

[REDACTED]

From: Craig, Tessa
Sent: 27 July 2016 08:27
To: Planning
Subject: FW: Objection to planning application 2016/3018/P

Please redact and upload.

Tessa Craig
Planning Officer

Telephone: 020 7974 6750



You can [sign up](#) to our new and improved planning e-alerts to let you know about new planning applications, decisions and appeals.

From: Richard Hopkin [mailto:[REDACTED]]
Sent: 26 July 2016 22:37
To: Craig, Tessa
Cc: Fulbrook, Julian (Councillor); Calum Lamont
Subject: Objection to planning application 2016/3018/P

Dear Tessa,

I have tried twice this evening to lodge this objection online but each time I have received an error message so I am sending it to you direct instead. Please confirm safe receipt.

You will see I have attached as an Appendix some recent correspondence regarding breaches of the S.106 agreement.

I object and would like to be notified of the hearing date. I would like to be able to speak at the hearing.

Thank you and kind regards

Richard Hopkin
Director, Ziggurat Freehold Limited

Objection of Ziggurat Freehold Limited

This objection is being filed on behalf of Ziggurat Freehold Limited (ZFL), the not-for-profit owner of the enfranchised freehold of The Ziggurat Building at 60-66 Saffron Hill, next door to the premises which are the subject of this application.

The shareholders of ZFL are all residents of the Ziggurat, which comprises 62 residential flats.

ZFL objects to this proposal.

Loss of natural right, increased overlooking and loss of privacy

Residents on the north side of our building (approximately 20 flats) will suffer from loss of natural light because of the additional storeys. There will also be an increase in overlooking and loss of privacy caused by the proposed enlargement of the windows in 67-74. There is already a problem with light pollution, as lights in the office are on 24 hours despite the office being empty at night time.

Further, the additional storeys will affect also probably block the afternoon sun path. It does not appear that any sun path survey has been carried out.

Lack of notification

The application has not been properly notified. A single notice has been displayed some distance away on Saffron Hill - opposite 67-74 not opposite our building - and none on the lamp posts immediately outside our residential building. Also, the notice has only been discovered this weekend, despite being dated 6 July, giving only 3 working days' notice to object.

Further, no residents of the Ziggurat building have been directly notified of this application despite being directly next door. There has been no attempt at consultation, which is surprising in the circumstances.

Past history and previous violations of planning law

The owner of 67-74 Saffron Hill has attempted to extend upwards on numerous occasions in the past. In all of these attempts it has been refused permission to extend as a result of objections from residential neighbours next door. The owner subsequently took direct action and illegally constructed a further floor in the undercroft without planning permission. This ultimately went to appeal and retrospective permission was refused; the developer was ordered to demolish the illegal construction, which it refused to do so. The illegal construction still stands, and the site is now policed by a s.106 agreement which is repeatedly flouted with vehicles parking in the lightwell area despite a complete ban on that activity.

See Appendix below which sets out some recent correspondence highlighting breaches.

These are material considerations when it comes to deciding whether or not to grant permission for further development. The reality is that the landlord and the occupants are not able to control use of the space.

Damage to residential amenity

The Council's primary priority in planning matters is to protect residential amenity. The site is already very congested and, as set out above, is operating unlawfully following the last (unlawful) development.

The current proposal will add further space and therefore people and noise into a complex mixed use area. not only will foot traffic be increased but also deliveries and parking on what is an extremely narrow street.

Further concentrating development in Saffron Hill, which is already a very narrow and densely populated and busy street, cannot be desirable. Allowing this will set an unacceptable precedent which will only encourage other surrounding buildings to go higher, thus completely enclosing our residential block.

ZFL asks the committee to refuse the application

We understand that the application will be reset because of non notification and we will submit further details in due course in relation to the loss of amenity and breaches of the s106 agreement currently in place as part of the objection to the renewed application.

Nevertheless, ZFL asks that the committee refuses the application and gives full weight to our current objections, the numerous past refusals and the previous infringements by the developer, in doing so.

