

**Gentet, Matthias**

---

**From:** O'Donnell, Shane  
**Sent:** 30 November 2015 10:07  
**To:** Planning  
**Subject:** FW: Planning Application 2015/5907/P - Objection

Hi,

Can this be logged as an objection for app above?

Thanks

Shane O'Donnell  
Planning Officer

Telephone: 020 7974 2944

-----Original Message-----

**From:** Guido Hagemann [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** 27 November 2015 19:40  
**To:** O'Donnell, Shane  
**Cc:** Andrew Smith  
**Subject:** Planning Application 2015/5907/P - Objection

Dear Shane,

I am the owner of the top-floor flat in 73 Parliament Hill.

I would like to object to and comment on Planning Application 2015/5907/P (Erection of single storey rear side extension including the creation of a first floor roof terrace, a single storey rear extension, and alterations to fenestration at 73 Parliament Hill).

My objections and comments are the following:

- The building is presently suffering from serious water ingress problems at and below ground level. An independent survey has confirmed that this issue must be addressed as a matter of urgency. All required measures have been outlined in the survey. In order to preserve the structural integrity of the building, all immediately required measures to deal with the water ingress must be addressed and completed before any building extensions are even considered.
- The proposed extensions will likely worsen the existing water ingress problems as the enlarged footprint of the building will further limit the natural flow and drainage of water around the building.
- The proposed creation of a roof terrace should be of privacy concern for occupants of the building the extension is proposed for and for occupants of buildings in the neighbourhood.
- The interior gardens in the area, such as in between Parliament Hill and South Hill Park Gardens, are characteristic for the neighbourhood and an important heritage aspect. The proposed development would significantly reduce the existing garden area.
- Instead of looking at a green space, anyone with a view onto the current garden would be looking at a man-made structure if the proposed extension was permitted.

- There is a mature holly tree on the property, which would have to be removed if the proposed construction was permitted. The tree provides shade and privacy. It is an important part of the mature vegetation in the area. The need to remove the tree should have been mentioned by the applicant.

- The wording in the application 'a small glazed addition with patinated metal cladding protruding from the brick structure' is misleading given its actual size and the relation of its size to the size of the existing building footprint.

Apart from the above, the lease of the flat stipulates that the freeholder needs to agree to alterations of the proposed type. I would like to bring to your attention that the freeholder has not agreed to the proposed alterations.

I would also like to note that the applicant has not been particularly cooperative regarding the water ingress issues mentioned above. Significant time has passed without addressing this serious issue. The occupiers of the three flats above the garden flat have been suffering from humidity penetrating through the staircase from the garden flat to the common hallway, leading to very unpleasant smells and to damage to the wooden staircase. The way this important issue has been neglected by the applicant over an extended period of time raises serious concerns about his ability to properly handle a construction project in the building.

Best regards  
Guido Hagemann