

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2020/2313/P	Leo Kaufman	29/07/2020 16:35:24	OBJ	<p>I object to this application because:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. This proposed development would be an undersized flat, even at the area that the drawings indicate. 2. If you actually measure the premises, you will find that the area is actually less than the drawings indicate. I would suggest that the existing room sizes are measured. 3. If and when this property was developed, this would have to include insulation of all the external walls which would further reduce the area even more. 4. The applicant indicates that he does not know the previous use and how long it has been empty for. However, I can confirm that I occupied these office premises for over 35 years, until the applicant refused to renew my lease on the grounds that he wanted to occupy the offices for his own business. This application obviously shows that the applicant has been very economical with the truth. He has still failed to compensate me for this which is payable under the Landlord and Tenant act 1954. 5. I was the occupier of this office for over 35 years since 1982, and know the history of this office and the entire building very well. This includes the existing ground floor extension that was built by the previous Landlord without listed building consent. Likewise, the various flats in the building were altered without listed building consent. 6. The proposed plans show that the applicant wants to put a bathroom/wet-room in the area which currently has very low ceiling under the main stairs of this listed building. It will be impossible to achieve this without altering the original staircase of this listed building. 7. These premises are part of the original water closet annex of this listed building and should be retained in their original form. 8. In order to retain the original features these premises should be retained as a small self contained office suite which would be much in demand in this area of Camden. 9. This proposed and cramped flat would be grossly undersized and should not be allowed, and the application should be refused.