

<b>Application No:</b>	<b>Consultees Name:</b>	<b>Received:</b>	<b>Comment:</b>
2020/2395/P	Craig Duncan	26/07/2020 19:33:04	COMMNT

**Response:**

Referring to the original planning decision for this property:

PEX0000737

In document:

<http://camdocs.camden.gov.uk/HPRMWebDrawer/Record/3925768/file/document?inline>

section 6 the question was raised:

“Have arrangements been made for refuse storage?”

To which the applicant ticked yes.

It should be noted that an ugly green bin has been in place on the pavement for several years now – apparently for use of the Black Horse Apartments - and fluctuates in position along the length of the Black Horse and often ends up in front of Durdans House either side.

In addition, the position on the pavement laterally regularly moves from against the Balck Horse to various places on the pavement and even sometimes within the cycle lane.

I would put that this does in fact infringe on pedestrian and cyclist safety – especially in light of recent social distancing widening of pavements.

Referring further to the new application and specifically Laura Hazelton’s initial response to the architect:

<http://camdocs.camden.gov.uk/HPRMWebDrawer/Record/8280272/file/document?inline>

I would have to question this under the

“Relevant policies and guidance” subheading “Transport”

- Specifically

“Policy T1 Prioritising walking, cycling and public transport ”

In addition to the above the fact that the original conversion application had “arrangements been made for refuse storage” it calls to question as to why this bin is needed – especially since there would seem to have been significant surplus storage within the building – which is in fact the subject of the current conversion application?

As the 11year standing Chair of the Durdans House TRA I have been well aware of internal works within the Black Horse – partly through my living and bedroom walls being adjacent to the Black Horse

It is with this history and knowledge that I would call into query the details of the quality of the proposed conversion.

Will there be sound insulation between the internal units?

There was no sound insulation to be found on the plans for the previous failed penthouse flat application for the Black Horse between itself and Durdans House so I wonder if there is any provision between the internal tenants either?

The expansion of the lightwell to the rear of the proposed lower ground

Application No:      Consultees Name:      Received:

Comment:      Response:

I am also concerned about the “Design”, “Excavations” and “Neighbouring amenity” in the “Relevant policies and guidance” mentioned before.

Given that the area in question includes the upright wall being the other side of the Durdans House courtyard wall, which in my tenure we have tried to improve the look and usability of for our own tenants. This has included repainting and adding signage, seating and planters to our side of this wall. My concern is that these works will disturb our tenants and adversely affect their use of this area and even damage the improvements we have had to seek DMC funding to implement.

As children, who use the playground we funded in the courtyard were often climbing on top of this wall, we added anti climb paint to deter them. Unfortunately, it did not. The proposed excavation and deepening of the lightwell worries me that this will become a worsened fall risk for any such “playing” children – is there any plan to address this? Otherwise it is essentially creating a new dangerous area.

Personally, I have found alterations and works to the Black Horse to have been very disrupting to our tenants – myself included.

On a recent occasion when there was water ingress into my own flat in Durdans House the damage (which has still not been resolved) was put down to faults in the adjoining roof of the Black Horse. When this was eventually looked at, scaffolding was erected very noisily at the weekend well before permissible hours – to which I had to make a formal complaint against the company involved.

Apart from ongoing internal works which are very noticeable through the wall, there was recent concern from a new tenant in the top floor flat complaining about television noise coming through my wall. Given I have not changed my living layout or position or model of television in some time and I have not changed my personal viewing habits in some 22 years of living here, I found this very strange and can only suggest that the Black Horse side of the wall on the top floor has never had requisite sound insulation (this is not apparent in the original conversion drawings), or work has been done internally to cause the problem subsequently or that this area has only recently been used for accommodation. All these points have been raised but no resolution has been found. I have myself in response adjusted my viewing habits (which I am not happy about) and have been spoken to by the 2 tenants underneath me who Noel (the Black Horse landlord) has also complained to similarly. They are not happy firstly about the complaints and also to Noel turning up on their doorstep (as he did on mine) to make them when we live in a security street door access stairwell, to which Noel seems to have free access – which legally he should not. On this point (and on my doorstep) he also contested the need for him to install any sound proofing – with his reckoning being that the brick of the adjoining wall was sufficient.

When Noel made his “Penthouse Apartment” application I used my (now deceased) father’s RIBA membership to check the legal requirements for this and am satisfied that with all his conversions he has not met them.

Application No:      Consultees Name:      Received:

Comment:      Response:

Is sound proofing to be included between this flat and the adjoining Durdans House – as is required by law?

These are just a handful of the issues we have had with Noel and the Black Horse over the years.

I would also like to reiterate the planning officers report that the land is suspected of being contaminated and that this was stated as not being the case in the initial application form, as was also not the risk of flooding noted.

In section 14 of the application, no plans are made for waste or recycling storage.

In the Screening Report:

<http://camdocs.camden.gov.uk/HPRMWebDrawer/Record/8233627/file/document?inline>

3.3 Slope Stability

Is the site within 5m of a highway or pedestrian right of way?

The existing lightwell is adjacent to the public garden. Please refer to the suggested structural methodology which presents a safe sequence of construction.

I may be mistaken but was there supposed to be details included of the “suggested structural methodology” ?

I would suggest therefore that any applications on these premises be seriously pre screened and any allowed works be closely watched.

In addition I would like to continue a conversation with the planning officer assigned this case by email, so ask that they contact me back to confirm.