

Printed on: 07/07/2020 09:10:12

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2020/1977/P		04/07/2020 12:11:53	INT	<p>This part of Goldhurst Terrace has a record of serious flooding and in August 2002 was seriously flooded out of my home for 18 months. 96 was also flooded. The cause: unbelievably heavy rainfall that the sewers couldn't cope with. The more extensions built on these properties the less soak-up during heavy rainfall. Gardens are replaced with concrete, decreasing the efficiency of drainage and leaving 'standing' water. The original environment and its character is being destroyed. These houses were not built for multi-occupancy by individual households, and an increase via extensions puts even an even greater burden on Camden Council's services, parking, sewerage, gas and electric supplies, medical and educational agencies. I cannot believe Camden Council wishes to destroy what makes this area desirable by allowing this application.</p>

Application No: Consultees Name: Received: Comment:

2020/1977/P



05/07/2020 20:58:37

OBJNOT

Printed on: 07/07/2020 09:10:12

Response:

1. Introduction

property [REDACTED] through the relevant holding company. I am a partner in a London based law firm and have owned and lived [REDACTED] since 2012.

As an active member of the local community, I have spoken with other neighbours including two sets of residents in [REDACTED] before deciding to submit this objection. Based on those discussions, I believe the views below represent not only my own views but reflect the concerns of at least a sizeable proportion of interested parties.

This application should be refused because: (a) it will facilitate the continued use of the property for multiple occupancy beyond that which is safe and so put in danger both occupants and neighbours, (b) it will create an unacceptable risk of flooding and (c) insufficient restrictions are in place to prevent high-levels of disruption during the proposed build.

2. Background

The following background is relevant to the Committee's decision making.

2.1 Living conditions and over-crowding at the Applicant's property

Flat 1, 96 Goldhurst Terrace is currently divided into two bedsits with one shower. Residents of the building inform me that in recent times these two bed rooms have been used by 15 people including minors. While I cannot confirm that number precisely, I would also say (based on my observations) that at least 10-15 people have lived in these bedsits at the same time, giving an approximate space per person per room of a few meters squared - without good ventilation. The property now appears to be lived in by three households, which is a lower number of people than before, but still above the level which makes it safe to use given not only COVID19 but normal council living standards.

As regards the owner and the state of repair of the property, during the last few years, the property has been in an extremely poor level of repair according to tenants, the backgarden was (until very recently) covered in brambles of above head height and drug using (in what is left of the garden) has been common. Complaints to the owner and managing agent of 96 Goldhurst terrace have gone unresolved - with the suggestion that the appropriate authority to deal with these issues is the police. Consistent with this standard of care taken by the Applicant, no attempt has been made to speak with neighbours in relation to their application and the property does not have an MHO license, appropriate fire alarm etc It also unclear whether the African tenants (from a range of countries) have been appropriately checked by the Applicant under the Right to Rent scheme and I suggest this is investigated for their benefit.

2.2 History of local flooding

In relation to flooding, No 96, 94 and 92 have all been previously flooded. This risk is taken so seriously that 92 Goldhurst Terrace has fitted bow doors at the back of the property to help prevent future flooding.

Application No: Consultees Name: Received:

Comment:

Response:

Printed on: 07/07/2020 09:10:12

2.3 Local community

The local community is made up of owner occupiers many of which are shielding or living / working at home with young families.

2.4 Current permission

The current planning permission is shortly due to expire having been granted in 2017.

3. Reasons why planning application should be rejected

On the basis of my experience living for almost 7 years adjacent to the Applicant's property and given the background above, it seems highly likely that the changes being sought are only to add more 'tenants' to the property and increase the profitability of the unit. This can be seen by the plans which do not increase the shower rooms or kitchen space. In otherwords, there is a real risk that the property will be used for what is essentially slum housing likely to harm the minors resident there but also to be a breeding place for COVID19 amongst a highly at risk group which require council protection. In this regard, the attitude of the owner to engagement and to complaints (and also to proper licencing for the property) is concerning and pertinent to the decision making process).

In relation to flooding, the plans make no allowance for increased drainage or to otherwise prevent flooding and damage to neighbouring properties. The fact that othe properties have already been extended exacerbates this risk.

Finally, the proposal includes none of the usual requirements around working hours and restrictions. Clearly any work that is permitted should only be allowed by the Council within working hours of 9.30am to 5.30pm and excluding weekends during a maximum 3 month period from start to finish. Anything less would be unfair on those many elderly people shielding at home and on those working from home. Other requirements should also be made that prevent the abuse of the planning system to facilitate the overcrowding of the property, including as regards proper ventilation etc. This of course would need a new plan and oversight of the construction by an independent person or appropriate officials at the council.

I thank the committee for their time considering this objection and am happy to discuss any of the above if that would be helpful.
