

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2018/0117/P	rachel.joseph	Flat 2 Chandos Court 61 Haverstock Hill London NW3 4SN	08/03/2018 18:22:08	OBJ	OPPOSING COMMENTS to Application 2018 0117 P

Overview of opposing comments:

1. Adding 2 flats to a block of already 6 is an increase of 25%. Too much additional traffic of people and access to small staircase and building. If designs were different and the existing flats wanted to "add on" by building up - it would be a very different scenario without adding many more people and traffic to live in the building.
2. Two additional flats with two-stories are too much. Overpowering in design and in volume addition to the building.
3. The building sits in a prominent position in the neighbourhood- too much dominance will be viewed from a towering addition to Chandos Court.
4. There is too much of a difference/contrast in design between the old 1960s style and the proposed big modern build on top.
5. Right to Quiet Enjoyment and Right to Enjoy Properties as they were sold to us.
6. Safety of residents with such work being carried out
7. We have not been given any estimate of time schedule
8. We do not believe the landlord/Freeholder to be reasonable because they do not even occupy a flat in the building and these works would only be carried out solely for their benefit. We have not been offered any compensation for the proposed works beyond what we believe to be lawful – which was just to paint the staircase.

Specific comments on the planning application "Design Statement"

- 1) Statement: "...improve and enhance the appearance of the conservation area while also providing a much needed addition to the housing stock in the Borough."

Comments:

-We find this to be subjective on the appearance and improvement suggestion.

-Also if the Freeholder is so keen to improve the appearance of the building for the conservation area, why have they not made any attempts to do so generally for the existing building? Why is the Freeholder only interested in the 'improvement to the conservation area' when they are looking to build up and make a further investment/profit for themselves?

- 2) Statement: "...the Eton conservation area has been extended to include 61 Haverstock Hill (2002 designation – Eton Conservation Area Statement). As with the previous application we believe that the current proposal represents an improvement to a prominent building that now sits within a conservation area."

Comment: We find that this is a very subjective and personal statement regarding an improvement. If an "improvement" is desired by the Freeholder then we believe that the Freeholder could "improve" the entire building.

Specific comments on 'Proposed Plan' Page 1

- 1) 4F Plan illustrates two Kitchens and two Living Areas directly above the two Bedrooms

Application No:    Consultees Name:    Consultees Addr:    Received:

Comment:    Response:

in existing flats.

Comment: Firstly we find that this design poses an increase in potential dangers in terms of the increase in fire hazard safety. This jeopardizes safe escape routes for the Bedrooms in the flats below with a concern in case of a fire spreading from a Kitchen. Secondly, there is a concern on the noise factor with Living Areas above the existing flats/bedrooms. We believe it is our right to be able to enjoy our properties as they were sold to us. Additionally, we have the right to tranquility during night-time hours for sleep and there is a risk this will be effected with a Living Area above the existing Bedrooms. Please note that the current layout of the 6 flats maintains the Living Areas next to each other and not to the Bedrooms – which is why the current layout is harmonious.

Specific comments on 'Visual Impact Assessment'

1) The model and photoshopped images of the new build illustrated in Views 2-5:

Comment: According to the Design Statement, the new build was to "blend in". The images shown here in our opinion do not "blend in" with the existing building. It is not shown to be of the same or similar materials nor in any way symmetrical, (i.e. windows not above windows, nor same number and style of windows, etc).

2) Statement: "View of Chandos Court Obscured" on Views 6-9

Comment: We find this to be an exaggerated viewpoint as it all depends what time of year it is. There are no leaves on any of those trees for 5-7 months of the year Oct-Apr. Which means that the view of Chandos Court during those months is indeed not obscured. It obviously also depends on what side of the street you are on whether or not you can see the building. If you are a pedestrian on the East side pavement you would be able to see Chandos Court all year long, making this statement above not true.

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2018/0117/P	Paolo Petrillo	61 Haverstock Hill Flat 5 London NW3 4SN	08/03/2018 18:16:48	COMMNT	OPPOSING COMMENTS to Application 2018 0117 P

Overview of opposing comments:

1. Adding 2 flats to a block of already 6 is an increase of 25%. Too much additional traffic of people and access to small staircase and building. If designs were different and the existing flats wanted to "add on" by building up - it would be a very different scenario without adding many more people and traffic to live in the building.
2. Two additional flats with two-stories are too much. Overpowering in design and in volume addition to the building.
3. The building sits in a prominent position in the neighbourhood- too much dominance will be viewed from a towering addition to Chandos Court.
4. There is too much of a difference/contrast in design between the old 1960s style and the proposed big modern build on top.
5. Right to Quiet Enjoyment and Right to Enjoy Properties as they were sold to us.
6. Safety of residents with such work being carried out
7. We have not been given any estimate of time schedule
8. We do not believe the landlord/Freeholder to be reasonable because they do not even occupy a flat in the building and these works would only be carried out solely for their benefit. We have not been offered any compensation for the proposed works beyond what we believe to be lawful – which was just to paint the staircase.

Specific comments on the planning application "Design Statement"

- 1) Statement: "...improve and enhance the appearance of the conservation area while also providing a much needed addition to the housing stock in the Borough."

Comments:

-We find this to be subjective on the appearance and improvement suggestion.

-Also if the Freeholder is so keen to improve the appearance of the building for the conservation area, why have they not made any attempts to do so generally for the existing building? Why is the Freeholder only interested in the 'improvement to the conservation area' when they are looking to build up and make a further investment/profit for themselves?

- 2) Statement: "...the Eton conservation area has been extended to include 61 Haverstock Hill (2002 designation – Eton Conservation Area Statement). As with the previous application we believe that the current proposal represents an improvement to a prominent building that now sits within a conservation area."

