Area and the terrace to which 1 & 9 belong comprises the oldest houses in the road; they have a whole architectural integrity distinct within the road. Since they precede the rest of the Princess Road houses they link to the roofs of those in St. Mark's Square and in Regents Park Road, with which they share an homogeneous appearance, particularly noticeable with that listed adjacent house of 4 St. Mark's Square. These plans will despoil that and to stick dormers at the rear and roof lights at the front of just 2 of this unity of 5 houses will wreck their appearance. Similarly the gable ends are inappropriate additions and that at Kingston Street, number 9, will take light from 8-12 Princess Road. Furthermore it will make Kingston Street more of a wind tunnel and give it a narrow tunnel like feel and look.</p> <p>To me the roof pitch looks too shallow to permit sensible living space within it; when insulation and structural demands are satisfied it may well end up with less height than the submitted plans show. Interestingly a less ambitious plan was refused for 3 Princess Road (2012/3404/P) on 9/07/2012. I assume there is consistency among the Planning Officers and that the same considerations will be applied to these more ambitious proposals for 1 & 9.</p> <p>I wonder whether the Council when selling under 'right to buy' the top flat of 1, sold the roof space? I would assume that the Council must be the Freeholder of the whole terrace, otherwise it would be difficult to apportion responsibility for repairs to common areas, particularly the roof and insulation & possibly the traditional roof space water tanks. Maybe if the applicants do own the loft space they have also assumed sole responsibility for the roof? These flats at 1 & 9 are very likely to impinge detrimentally on the lives of the neighbouring top floor Council tenant in 5 & 7.</p> <p>Loft conversions are cheap & add lucrative value: if this is council space then it should create homes therein.</p> |

| Application No: | Consultees Name: | Consultees Addr: | Received: | Comment: | Response: |
|-----------------|------------------|-----------------------------|---------------------|----------|---|
| 2015/1849/P | Lorenzo Conti | 3B Princess Road NW1 8JN | 20/05/2015 07:35:52 | OBJ | <p>Dear leader of the council, thanks for your advertising and for inviting me to comment on what appears to be a further fraudulent planning application filed by Mr Costa Diamantis on behalf of Mrs/Mr Pawan in the form of a joined application aimed to develop within the communal loft both at 1D and 9 Princess Road. Those are 2 developments in one filed by Mr Costa who is not the lease holder of flat 1D NW1 8JN according to the Land Registry records extracted few hours ago, nor at number 9, therefore Mr Costa had/has no merit to apply for a planning application to develop within the communal loft in flat 1D, nor he has/had merit to apply on behalf of Mrs/Mr Pawan Arora of number 9. The only free holder and lease holder at flat D, 1 Princess Road was/is the THE MAYOR AND BURGESSES OF THE LONDON BOROUGH OF CAMDEN and nothing has changed within the titles since Mr Costa withdrawn his original application 2014/7685/P back in January 2015 nor he bought the property according to the Land registry. Mr Costa then filed a new application few months later once again claiming to be the lease holder of flat 1D, however this resulted to be a further false representation contrary to the fraud act 2006 which I have already challenged during his first planning application. Your planning officer Mr Carlos Martin assisted Mr Costa twice in this endeavour to defraud the public so you have now 24 hours to rebut in substance by uploading publicly a copy of the titles for flat 1D NW1 8JN and the extract from the the Land register to confirm whether or not the titles of flat 1D were exchanged between the London Borough of Camden or else this is the truth and will form judgement against you both in common law.</p> <p>On the other hands was Mrs/Mr Pawan Arora interested to file an application to develop the loft at 9 Princess Road, she/he would have filed the application on her/his own capacity as a freeholder of number 9, but so far she/he failed to do so. It appears that the main priority of your departments was to persuade the public to believe that Mr Costa has a legitimacy to file a planning application as a lease holder and you will certainly keep playing the role until all this fraud is going to be revealed. What I am witnessing here is the council engineering joint planning applications to favour Mr Costa, Mr/Ms Pawan Arora, and Foxton agents the latter already advertising on in situ, without Mr Costa owing the titles nor the land so I wonder if this practice is already carbon copied across the entire borough and what are you doing to prevent those kind of frauds to take place. Now coming back to the issues involved with the proposed developments, the acoustic defects within your void cavity party floor/ceiling are still in place, and due to this I Am exposed to class 1 Environmental hazards coming from you fucking void cavity timber floor separating my flat B to flat C at 3 Princess Road so by allowing the proposed developments you will cause me to suffer a 2000 % exacerbation in noise nuisance due to the worse transmission of harmful vibrations, impacts and air borne noises which will be amplified down into my flat via the aforementioned untreated VOID squeaking, party floor/ceiling of yours, and to such an extent to cause me aggravated injuries and detriment to my activities so I strongly oppose those developments. You also are very well aware that I have paid for and commissioned UKAS independent acoustic tests in October 2011 which both confirmed that the party floor/ceiling structure between my flat 3B and flat 3C Princess Road was and still is highly defective subjecting me to injurious level of noise nuisance and so far you failed to address my grievance. Due to this, the deficient party floor structure how it is, does not allow to add the critical mass proposed by Mr Costa developments nor by anyone else wishing to carry out similar heavy and noisy developments such as the loft development proposed by Mr Paul Donnelly of flat C at 3 Princess Road who recently joined Mr Costa's and Mr/Mrs Pawan crusade to further destroy our heritage. Also you must be aware that by adding mass to fractured party walls already</p> |

Application No: **Consultees Name:** **Consultees Addr:** **Received:****Comment:** **Response:**

damaged by Mr Costa removing the breast walls at 1 Princess Road, this could in turns cause the total collapse of the building, resulting in several casualties amongst resident so I further confirm my objection to the proposed developments. I would like to remark that the proposed developments are all within Prime rose hill conservation area there fore particularly inopportune, as they will ruin the character of the Italianate terrace both aesthetically and historically. The proposed works will cause a dramatic change in the landscape and will cause what we describe a cacophony effect in music which is in this case will be absolutely detrimental. The communal lofts host the water tanks serving all flats, which are due to be maintained by the council who must have access to the lofts at any given time, there fore the lofts cannot be secluded by Mr Costa nor by Mr/Mrs Pawan or anyone else. Rather I welcome a planning application by the council, aimed to host in the communal loft complementary installation of renewable energies devices for the benefits of the whole community within all our Italianate terrace, such as battery accumulators, and solar panel installed, so to provide an equal share of free and clean energy to all residents. It will assist your decision making, by considering your liability in terms of misconduct in public office and whether or not it is reasonable to cause me to suffer injuries and damages, to falsify records, tamper with transcripts, committing perjuries and simultaneously providing gifts in kind in excess of £300.000 to each of the aforementioned applicants, rather than to rectify the structural and acoustic defects within the party floors and which I have complained about for almost a decade without any joy. You also agree that there is no possible structural expansion without securing at first the foundations of a building and the safety of its inhabitants. For the aforementioned reasons I do not consent nor agree to Mr Costa, and Mrs Pawan planning application.
