

**Dike, Darlene**

---

**From:** [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** 31 August 2016 14:25  
**To:** Planning  
**Subject:** Planning application 2016/4143/P

I am writing to object to this planning application. Please read this objection in conjunction with my separate objection to planning application 2016/3018/P.

I object to this application on the grounds that it may increase the traffic and noise pollution in Onslow Street, which my bedroom windows overlook. I am fully aware of all the problems my neighbours on the other sides of the building have had with this owner, with illegal development and consistent breaches of a s106 agreement. I do not want the landlord in any circumstances to replicate those difficulties by 'moving round' the traffic to the rear of the building, so I am very against any development of the rear of this building (or at all) whilst under the current ownership.

The plans show the rear staircase in Onslow Street as a 'fire exit'. If any development is permitted at all (whether under this application or related application 2016/3018/P) then please impose a condition that this exit to the building is only to be used as a fire exit and not as a main means of entry to any part of the building, especially the upper floors.

I also object on the grounds of increased light pollution.

The design statement for this application says that as part of the development there will be a stair lift added to increase disabled access to the lift which starts on the half-landing. I think that this is for the lift at the front of the building, but this is not entirely clear. Whilst it is highly unusual to object to a disabled stair lift, if it is intended for the rear of the building I consider that inappropriate for a fire exit. In any event, there is nothing to stop the building owner putting this lift in to benefit disabled access so I do not consider it in any sense an amenity which requires the trade-off of further development of space.

Please note that my view is that, having regard to the history of the site, this application, and the related application 2016/3018/P both need to be decided by committee not a single case officer.

regards,

Catherine Ghosh  
Flat 3.4 The Ziggurat, 60-66 Saffron Hill, London EC1N 8QX.

**Dike, Darlene**

---

**From:** Katy Ricks [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** 31 August 2016 14:53  
**To:** Planning  
**Subject:** objections to Planning Proposal 2016/4143

**Please read in conjunction to my earlier objection to 2016/3018P**

I am writing as a resident of the adjacent Ziggurat Building to add objections to these two related proposals involving the same property.

1 This property has a history of flouting planning regulation and a subsequent s106 binding agreement. There is already an illegal infill subject to a still flouted demolition order.

2 It is inappropriate and irresponsible for further development to be permitted before earlier planning breaches have been rectified.

3 Extra storeys on both sides of this building will increase congestion, noise and light pollution (already a significant problem to the residents of twenty flats which face this property at a distance of approximately 3 metres) and potentially now detrimental to the thirty flats on the east side of the residential property).

4 If any development is permitted to either elevation, it is essential that construction controls are enforced, restricted to 9am - 5pm weekdays and at no time over weekends and public holidays.

5 The rights to light and privacy for neighbours should be a major consideration as the proposals are scrutinised.

I urge these proposals to be considered together, as one proposal, in the light of the history of, and continuing building management history, and by committee, not by a single case officer.

I request notification of the committee meeting, and acknowledgement of receipt of this email.

Yours sincerely  
Katy Ricks  
4.9 Ziggurat Building