

| Application No: | Consultees Name: | Received:           | Comment:     | Response:  |
|-----------------|------------------|---------------------|--------------|--|
| 2018/5028/P     | Patrick Hayes    | 12/11/2018 13:03:13 | OBJ          | <p>We note the above application further undermines the quiet enjoyment and residential nature of the buildings of immediate neighbours.</p> <p>We would draw the Council's attention to case history concerning the applicants apparent failure to comply at this address</p>   |
| 2018/5028/P     | Peter Yeoh Yeoh  | 16/11/2018 16:56:35 | COMML<br>TER | <p>I'm confused ... I thought this is an old application that has been objected and refused by the council. Why is back up again? Nothing seems to have changed much in the application as both proposals will adversely affect the quality of life of 60-66 Saffron Hill residents in terms of light and noise. Even as it stands, the building has been producing immense noise and disturbing the immediate residents. There's also the issue with privacy with people looking directly into apartments if it is allowed to extend up to our building. This is an unacceptable invasion of privacy and illegal. Has a light survey been done by the owner/s? I would like to see a light survey report before the council makes any decisions on this application. It is only fair. I'm particularly worried about light flooding the apartments in nighttime with their plan to expand the building. That has to be studied and addressed before proceeding as well. And more importantly, there hasn't been real or earnest consultation with us, which to me means the proposals are problematic and break various construction laws. What they want to do is both unnecessary and intrusive and I hope the council will share the same view. They have a long history of flouting planning laws on this site and should not be allowed to develop the building further or in the near future. Therefore, I strongly object to the application. Many thanks.</p> |

| Application No: | Consultees Name: | Received:           | Comment: | Response:   |
|-----------------|------------------|---------------------|----------|---|
| 2018/5028/P     | Calum Lamont     | 19/11/2018 11:24:33 | OBJ      | <p>I object to this application.</p> <p>There is a protracted and somewhat sorry history to this site, to which officers should be fully aware before considering this application.</p> <p>Currently the site is subject to a s.106 agreement following an unlawful infill carried out a few years ago (2009) without planning permission. That infill was initially refused, both by Camden Council and on appeal:</p> <p>“the infilling of the undercroft has had a serious adverse effect on the amenities of residents of the Ziggurat and this is sufficient reason in itself to withhold planning permission. The ground (a) appeal thus fails”</p> <p>Ultimately planning permission was granted retrospectively in 2011 subject to the s.106 agreement, and following the commencement of criminal proceedings against the developer.</p> <p>However, the landlord and tenant continually flout the s.106 agreement (which was, of course, specifically put in place in exchange for them being able to keep the infill). It is galling to see the developer being permitted to develop further (and they have been) despite the fact that they do not abide by terms of an agreement which is supposed to be in place to protect residential amenity. This is background, but is of central relevance to this application, as it demonstrates that the landlord has no concern to abide by its obligations.</p> <p>Please consider the officer’s report which provides a full history of planning on this site up to 2011.</p> <p><a href="http://camdocs.camden.gov.uk/HPRMWebDrawer/Record/3218858/file/document?inline">http://camdocs.camden.gov.uk/HPRMWebDrawer/Record/3218858/file/document?inline</a></p> <p>Officers will note that the current application fails to mention all of the relevant applications and outcomes.</p> <p>The current application seeks to put on an additional storey, which the landlord tried to do many years ago, and that was refused (prior to 2007).</p> <p>I assume that the Council will review that application and the objections which were made to it. That would be sensible and rational, as the same considerations arise.</p> <p>The current applica</p> |