Richard Hopkin

Director, ZFL

Comments made by Richard Hopkin of 7.1 Ziggurat Building, London Phone [REDACTED]
EMail [REDACTED] Preferred Method of Contact is email.

Appendix

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

From: Calum Lamont

Sent: 06 July 2016 14:52

To: 'Barbara'

Subject: RE: More illegal parking

Dear Barbara

It is not about impediment to physical access. It is about breaches of the s.106 agreement, to which Nyraff is a party and can also be held responsible.

Please do not belittle concerns of a residential block as you have done in your last sentence. I realise it is a pain having to manage your tenants, but the s.106 conditions are very important to your immediate neighbours, notwithstanding the fact that your tenants might find them irksome.

I look forward to productive and positive discussions going forward, but I would ask you please to desist from making sarcastic remarks when it is Nyraff and Callprint, and not anyone else, that is in breach of a legally binding agreement which was put in place because of illegal construction activities on your land.

Calum

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

From: Barbara [mailto:[REDACTED]]

Sent: 06 July 2016 14:42

To: Calum Lamont

Subject: RE: More illegal parking

Dear Calum

As stated in the previous email, we are in the process of changing to an alternative access system to the courtyard and also will be installing CCTV so that there will be no doubt as to what is in the courtyard and when and for how long. I am sure that you will understand that in a multi-occupation building such as this we cannot "guarantee" the behaviour of the occupants. We can request and advise and even make threats, but not being on site ourselves we cannot control what they actually do.

You are of course welcome to contact the Council at any time to explain why parked vehicles cause you such distress when they do not physically impede you or your access

Barbara

Barbara Goodhew

General Manager

Penn Street Properties

and

Nyrraff Limited

Ground Floor, Crystal Gate

28/30 Worship Street, London EC2A 2AH

Tel: [REDACTED]

Maintenance Manager: Derek Povey [REDACTED]

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

From: Calum Lamont [mailto:[REDACTED]]

Sent: 06 July 2016 10:25

To: Barbara <[REDACTED]>

Subject: RE: More illegal parking

Dear Barbara

I am informed that Derek East has informed you directly about parking during 15 days in June.

Obviously in addition to Saturday parking, the s.106 requirements are being continually flouted.

As discussed yesterday, please could you provide us with a guarantee by CoB tomorrow that Callprint and/or any other tenants will not breach these rules again, failing which we will need to inform the Council.

Thanks

Calum

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

From: Calum Lamont

Sent: 05 July 2016 12:17

To: 'Barbara'

Subject: RE: More illegal parking

Thanks Barbara, it is appreciated.

The timelocks are obviously a good thing but don't stop abuse of the space when the shutters are raised during permitted hours. There have been instances of overnight parking as well.

There is no "time allowance" in the conditions - the only permission is for deliveries, so there is no "stopping on" allowed, as Callprint has historically contended for (and which was rejected by the planners).

Vehicles are only allowed in to pick up or drop off, and then they have to leave.

Thanks

Calum

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

From: Barbara [REDACTED]

Sent: 05 July 2016 11:07

To: Calum Lamont

Subject: RE: More illegal parking

Dear Calum

You are right - it is extremely frustrating to us and we spend a great deal of time trying to enforce the planning conditions but we cannot physically make people do things. We are constantly reviewing ways of ensuring compliance with access and usage of the courtyard. At the moment there are time locks on the shutter, as stated previously, which control access in accordance with the Council requirements.

However, we are in the process of upgrading the current keypad control on the entry shutter to door controllers and readers, so that access will be by individual fob only. We are also instructing installation of cctv. These measures will allow us to see immediately who has violated the restrictions and when.

I hope this goes some way to convincing you that we are taking matters seriously.

Kind regards

Barbara

Barbara Goodhew

General Manager

Penn Street Properties

and

Nyraff Limited

Ground Floor, Crystal Gate

28/30 Worship Street, London EC2A 2AH

Tel: [REDACTED]

Maintenance Manager: Derek Povey [REDACTED]

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

From: Calum Lamont [mailto:[REDACTED]]

Sent: 05 July 2016 09:03

To: Barbara [REDACTED]

Subject: Re: More illegal parking

Thanks

Please could you revert by Thursday. Callprint have no excuse, so they should respond to you immediately.

