

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2018/3274/P	Michael Turner	29/10/2018 08:31:49	OBJ	Dear Sirs,

There are a number of concerns to the proposal. Given the lack of adherence to previous planning permissions I think you should treat this submission with high degrees of caution.

1. High guard rail = While his plan suggests this guard rail is existing, it is not. He plans to add this as well, and this can only be acceptable as a fire exit and if confirmed no external usage of the flat roof given noise levels.
 2. Completion of work = in the submission it is suggested the work is complete. This is not the case. No new windows have been built on the side access, nor have guard rails been installed.
 3. Residential land use = the application suggests the property has both A1 and C3 usage rights. This is not correct. It has no rights to residential dwelling (these are for the properties in 122b). Nor is it currently used as a residential property. It is a commercial property and has been used to provide A3 services (i.e. a beauty salon). If you examine previous submissions this is the case.
 4. Fears will not hold to the restriction of the planning permissions = For example he has installed new condensation/ventilation equipment without planning permission (even though was a condition of the last planning approval).
 5. Disputed access rights to our waste area = The area of land he is trying to build his fire escape (near the sliding metal gate) has disputed access rights. The residents of 122B have access to this land, which have been cut-off during his building works and not restored. This must be incorporated this into his plans and planning permission cannot be given until he has resolved proceedings about rightful access to the land. Previous we had separate recycling waste. This has been prevented by his building works and is not supportive of Camden's commitment to improving the environmental impact of developments.
-