



Dear Sir/Madam

For reasons which are unclear to me, but in respect of which you will hopefully enlighten me, your website is not logging any comments.

Please can you ensure that this is added to the objections.

Separately can you advise how many objections you have received, as the website is silent, and I am aware that others are attempting to object.



Dear Sir/Madam,

There is a protracted and somewhat sorry history to this site, to which officers should be fully aware before considering this application.

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:

“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”

Ultimately planning permission was granted retrospectively in 2011 subject to the s.106 agreement, and following the commencement of criminal proceedings against the developer.

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.

Please consider the officer's report which provides a full history of planning on this site up to 2011.

<http://camdocs.camden.gov.uk/HPRMWebDrawer/Record/3218858/file/document?inline>

Officers will note that the current application fails to mention all of the relevant applications and outcomes.

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).

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.

The current application is essentially a repeat of the previous application, although a slight modification has been made to add a "green roof".

The fact of the matter is that the application is to all intents and purposes the same. The windows on the existing storeys are extremely close and even with a green roof, the additional storey will have windows which are still very close looking directly into private living spaces. There will be light pollution at night. The view of the sky will be blocked even further for those living below the 5th floor and for those higher, there will be a new obstruction to the sky. Extra storeys mean extra people and extra potential for disturbance.

I would hope that the planners visit the Ziggurat to see how imposing the current structure is and how additional storeys will be intolerable for residents.

It is worth stating that the residents on the north side of our building have suffered continually at the hands of this developer for almost 10 years, dating from when the illegal infill was made, to today, in view of the repeated breaches of the s.106 agreement designed to protect our amenity, but in practice flouted by the landlord/tenant and, regrettably, ignored by Camden when it comes to properly policing. They are currently suffering from further development to enlarge windows immediately opposite living spaces, which the Council granted a year or so ago, despite vociferous objections.

Further:

- There has been NO consultation, whatsoever. That is perhaps not surprising, in view of the fact that the landlord is well aware that residential amenity will be affected.
- No light survey has been undertaken – there is passing reference to an original light survey many years ago, which is not only procedurally insufficient, it also does not take into account that all residents will have less view of sky (irrespective of the fact that the frontage faces north west). Further, the light does in fact hit windows on that elevation in the afternoons, so the addition of an extra storey.
- This application ought properly be decided by committee, in view of the historic problems on this site and the number of objections.
- It would be rational and reasonable for the Council to prioritise residential amenity over commercial development and to finally put an end to development on this site. There has been much development over the last 10 years (both legal and illegal). Enough is enough.

Regards

