

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2021/2602/P	Teresa Smart	27/07/2021 08:25:15	OBJ	<p>This objection is filed by the Ormonde Mansions Residents Association, the recognised residents' association of residential leaseholders. A full version of this objection is filed separately by letter.</p> <p>Objection on grounds of</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Failure to consult adjoining residential leaseholders 2. Contradictions with existing residential leases 3. Failure to protect existing residential leaseholders against noise and other nuisance 4. Creating a commercial space without toilet or washing facilities. <p>Possible resolution</p> <p>We are not opposed in principle to the conversion of commercial to residential and recognise the likely long-term difficulty of renting shops in this area. The current plan is unacceptable, and there are two routes to resolve this:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Withdrawal or rejection of the application to allow consultations with residential leaseholders and the residents association to resolve the problems. 2. Imposing conditions on the planning approval requiring that the lease on the new residential property match existing residential leases

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2021/2602/P	Rev. Andrew Marshall	26/07/2021 22:55:35	OBJ	<p>My partner and I are resident in Ormonde Mansions, and have been for four years now. We wish to object to this planning application, on the following grounds:</p> <p>1) There is a residents' association for the residents of Ormonde Mansions; Ormonde Mansions Residents' Association (known as OMRA).</p> <p>In previous years, Lapid was in the habit of consulting with OMRA about any proposed changes to the building and / or to the use of parts of the building. OMRA had a designated contact person at Lapid, whom we could contact with any concerns. Since 2019, after a prolonged period of mediation, because a significant sum of money had been lost by Lapid from the Major Works Fund, communication seems to have ceased between Lapid and OMRA.</p> <p>As such, there has been no communication with any owners or occupiers about the proposed changes at basement level, which will affect all flats, as a result of noise from building work and change of use.</p> <p>2) All owners of the original flats in the building contribute to the Standing Charge and Major Works Fund.</p> <p>It is worth noting that, as this planning application was not discussed with residents and owners, it is not known whether the owners of the proposed flat will also contribute to the Standing Charge or Major Works Fund, and - if so - to what extent. Or will existing owners be expected to pay for the upkeep of the building that the new owners will be using?</p> <p>3) The existing owners in Ormonde Mansions all have strict guidelines in their leases pertaining to things like keeping down noise levels from occupants, building works, pet ownership and also in preventing use for short-term lets, such as holiday rentals or bed & breakfasts.</p> <p>There has been no communication with OMRA what the requirements of the new leases are, or whether the burden of managing any antisocial behaviour will rest on us.</p> <p>4) The planning application mentions that "There is also a precedent for conversion into lower ground floor flats at this location, with a similar change of use gaining consent and implemented in 2005."</p> <p>While this may be true, however, this application was also not discussed with OMRA, and has caused tensions, for exactly the reasons above, pertaining to noise levels - as they have an outdoor garden area, which has been used for several late-night parties. This is particularly problematic to myself and my partner, who are both key workers, and can have unsociable shift patterns. There is also no clarity about what the differences are between their lease and the leases of the other preexisting flats in the building</p> <p>5) OMRA already had to go to mediation because Lapid was breaking our leases by taking different contributions from each flat to the Service Charge. We do not want to go to mediation again.</p> <p>So, I think this application needs to be denied until Lapid have properly done their homework, and can evidence that they have clearly consulted with all existing owners and occupants through OMRA, and worked out suitable solutions to the above.</p>

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2021/2602/P	Teresa Smart	27/07/2021 08:25:13	OBJ	<p>This objection is filed by the Ormonde Mansions Residents Association, the recognised residents association of residential leaseholders. A full version of this objection is filed separately by letter.</p> <p>Objection on grounds of</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Failure to consult adjoining residential leaseholders 2. Contradictions with existing residential leases 3. Failure to protect existing residential leaseholders against noise and other nuisance 4. Creating a commercial space without toilet or washing facilities. <p>Possible resolution</p> <p>We are not opposed in principle to the conversion of commercial to residential and recognise the likely long-term difficulty of renting shops in this area. The current plan is unacceptable, and there are two routes to resolve this:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Withdrawal or rejection of the application to allow consultations with residential leaseholders and the residents association to resolve the problems. 2. Imposing conditions on the planning approval requiring that the lease on the new residential property match existing residential leases