Comment: We find that this is a very subjective and personal statement regarding an improvement. If an "improvement" is desired by the Freeholder then we believe that the Freeholder could "improve" the entire building.

Specific comments on 'Proposed Plan' Page 1

- 1) 4F Plan illustrates two Kitchens and two Living Areas directly above the two Bedrooms

Application No:    Consultees Name:    Consultees Addr:    Received:

Comment:    Response:

in existing flats.

Comment: Firstly we find that this design poses an increase in potential dangers in terms of the increase in fire hazard safety. This jeopardizes safe escape routes for the Bedrooms in the flats below with a concern in case of a fire spreading from a Kitchen. Secondly, there is a concern on the noise factor with Living Areas above the existing flats/bedrooms. We believe it is our right to be able to enjoy our properties as they were sold to us. Additionally, we have the right to tranquility during night-time hours for sleep and there is a risk this will be effected with a Living Area above the existing Bedrooms. Please note that the current layout of the 6 flats maintains the Living Areas next to each other and not to the Bedrooms – which is why the current layout is harmonious.

Specific comments on 'Visual Impact Assessment'

1) The model and photoshopped images of the new build illustrated in Views 2-5:

Comment: According to the Design Statement, the new build was to "blend in". The images shown here in our opinion do not "blend in" with the existing building. It is not shown to be of the same or similar materials nor in any way symmetrical, (i.e. windows not above windows, nor same number and style of windows, etc).

2) Statement: "View of Chandos Court Obscured" on Views 6-9

Comment: We find this to be an exaggerated viewpoint as it all depends what time of year it is. There are no leaves on any of those trees for 5-7 months of the year Oct-Apr. Which means that the view of Chandos Court during those months is indeed not obscured. It obviously also depends on what side of the street you are on whether or not you can see the building. If you are a pedestrian on the East side pavement you would be able to see Chandos Court all year long, making this statement above not true.

---

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2018/0117/P	Kian Tan	NW3 4SN Flat 3 Chandos Court	08/03/2018 22:08:31	OBJCOMP AP	OPPOSING COMMENTS to Application 2018 0117 P  Overview of opposing comments:

1. Adding 2 flats to a block of already 6 is an increase of 25%. Too much additional traffic of people and access to small staircase and building. If designs were different and the existing flats wanted to "add on" by building up - it would be a very different scenario without adding many more people and traffic to live in the building.
2. Two additional flats with two-stories are too much. Overpowering in design and in volume addition to the building.
3. The building sits in a prominent position in the neighbourhood- too much dominance will be viewed from a towering addition to Chandos Court.
4. There is too much of a difference/contrast in design between the old 1960s style and the proposed big modern build on top.
5. Right to Quiet Enjoyment and Right to Enjoy Properties as they were sold to us.
6. Safety of residents with such work being carried out
7. We have not been given any estimate of time schedule
8. We do not believe the landlord/Freeholder to be reasonable because they do not even occupy a flat in the building and these works would only be carried out solely for their benefit. We have not been offered any compensation for the proposed works beyond what we believe to be lawful – which was just to paint the staircase.

#### Specific comments on the planning application "Design Statement"

1) Statement: "...improve and enhance the appearance of the conservation area while also providing a much needed addition to the housing stock in the Borough."

##### Comments:

-We find this to be subjective on the appearance and improvement suggestion.  
-Also if the Freeholder is so keen to improve the appearance of the building for the conservation area, why have they not made any attempts to do so generally for the existing building? Why is the Freeholder only interested in the 'improvement to the conservation area' when they are looking to build up and make a further investment/profit for themselves?

2) Statement: "...the Eton conservation area has been extended to include 61 Haverstock Hill (2002 designation – Eton Conservation Area Statement). As with the previous application we believe that the current proposal represents an improvement to a prominent building that now sits within a conservation area."

Comment: We find that this is a very subjective and personal statement regarding an improvement. If an "improvement" is desired by the Freeholder then we believe that the Freeholder could "improve" the entire building.

#### Specific comments on 'Proposed Plan' Page 1

1) 4F Plan illustrates two Kitchens and two Living Areas directly above the two Bedrooms

**Application No:**    **Consultees Name:**    **Consultees Addr:**    **Received:**

**Comment:**    **Response:**

in existing flats.

Comment: Firstly we find that this design poses an increase in potential dangers in terms of the increase in fire hazard safety. This jeopardizes safe escape routes for the Bedrooms in the flats below with a concern in case of a fire spreading from a Kitchen. Secondly, there is a concern on the noise factor with Living Areas above the existing flats/bedrooms. We believe it is our right to be able to enjoy our properties as they were sold to us. Additionally, we have the right to tranquility during night-time hours for sleep and there is a risk this will be effected with a Living Area above the existing Bedrooms. Please note that the current layout of the 6 flats maintains the Living Areas next to each other and not to the Bedrooms – which is why the current layout is harmonious.

Specific comments on 'Visual Impact Assessment'

1) The model and photoshopped images of the new build illustrated in Views 2-5:

Comment: According to the Design Statement, the new build was to "blend in". The images shown here in our opinion do not "blend in" with the existing building. It is not shown to be of the same or similar materials nor in any way symmetrical, (i.e. windows not above windows, nor same number and style of windows, etc).

2) Statement: "View of Chandos Court Obscured" on Views 6-9

Comment: We find this to be an exaggerated viewpoint as it all depends what time of year it is. There are no leaves on any of those trees for 5-7 months of the year Oct-Apr. Which means that the view of Chandos Court during those months is indeed not obscured. It obviously also depends on what side of the street you are on whether or not you can see the building. If you are a pedestrian on the East side pavement you would be able to see Chandos Court all year long, making this statement above not true.