We need a guarantee it won't happen again and there should be no problem in giving it.

I appreciate this is frustrating for you, but we have to live Nextdoor to this, and the reason that the conditions are in place is so that you as landlord could avoid the building being forcibly demolished, it having been erected without planning permission.

We have no wish to fall out but it is not satisfactory that your tenant continually flouts a formal and binding agreement.

I look forward to hearing from you by Thursday, failing which we will have to contact Camden.

Thanks

Calum

On 5 Jul 2016, at 08:55, Barbara [REDACTED] wrote:

Calum

If you read my email properly you will see that I have stated that "of course there should still be no parking during that time". I have passed your photos on every time and was merely asking if you had evidence of any other infringement outside of the permitted access hours. Everyone is aware of the no-parking restriction at all times.

I will get back to you when I have something to report

Barbara

Barbara Goodhew

General Manager

Penn Street Properties

and

Nyraff Limited

Ground Floor, Crystal Gate

28/30 Worship Street, London EC2A 2AH

Tel: [REDACTED]

Maintenance Manager: Derek Povey [REDACTED]

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

From: Calum Lamont [mailto:[REDACTED]]

Sent: 05 July 2016 08:44

To: Barbara [REDACTED]

Subject: Re: More illegal parking

Dear Barbara

The complaint is about parking during those hours. I have sent you photos of the vehicles. They are parking in these periods.

No parking at all is allowed.

I shouldn't need to resend photos which I have already sent.

What is the position please? It seems that there is no option but to contact the council to confirm repeated breaches of the s106 agreement if call print are going to continually flout the conditions.

Calum

On 5 Jul 2016, at 08:37, Barbara [REDACTED] wrote:

Hello Calum

I have chased up Callprint again, and sent an email round the rest of the tenants yesterday reminding them of the access conditions.

We are allowed access on Saturdays between 10.00am and 3.00pm as I understand it, but of course there should still be no parking during that time. On Sundays there is no access at all for any reason, and the shutter is set to remain closed on that day. Monday to Friday I have access down as between 8.00am and

10.00pm to allow for the cleaners going in to use the bins. These times are set on the shutter and there should be no possibility of access outside them. If you think this is happening please provide us with some evidence so that we can investigate.

Kind regards

Barbara

Barbara Goodhew

General Manager

Penn Street Properties

and

Nyraff Limited

Ground Floor, Crystal Gate

28/30 Worship Street, London EC2A 2AH

Tel: [REDACTED]

Maintenance Manager: Derek Povey [REDACTED]

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

From: Calum Lamont [mailto:[REDACTED]]

Sent: 04 July 2016 17:16

To: Office (Nyraff Ltd.) [REDACTED]

Subject: RE: More illegal parking

Many thanks Barbara,

Could you press them please, as they are not allowed to park on Saturdays, but they do so every single week.

Could you let me know by Thursday, please, so that I can contact the Council if required.

Thanks

Calum

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

From: Nyraff (BT Connect) [REDACTED]

Sent: 04 July 2016 10:32

To: Calum Lamont

Subject: RE: More illegal parking

Hello Callum

I have been on holiday and only back today. I have forwarded your previous email to Callprint and asked them to get back to me on it.

When I hear from them I will get back to you in turn.

Kind regards

Barbara

Barbara Goodhew

General Manager

Penn Street Properties

and

Nyraff Limited

Ground Floor, Crystal Gate

28/30 Worship Street, London EC2A 2AH

Tel: [REDACTED]

Maintenance Manager: Derek Povey [REDACTED]

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

From: Calum Lamont [mailto:[REDACTED]]

Sent: 02 July 2016 09:02

To: Barbara Hughes Nyraff Penn St <[REDACTED]>

Subject: More illegal parking

Barbara

Another Saturday and more illegal parking.

Please respond to this email and the many previous. What are doing to stop this? Do we need to issue an injunction and involve the council again? Or will you ensure that you do not continue to breach the agreement?

Calum =