

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2016/4143/P	Calum Lamont	6.3 Ziggurat Building 60-66 Saffron Hill London EC1N 8QX	31/08/2016 07:42:52	OBJ	<p>YOU WILL NEED TO READ ALL OBJECTIONS TO RELATED APPLICATION 2016/3018/P AS THE TWO ARE LINKED.</p> <p>The property in question has consistently been refused permission to develop in view of concerns over residential amenity. It is critical that you review the history of the site which is voluminous and culminated in a criminal prosecution by the Council against the current landlord.</p> <p>The landlord is bound by a s106 agreement in relation to the use of the delivery yard following an appeal which it lost in 2011. It was allowed to keep the illegal infill despite being ordered to demolish it.</p> <p>However, it continually flouts these conditions, and the council does absolutely nothing. Please see complaints in relation to related application 2016/3018/P.</p> <p>As a matter of principle, I don't see why the landlord should be allowed further development if it cannot abide by a legally binding agreement.</p> <p>Specifically, in relation to this application, I object further on the following grounds:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Extra storeys means extra people and potential for disturbance on a very congested site 2. The floor to ceiling windows will cause light pollution in onslow street at night. 3. The floor to ceiling windows will affect the amenity of those in Montgomery House opposite. They will be fully overlooked. 4. We are very concerned over the possibility of access, deliveries and noise in Onslow street through the access door. If the development is going to be allowed, it should be on condition that there are no deliveries and no people in Onslow Street at any times. This is a very narrow street which amplifies noise and there are 30 flats which have bedrooms overlooking it. 5. The applicant has included no controls at all over how construction will be undertaken or policed. There are around 30 apartments on the rear of the building which stand to be affected by noise pollution if builders are going to be allowed into Onslow Street to work at all times. At the very least there needs to be a ban on any construction activity, vehicular access, or people loitering in Onslow street between 5pm and 9am on weekdays, and at any time on weekends. <p>Finally - BOTH OF THESE APPLICATIONS NEED TO BE DECIDED BY COMMITTEE, NOT A SINGLE CASE OFFICER IN VIEW OF THE NUMBER OF PEOPLE AFFECTED.</p> <p>Regards Calum Lamont</p>

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2016/4143/P	Calum Lamont	6.3 Ziggurat Building 60-66 Saffron Hill London EC1N 8QX	31/08/2016 07:42:54	OBJ	<p>YOU WILL NEED TO READ ALL OBJECTIONS TO RELATED APPLICATION 2016/3018/P AS THE TWO ARE LINKED.</p> <p>The property in question has consistently been refused permission to develop in view of concerns over residential amenity. It is critical that you review the history of the site which is voluminous and culminated in a criminal prosecution by the Council against the current landlord.</p> <p>The landlord is bound by a s106 agreement in relation to the use of the delivery yard following an appeal which it lost in 2011. It was allowed to keep the illegal infill despite being ordered to demolish it.</p> <p>However, it continually flouts these conditions, and the council does absolutely nothing. Please see complaints in relation to related application 2016/3018/P.</p> <p>As a matter of principle, I don't see why the landlord should be allowed further development if it cannot abide by a legally binding agreement.</p> <p>Specifically, in relation to this application, I object further on the following grounds:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Extra storeys means extra people and potential for disturbance on a very congested site 2. The floor to ceiling windows will cause light pollution in onslow street at night. 3. The floor to ceiling windows will affect the amenity of those in Montgomery House opposite. They will be fully overlooked. 4. We are very concerned over the possibility of access, deliveries and noise in Onslow street through the access door. If the development is going to be allowed, it should be on condition that there are no deliveries and no people in Onslow Street at any times. This is a very narrow street which amplifies noise and there are 30 flats which have bedrooms overlooking it. 5. The applicant has included no controls at all over how construction will be undertaken or policed. There are around 30 apartments on the rear of the building which stand to be affected by noise pollution if builders are going to be allowed into Onslow Street to work at all times. At the very least there needs to be a ban on any construction activity, vehicular access, or people loitering in Onslow street between 5pm and 9am on weekdays, and at any time on weekends. <p>Finally - BOTH OF THESE APPLICATIONS NEED TO BE DECIDED BY COMMITTEE, NOT A SINGLE CASE OFFICER IN VIEW OF THE NUMBER OF PEOPLE AFFECTED.</p> <p>Regards Calum Lamont</p>

