



Shirley Jones



13 January 2019

The Planning Inspectorate
Room 3/26a
Temple Quay House
2 The Square
Temple Quay
Bristol BS1 6PN

Re: Reference APP/X5210/.C/18/3207127
Appeal Ref EN18/0049 - 50A Haverstock Hill, London NW3 2BH

Dear Sirs



I, along with six other leasehold owners, are directors of the management company for 52-54 Haverstock Hill. However, I am acting on my own behalf only. Of the six other directors, all live at other properties (apart from one, who lives at 54 Haverstock, which is adjacent to 56 Haverstock Hill). The other leaseholders, therefore, were not affected on a daily basis by the building works that took place. Five other directors rent out their flats and a majority of the rentals have lasted for short periods (up to one year but often much shorter). Therefore, transient tenants have had little or no interest in the property.

As you are aware, works commenced in January 2018 on the forecourt of 50A Haverstock Hill without any planning permission being sought. Deep digging took place and I was initially very concerned that this would affect the foundations of [REDACTED]. There is no way to know if that is the case or not. The digging often starting early in the morning (before 0800). I was also concerned and affected by the amount of dirt created by the works. My front bedroom, in particular, became extremely dirty on a daily basis whilst the works were taking place. I am a senior citizen and found it difficult to deal with all the extra cleaning that needed to be done. I did, at one point, hire a professional cleaner to do a thorough clean of my flat. The whole ordeal was extremely unpleasant and costly in terms of time and money spent.

As regards the specifics in your letter dated 14 December, I would comment as follows:

a)

I do not believe that planning permission would have been granted for this project had it been sought. The reason for my assumption is that the developer of my building requested, either formally or informally, permission to turn the forecourt into parking space and was refused (I do not have any details but was informed that this was the case). Subsequently, one of my fellow leaseholders also made enquiries with Camden Council as to whether our forecourt could be turned into car parking space and reported back that it would not be allowed. Therefore, I do not believe that the owners of the building next door should have ignored normal legal processes that we are all subject to – they simply commenced a project that would probably have been refused, had the owner complied with the law and existing regulations.

c)

The claim that there has been no breach of planning control is surely false. If no planning permission was required to carry out these works, Camden Council would surely have stated so when a complaint about the works was initially made and after they had looked into the matter. As far as I am aware, planning permission should have been sought for this project and, by not doing so, the owners of the property ignored laws and regulations which we are all obliged to follow.

f)

I do not have the details of what steps are required to comply with the requirements of the Notice so cannot make a comment as to whether they are excessive. However, I believe that forecourt should be restored as to how it was, that a front gate (along the entire front of the property) should be restored and the forecourt should cease being used as parking space.

My final comment is that the owners of the property (who, as far as I am aware, are not residents in the building and have no interest in the neighbourhood or community - the building has often been left in an unkempt state) should be obliged to compensate those who suffered losses whilst works took place and that compensation should cover any future works that they will carry out to comply with the Notice. The amount of dirt and noise throughout the day, over a period of several months, was sometimes unbearable. Now the forecourt is being used as parking space for cars or motorbikes, also causing noise and exhaust fumes very near to my front bedroom windows.

It certainly cannot be right or fair that owners of properties simply carry out major works, causing a great deal of inconvenience to residents of adjacent properties, as they believe they are at liberty to flout laws and make people's lives a misery whilst the unapproved works take place.

Thank you for taking my comments into consideration.

Yours faithfully

Shirley Jones