---

| Application No: | Consultees Name: | Received:           | Comment:      | Response:  |
|-----------------|------------------|---------------------|---------------|--|
| 2018/5028/P     | Malcolm McKay    | 12/11/2018 18:41:58 | COMMEMA<br>IL | <p>As a resident on the sixth floor of the Ziggurat building next door to 67-74 Saffron Hill I wish to register my objection to the planning application 2018/5028/P on the following grounds.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. As you will know this application and has been refused before.</li> <li>2. Residents on the fifth floor of the Ziggurat will have office workers looking into their private properties from twenty feet away.</li> <li>2. There will definitely be an increase in the sense of enclosure.</li> <li>3. There has been no consultaion with residents of the Ziggurat</li> <li>4. The owners of this building have proved themselves to be irresponsible ahd have a history of flouting planning laws. (See your own records)</li> <li>5. Light pollution at night especially during the winter.</li> <li>6. There has been no light survey.</li> <li>6. They've already had permission this year to extend the site. This is proving to be unacceptable disruption and congestion of the site.</li> </ol> <p>I object most strongly to this application.<br/>Malcolm McKay.</p>   |
| 2018/5028/P     | Lindsay Alker    | 09/11/2018 11:00:34 | OBJ           | <p>We own a flat in the Ziggurat on the 2nd floor looking into the 'lightwell' we already suffer from lack of light and this will impact us even more so : another floor will block any oblique light completely to all the flats in the Ziggurat adjacent to the building. our building is residential and we have a history of noise issues with this buildings occupants which will increase with more occupants . It's causing our family a huge amount of stress as it's been ongoing for many years now . They have no regard for residents and ignore the agreements which limit the activities and hours they can access and use the lightwell thus blighting our enjoyment of our property .</p>  |
| 2018/5028/P     | Mario Rossi      | 09/11/2018 11:32:14 | OBJ           | <p>I strongly object to the re-submission of this planning extension. I would raise all the previous objections again as the proposals do not include any significant modifications to prior ones. First point is that this particular application has been refused in the past. It is essentially the same as before, with the addition of some kind of green roof.</p> <p>5th floor will obviously increase the sense of enclosure. It is a very narrow gap and the green roof will not make a difference. The point is that residents will look out directly onto mundane office space Those on the 5th floor on the north side of the building will have people looking directly into private apartments, invasion of privacy</p> <p>There is no light survey. Whilst it faces north it will have a dramatic amenity effect on those living on that side of the building</p> <p>Light pollution at night from lights left on is an existing problem and this will increase it</p> <p>The use of the light well by current occupiers is already in contravenes environmental and planning regulations with constant Noise emptying of portable toilets. Grinding steel frameworks at 9.00 am.</p> <p>As they have only just had permission to extend the property –this seems excessive over development, and will only contribute more pressure on a variety of levels onto an already over congested site.</p> <p>Protracted history of flouting of planning laws on this site, on this basis they should NOT be allowed to develop further when they continually flout the s..106 in place for the ground floor infill</p> |

| Application No: | Consultees Name: | Received:           | Comment: | Response:   |
|-----------------|------------------|---------------------|----------|---|
| 2018/5028/P     | Calum Lamont     | 19/11/2018 11:24:52 | OBJ      | <p>I object to this application.</p> <p>There is a protracted and somewhat sorry history to this site, to which officers should be fully aware before considering this application.</p> <p>Currently the site is subject to a s.106 agreement following an unlawful infill carried out a few years ago (2009) without planning permission. That infill was initially refused, both by Camden Council and on appeal:</p> <p>“the infilling of the undercroft has had a serious adverse effect on the amenities of residents of the Ziggurat and this is sufficient reason in itself to withhold planning permission. The ground (a) appeal thus fails”</p> <p>Ultimately planning permission was granted retrospectively in 2011 subject to the s.106 agreement, and following the commencement of criminal proceedings against the developer.</p> <p>However, the landlord and tenant continually flout the s.106 agreement (which was, of course, specifically put in place in exchange for them being able to keep the infill). It is galling to see the developer being permitted to develop further (and they have been) despite the fact that they do not abide by terms of an agreement which is supposed to be in place to protect residential amenity. This is background, but is of central relevance to this application, as it demonstrates that the landlord has no concern to abide by its obligations.</p> <p>Please consider the officer's report which provides a full history of planning on this site up to 2011.</p> <p><a href="http://camdocs.camden.gov.uk/HPRMWebDrawer/Record/3218858/file/document?inline">http://camdocs.camden.gov.uk/HPRMWebDrawer/Record/3218858/file/document?inline</a></p> <p>Officers will note that the current application fails to mention all of the relevant applications and outcomes.</p> <p>The current application seeks to put on an additional storey, which the landlord tried to do many years ago, and that was refused (prior to 2007).</p> <p>I assume that the Council will review that application and the objections which were made to it. That would be sensible and rational, as the same considerations arise.</p> <p>The current applica</p> |

---