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2016/4143/P	Serena Davidson	FLAT 4.7 ZIGGURAT BUILDING 60-66 SAFFRON HILL EC1N 8QX EC1N 8QX	26/08/2016 17:18:53	OBJ	<p>I object on the basis that</p> <p>(i) More space = more people = more potential for disturbance. They operate 24 hours a day which is completely at odds with trying to mix residential and business. I'm woken up most nights by the traffic and running engines and shouting and slamming doors. It will only get worse if you allow them to extend.</p> <p>(ii) The developer can't abide by current planning s.106 restrictions so should not be allowed to develop until it abides by those.</p>

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2016/4143/P	Calum Lamont	6.3 Ziggurat Building 60-66 Saffron Hill London EC1N 8QX	31/08/2016 07:42:38	OBJ	<p>YOU WILL NEED TO READ ALL OBJECTIONS TO RELATED APPLICATION 2016/3018/P AS THE TWO ARE LINKED.</p> <p>The property in question has consistently been refused permission to develop in view of concerns over residential amenity. It is critical that you review the history of the site which is voluminous and culminated in a criminal prosecution by the Council against the current landlord.</p> <p>The landlord is bound by a s106 agreement in relation to the use of the delivery yard following an appeal which it lost in 2011. It was allowed to keep the illegal infill despite being ordered to demolish it.</p> <p>However, it continually flouts these conditions, and the council does absolutely nothing. Please see complaints in relation to related application 2016/3018/P.</p> <p>As a matter of principle, I don't see why the landlord should be allowed further development if it cannot abide by a legally binding agreement.</p> <p>Specifically, in relation to this application, I object further on the following grounds:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Extra storeys means extra people and potential for disturbance on a very congested site 2. The floor to ceiling windows will cause light pollution in onslow street at night. 3. The floor to ceiling windows will affect the amenity of those in Montgomery House opposite. They will be fully overlooked. 4. We are very concerned over the possibility of access, deliveries and noise in Onslow street through the access door. If the development is going to be allowed, it should be on condition that there are no deliveries and no people in Onslow Street at any times. This is a very narrow street which amplifies noise and there are 30 flats which have bedrooms overlooking it. 5. The applicant has included no controls at all over how construction will be undertaken or policed. There are around 30 apartments on the rear of the building which stand to be affected by noise pollution if builders are going to be allowed into Onslow Street to work at all times. At the very least there needs to be a ban on any construction activity, vehicular access, or people loitering in Onslow street between 5pm and 9am on weekdays, and at any time on weekends. <p>Finally - BOTH OF THESE APPLICATIONS NEED TO BE DECIDED BY COMMITTEE, NOT A SINGLE CASE OFFICER IN VIEW OF THE NUMBER OF PEOPLE AFFECTED.</p> <p>Regards Calum Lamont</p>

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2016/4143/P	Calum Lamont	6.3 Ziggurat Building 60-66 Saffron Hill London EC1N 8QX	31/08/2016 07:42:44	OBJ	<p>YOU WILL NEED TO READ ALL OBJECTIONS TO RELATED APPLICATION 2016/3018/P AS THE TWO ARE LINKED.</p> <p>The property in question has consistently been refused permission to develop in view of concerns over residential amenity. It is critical that you review the history of the site which is voluminous and culminated in a criminal prosecution by the Council against the current landlord.</p> <p>The landlord is bound by a s106 agreement in relation to the use of the delivery yard following an appeal which it lost in 2011. It was allowed to keep the illegal infill despite being ordered to demolish it.</p> <p>However, it continually flouts these conditions, and the council does absolutely nothing. Please see complaints in relation to related application 2016/3018/P.</p> <p>As a matter of principle, I don't see why the landlord should be allowed further development if it cannot abide by a legally binding agreement.</p> <p>Specifically, in relation to this application, I object further on the following grounds:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Extra storeys means extra people and potential for disturbance on a very congested site 2. The floor to ceiling windows will cause light pollution in onslow street at night. 3. The floor to ceiling windows will affect the amenity of those in Montgomery House opposite. They will be fully overlooked. 4. We are very concerned over the possibility of access, deliveries and noise in Onslow street through the access door. If the development is going to be allowed, it should be on condition that there are no deliveries and no people in Onslow Street at any times. This is a very narrow street which amplifies noise and there are 30 flats which have bedrooms overlooking it. 5. The applicant has included no controls at all over how construction will be undertaken or policed. There are around 30 apartments on the rear of the building which stand to be affected by noise pollution if builders are going to be allowed into Onslow Street to work at all times. At the very least there needs to be a ban on any construction activity, vehicular access, or people loitering in Onslow street between 5pm and 9am on weekdays, and at any time on weekends. <p>Finally - BOTH OF THESE APPLICATIONS NEED TO BE DECIDED BY COMMITTEE, NOT A SINGLE CASE OFFICER IN VIEW OF THE NUMBER OF PEOPLE AFFECTED.</p> <p>Regards Calum Lamont</p>