

Camden Planning

Subject: Objection Planning Application - 2016/4959/P

Dear Sirs/Madam,

I am writing to **object** to the proposed erection of a 3m extension to the rear elevation of 122B Finchley Road.

This letter will cover 3 main areas:

1. The work will cause a **significant increase in noise and disturbance** after change of use to a much larger A3 premise after 3 years of use as A1 premise
2. The plans do not detail a waste disposal area for the commercial and residential areas which could cause a huge **disturbance** to the residents
3. **Loss of privacy** as the restaurant will have new windows installed right next to our residential entrance

These are detailed below.

1. Increase in noise and disturbance

The current shop has been used as an A1 premise (a Beauty salon) since 2014. The plan proposes an increase in the floor space for an A3 restaurant.

This will lead to a significant increase in the noise levels:

- The final size of the A3 premises will be significantly larger and have a proportional increase in the noise levels
- The noise levels will be much higher than have been experienced for last 3 years
- The extension will be at the back of the properties where some flats have bedrooms, as this is currently the only area not facing the very busy main road

In summary the design and size of the buildings are not considerate of a residential area that already faces significant noise to the front of the building. This will significantly increase the noise experienced to the only quiet area of the building at the rear (due to the increase in pedestrian traffic, goods deliveries and staff movements).

2. Waste disposal area

The plans do not detail the location of the waste area. Depending on the location this could have a significant impact on noise and disturbance levels (as it could impact the way they transport waste from the shop to the bins). This will be a significant increase given previously there was a separate waste area that was blocked off from the residential areas.

In addition, the freeholder has already started work in the proposal (e.g. he has already preparatory brick foundations and changed door way locations in the front of the building). This work has removed residential access to a waste area for over 6 months. The freeholder has not clarified when access will be restored, nor where in his proposal this will be. This is current against the terms of the leasehold and potentially against health and safety (the Camden refuse collection team has refused to serve us due to the freeholders poor planning).

3. Loss of privacy

The current plans will install windows next to our entrance. This will significantly impede our privacy as people will be able to see us exiting/entering. We fear this could significantly impact safety as people will be able to watch the doors and see when all residents may have left.

In addition, while not directly related to the planning permission we are significantly concerned by the general attitude of the freeholder to the procedures around the building work. He has repeatedly ignored requests from building control, health and safety, and previous application clarifications from Camden planning. We fear that if granted he will not comply with the restrictions of the proposal.

Kind regards

To: Mr. Obote Hope, Camden Planning Dept.
From: Joan Wilson, 122B Finchley Road NW3 5HT-Flat 1, 4 February, 2017

Dear Mr Hope,
I refer to Planning Application 2016/4959/P - Planning Applications 2014/3012P and 2013/5420/P also

The whole situation with this extension has lurched from one disaster to another seemingly due to both poor supervision and inexperienced workers/builders enabling the horror story to unfold. It does not bode well with any further changes which is why I think that the Application should be refused. Already two considerable landslips from the very steep slope due to removal of strong retaining walls at both the bottom and top of what was a very steep slope, in addition to the removal of the steps/retaining wall at the side of the driveway leading up to 122C (London Tokyo property). No assistance has been arranged for flat residents to dispose of rubbish. Now a dangerous area.

The residents of 122B and 122C are left with the aftermath of whatever the applicant can salvage out of the present mess and for this reason I am strongly against any further Planning Application approval. We have no idea with what the applicant will come up with. Long established trees, bushes and greenery of various kind over the length of the slope all of which were holding it together and provided a pleasant outlook for the flat owners - all gone. The area at the back is now covered in cement with a half rubbish filled hole "downstairs". All greenery gone. A completely changed view of the back area and cement everywhere. A bleak prospect from my back windows as well as lowering the value of my flat even more with all this and the rest of the extension roof providing easy access to any intruder into the common parts. I have had to get bars on my back windows having had this attempted earlier.

Cutting down a tree on land part of the HSBC bank and tearing down a dividing fence is all in a day's work for the applicant when putting steps there. A doorway cut onto the front of Finchley Road at the side of the building to facilitate his own needs leaving it in a derelict condition. No planning permission was applied for. In relation to this change of facade there appears to have been no response from the Freeholder. Requests for many months to and from John Sheehy in the Planning Department and Mayer Hillman have been ignored.

Though appearing to be a slight addition to the previous Planning Permission which has been earlier agreed, this extra 3m given this extra "mile" could well provide for 3 m of more opportunity to disregard whatever he can get away with and take advantage. I think he has done enough damage and should not be given the opportunity to "grow" any more cement. We have no idea what he can have in mind and there is no communication. Whether Jonathan Robb of Building Control feels sufficient has been done at rear for the need of strong retaining walls, which were deemed inadequate earlier, I do not know. I am convinced the work done changing the restaurant into to a beauty salon is the cause of the present problem of considerable and frequent vibrations felt in my flat from passing traffic. There were no vibrations over earlier changes.

My strong personal objections to this application is the way all the above applications are being "cherry picked" to suit the applicant's extra wants and when he can ignore something he hopes it won't be noticed or dealt with he just steams ahead. The work on any of his property, as I said at the beginning, has not been well supervised or carried out. Anyone with the slightest knowledge would have known how to prevent the two landslips on this site. Please do not let us have more problems **even if you do consider that points I have made are not relevant** to Planning I think they should be looked at in the **ENTIRE CONTEX** of this structure.

I would also mention that both Sarah Robinson of the Health and Safety Executive (phone [REDACTED] - Mobile [REDACTED]) as well as the Camden employees mentioned and Police Constables PC Orrow 460 EK and PC Kootyzadeh PC 342 EK (Call Sign EK84E) have all been involved with the last landfall and necessary measures needed over what was considered to be a "dangerous situation".

