

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2015/5644/P	Mark Bliss	Flat 5 9 Belsize Square	18/11/2015 21:16:39	OBJ	Dear Mr Gentet,

I object to the proposal on three grounds.

Creation of additional risk of external water damage

The new dormer would straddle that part of the lower floor across the party wall separating my Flat 5 and Flat 6. This would mean that leaks from this new structure would see water coming directly into my property immediately below. We currently have a single integrated roof above this area of my property, with no history of leakage. The introduction of this dormer would compromise what has hitherto been an entirely effective structure. The existence of transitional areas between original roof and new dormer creates material additional risk of external water leakage and consequent damage to my property at the side elevation of the house. I can raise this as a real issue to object to, given our past experience at this property.

You will be aware from the history of the building that a dormer and balcony was built out from the rear roof and events since permission was granted (application 2004/2136/P) are very instructive of the risks to my amenity which would be directly created by this work. There have been three occasions since installation in 2007 when water damage has occurred – all of them directly attributable to the dormer/balcony. Firstly, when the work was being carried out in 2007, major water damage occurred when the builders failed to adequately secure the tarpaulin which was supposed to be in place overnight thereby keeping Flat 5 safe from the elements. Winds pulled the tarpaulin free and rain enjoyed unfettered access to the ceiling and the room below it.

Building accidents can happen. More relevant however, is that around 7 years ago, the drainage around the edge of the dormer/balcony failed and backed up the rainfall. This led to water finding its way through the gaps and causing material cosmetic damage to my ceiling, aligning with the footprint of the balcony. More recently, last Spring, drainage failed again, leading to damage to the paintwork of a larger, and different, part of the ceiling. I can provide photographs of this most recent damage to demonstrate this.

I can only surmise that none of this would have occurred had the single roof structure remained in place, uncompromised by a dormer.

New risk of internal water damage

The scheme also creates a risk for me which does not exist today by its introduction of a kitchen to the enlarged floor area. A kitchen can reasonably be expected to having a sink with running water together with a washing machine, refrigerator and freezer. Water pipes inevitably spring leaks; washing machines periodically flood and freezers are known to unexpectedly thaw. All perhaps unlikely on a day-to-day basis – but currently, all of this sits on the same level as my Flat. There is zero risk of this damaging my property today – but this proposal would change that.

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

New and ongoing noise

Flat 6's kitchen is currently next to my own, on the same second floor. Noise travels through the party wall but not overwhelmingly so. Moving the kitchen and its associated activities upstairs will create a significant additional amount of noise, since more to-ing and fro-ing creates additional footfall, to come through my ceiling. The flooring upstairs in Flat 6 is of bare wood and the existing noise insulation between my ceiling and that floor is very poor indeed.

Any approval of the scheme the Council might make must surely then incorporate the introduction of proper, effective noise insulation between Flat 6's upper floor and Flat 5 below, at least in this new kitchen area.

I gather there have been aesthetic/architectural concerns raised, although I leave that to others better placed to give a view.

Altogether then, this proposal creates material issues for my property in the form of raised actual, and potential for, disturbance and/or damage. Consequently, I wish to object to it.
