

**SANDRA JULIEN**  
1c Highgate Rd London NW5 1JY

The Chief Planning Officer  
Regeneration & Planning Development Management  
London Borough of Camden  
Town Hall, Judd Street

9 November 2016

**Objections/Comments re: APPLICATION 2016/4663/P**  
(external alterations)

**Documents added 20-28 October 2016**

*Associated Ref. 2016/2279/P*

following

**Change of Use from Warehouse (Class B8) increased to  
13 self-contained residential units in Application 2016/5336/P**

I am appraising this flow of applications as someone who has embraced London's urban living for decades and fully appreciates the city's environmental and housing needs, I also comment from a professional background which prioritises good design solutions. The planning documents have not been fully clear from the outset, continue to be inconsistent and our legitimate concerns have been side-lined by the developer. As an immediate neighbour, I believe that these ongoing applications are due to the fact that the developer did not succeed in getting an initial brief established realistically first time round. We have had to combat their constant pressure to obtain permission for inappropriate designs, intended primarily to increase the project's financial viability, whatever the costs to proposed residents, the site and ourselves. The Council's integrity is being tested whilst we are exasperated. I wish to draw the Council's urgent attention to my following OBJECTIONS.

**NOISE plus FIRE EXIT ISSUES >THE PRIVATE PATIO has not been removed from the alleyway** and is still clearly marked on the new front elevation drawings despite all our objections. It dominates the proposed front exterior access, reducing that area by 50% and projects along the length of flat A's garden wall! The Fire exit has therefore been halved without concern for the proposed residents. As immediate neighbours we will suffer noise of people socialising in even closer proximity - this is highly provocative in view of the developer's overall site limitations.

**NOISE:** The proximity of entrance/exit access of proposed units plus eventual "office" occupants, bikes, deliveries, use of metal gates already installed against our wall etc will increase noise and create a stressful environment.

**FIRE EXIT IS GREATLY RESTRICTED:** Main exit is still impeded by newly proposed internal position of bike storage. Entrance/exit internal area has been shrunk by 50% to accommodate 2 new residential units. No Fire Authority Assessment indicated for project so far, no secondary fire exit shown on drawings.

**EXTERNAL PATIO: CONTRADICTIONARY PLANS/ELEVATIONS>** on the 21 October 2016 ground floor plan (2016/5336/P) showing new bike storage and refuse area, the Patio is not indicated. Yet it appears in 053 dated 28 October 2016 "External Works" on the proposed elevation.

**MISLEADING STATEMENTS in Structural Appraisal of Existing Roof Structure** This was prepared by Philip Penco for Structural Engineers Barratt Mahoney, dated 20 October 2016, and

---

includes site photos: P02 shows “views of existing hole” whilst P07 shows “failure of roof rafters” and “collapse of roof”. Going on: P3 of the document Assessment lists: “the existing roof is structurally unsound.....and partially collapsed in places.....damaged beyond repair”. Then comes their unsurprising strategy conclusion: “...demolition and replacement of roof would be the answer.....The roof structure is in a severely dilapidated condition.... there are a number of large holes in the roof structure.....the exposure has caused irreparable damage.”

This leads one to believe the building has become dilapidated entirely due to previous natural structural failures and neglect. However, in my Objections dated 11 February 2016 (to previous application 2016/0091/P), I drew attention to the fact that shortly after a neighbours' meeting with the developers at the Bull & Gate on 8<sup>th</sup> December 2015 – we saw the developer's lorry backing up the alleyway to deposit a skip and duntakings commenced in the interior.” From my kitchen window I witnessed the roof deliberately being broken open from inside the building.

The Structural Assessment mentions “trial pits” being carried out and we could clearly hear the evidence of concrete being drilled and saw skips removing the consequent rubble over several weeks. My point is that the current condition of the building is mainly due to the developer's actions over the past year and their desire to justify the “demolition and replacement of roof.” This would accommodate their intention to fill in the valley sections, raise the roof height and increase density, to which we have expressly objected.

**INCREASED DENSITY has not been addressed:** 26 proposed residents already, plus likely eventual application to create attached “offices” behind the Bull & Gate building, which would

