

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2021/2602/P	Lisa Klazek and James Pender	29/07/2021 17:41:56	OBJ	<p>As owners and residents of a flat in Ormonde Mansions, we object to this planning application for the following reasons:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none">1) Lack of consultation - the freeholder has made no attempt to consult with existing residential owners and occupants about the proposed changes, despite the fact that these changes could have a significant potential impact on us. As owners, we have not received any communication from the freeholder, nor have they gone through the Ormonde Mansions Residents Association, which is a well-established means for liaising with residents.2) Lack of protection against noise and nuisance - the creation of an additional flat with outside space could have a detrimental impact on existing residents, in particular due to noise. There is already an ongoing noise problem resulting from the occupants of one of the basement flats having loud, long and often late-night gatherings in their outdoor space. This space is directly below the bedrooms of the other 24 residential flats on floors 1-4 and prevents us from being able to sleep. This is a high density area, sound from the lightwells and outdoor space at the back echoes and amplifies.3) Lack of transparency, and lack of consistency with existing leases – the leases for the 24 residential flats on floors 1-4 all have provisions in them to guard against anti-social behaviour and nuisance (e.g. limits on noise after certain times, prevention from use as short term holiday lets, keeping animals, timings of building works). In short, these provisions help to ensure that neighbours are considerate of each other, which is particularly important in such a high density setting. The lease on any new residential flat absolutely must have similar provisions, and there is no evidence of this in the planning application. <p>Furthermore, the residential flats on floors 1-4 all pay a 1/24th contribution of the service charge and any other costs, such as major works. It is not at all clear how the basement flats – both current and the proposed new flat - contribute to the upkeep of the building, and how the costs will be equitably split with existing leaseholders.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none">4) The application cites the conversion of commercial premises into residential flats in the past as having set a precedent. It has set a precedent, but not one that is acceptable for existing leaseholders and residents for exactly the reasons outlined above – noise disturbance and lack of transparency about contribution to service charges. <p>Until issues around leases have been resolved, ensuring that all residents are offered protection against noise and nuisance, and that there is a fair and transparent agreement for contributing to building maintenance costs, this application should be rejected.</p>

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2021/2602/P	Lisa Klazek and James Pender	29/07/2021 17:41:51	OBJ	<p>As owners and residents of a flat in Ormonde Mansions, we object to this planning application for the following reasons:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none">1) Lack of consultation - the freeholder has made no attempt to consult with existing residential owners and occupants about the proposed changes, despite the fact that these changes could have a significant potential impact on us. As owners, we have not received any communication from the freeholder, nor have they gone through the Ormonde Mansions Residents Association, which is a well-established means for liaising with residents.2) Lack of protection against noise and nuisance - the creation of an additional flat with outside space could have a detrimental impact on existing residents, in particular due to noise. There is already an ongoing noise problem resulting from the occupants of one of the basement flats having loud, long and often late-night gatherings in their outdoor space. This space is directly below the bedrooms of the other 24 residential flats on floors 1-4 and prevents us from being able to sleep. This is a high density area, sound from the lightwells and outdoor space at the back echoes and amplifies.3) Lack of transparency, and lack of consistency with existing leases – the leases for the 24 residential flats on floors 1-4 all have provisions in them to guard against anti-social behaviour and nuisance (e.g. limits on noise after certain times, prevention from use as short term holiday lets, keeping animals, timings of building works). In short, these provisions help to ensure that neighbours are considerate of each other, which is particularly important in such a high density setting. The lease on any new residential flat absolutely must have similar provisions, and there is no evidence of this in the planning application. <p>Furthermore, the residential flats on floors 1-4 all pay a 1/24th contribution of the service charge and any other costs, such as major works. It is not at all clear how the basement flats – both current and the proposed new flat - contribute to the upkeep of the building, and how the costs will be equitably split with existing leaseholders.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none">4) The application cites the conversion of commercial premises into residential flats in the past as having set a precedent. It has set a precedent, but not one that is acceptable for existing leaseholders and residents for exactly the reasons outlined above – noise disturbance and lack of transparency about contribution to service charges. <p>Until issues around leases have been resolved, ensuring that all residents are offered protection against noise and nuisance, and that there is a fair and transparent agreement for contributing to building maintenance costs, this application should be rejected.</p>
