

15 SEP 2017

KINGS X

By hand 05/09/17

Flat B,
3, Great Ormond St.
KCIN 3RA.

* sorry handwritten, printer
out of action

S: 09:17.

To: Mr. Charles Thuairé.
Council Planning Application Dept.,
Camden Council, Argyll Square.

Dear Mr. Thuairé,

Re: planning application for alterations to
be made to Flat A. 3, Great Ormond St.
App. no. 2017/4516/P

As requested in the (yellow) planning application
poster posted outside house 3, I have the
following observations to make:-

- ① Having lived here for now over 20 years I have quite considerable experience with this building and neighbourhood issues. During this time I understand there have been a number of requests, by residents in the street, for a staircase to be installed in the lower ground floor of properties but this was always denied due to:-
 - (i) such a structure is not in keeping with the historical of the building (especially in nos. 1 and 3)
 - (ii) there being no precedent for this in this street
 - (iii) concerns about weight strain to buildings.
- ② The planning application does not clearly/exactly state the proposed siting of said staircase. It does indicate it is to be near/in front of

would be put^(a) to the immediate right of the street door, or^(b) in the railings in front of the house?

Comments:-

CONTACT CASE

15 SEP 200

KINGS A

(a) if this is the proposed site then it would be extremely dangerous as, if such a gate was left open/unlatched, then anybody could fall down the opening - and it is a considerable distance to fall!

(b) if this is the proposed site then it would have to be in the middle of the railings. If put to (our) left then, again, safety is an issue. If put to (our) right then this would/might severely interfere with all the wiring/cables issuing into house 3.

However, to (our) right might 'solve' issue ③ below.

- ③ Has the council and new leaseholders considered the 'potential vulnerability' of the building - which is very old? During the past few years the back part of the building/garden has been surveyed many times - and the building has moved/is moving (subsiding has been mooted) thus, it is questionable if the building can support any further structural height. Requests, in previous years, by previous tenant, were denied fruition as it was deemed that additional building works would be too heavy. Thus, we would need to be assured that the building can support any additional weight.

under houses 1 and 5) should also be taken into serious consideration as this, as your plans would show, adds to the somewhat instability situation.

③ Should the planned separate entrance for Flat A go ahead then can it be assumed/agreed/reiterated that the leaseholder/s of Flat A will continue to be responsible for:-

(a) the cleaning of the ground floor common parts of house 3.

(b) the upkeep, in consultation with the council of course, of light bulbs and fire alarms.

Items 3(a) + 3(b) here, and always have been, the responsibility of Flat A. Unfortunately, over the years, due to the previous leaseholders' being ill and subsequent deaths and the flat being empty for many years, these actions have not been forthcoming. Perhaps we can improve this situation?

Apart from the proposed staircase not being in keeping with the historicity of this building I am, tentatively, in favour - however, assurances will be needed as to our safety concerning additional weight to the building.

I have tried to phone you concerning my points of concern on a number of occasions but your number - 7. 974. 5867 - seems permanently engaged.

I look forward to your reply.

(3/3)