

Application No:	Consultee Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2021/0364/P	wai ting wilfred	15/08/2021 09:12:26	OBJ	We are a leaseholder of the above property. We strongly object to the applicant's attempt to extend upwards of property. We worry about fire and safety. The construction will bring pollution and nuisance. Construction will bring damage to the outlook of the property.

Application No: 20/21/3594/F
 Consultee Name: Sirah Tan
 Received: 13/08/2021 07:59:07
 Comment: ODF

Response:

Dear Patrick Marleed,

I would like to register an objection to the above Planning Application for a Single Rooftop Extension at Beaufort Court on the basis that the proposed development does not comply with the conditions as specified under Class A, Part 20, Schedule 2 of The Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) (England) Order 2015 (the Order).

Loss of light

1. Under Schedule 2, Part 20, Class A(A 2)(1)(g) of the Order, any proposed development must consider the impact of the development on the amenity of the existing building and neighbouring premises including overlooking, privacy and the loss of light.
2. The Council has also recognised in its Camden Local Plan 2017 the importance of considering the potential harmful effects of proposed developments on existing and future occupiers as a result of loss of daylight and sunlight, and has committed to protecting the amenity of occupiers and neighbours.
3. As a leaseholder and current occupier of Beaufort Court, I am concerned that the proposed development would result in an unacceptable loss of light for my home (and presumably other similarly affected flats in the building). As one of the flats on the lower levels, two of the three bedrooms which are north-facing already suffer from questionably acceptable levels of natural light. An extension to the building will further reduce the amount of light reaching the rooms. As a consequence, my home may no longer possess sufficient access to light in line with Building Research Establishment guidelines.
4. As stated in a comment of 12 August 2021 from lawyers acting on behalf of Regal Property Investments Limited, the Applicant has not provided an independent assessment of the likely sunlight and daylight impacts of the proposed development. Proper scrutiny is critical before any such Application can be considered to meet the conditions set out in A 2(1)(g).
5. Given the current context, myself and other occupiers of the flat (including occasionally my elderly parents) - as well as other existing and future occupiers of neighbouring flats - are having to spend more time at home, working, living and even isolating. As noted in the Camden Local Plan, such detrimental loss of light can have [REDACTED] During the extended lockdowns I had to install 5 long mirrors in my bedroom just to try to create more natural light and make the space more habitable to minimal effect.
6. The Council's Local Plan sets out an expectation that new developments provide high quality housing with a focus on good natural light. This is in recognition of the fact that such housing can, amongst other things, support the health and wellbeing of residents in the Borough (especially the elderly), as well as contribute to the energy efficiency of buildings. Approving this proposed development will run directly counter to the Council's policies. I urge the Council to carefully consider and approve only development that furthers and positively contributes to, rather than detracts from, the Council's vision for the Borough.

Residential amenity

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
				<p>7. The Applicant fails to comment on the proposed developments impact on the amenity of the existing building. In its Application, the Applicant merely states that the proposed new dwellings were considered to deliver a good standard of accommodation.</p> <p>8. However, the Applicant has to date demonstrated a track record of poor management of the existing dwellings. Recently we faced an emergency in the flat as a result of penetrating damp where water was infiltrating through the external wall and into one of the bedrooms. The room occupants had to move out (of the only room that receives light) and into another room as it was rendered inhabitable and a health detriment. After over four months and numerous follow-ups met by deflection, the Applicant and their management eventually bothered to repair the defective exterior wall. This issue was similarly shared by the flat in the level above.</p> <p>9. The Applicant also states that refuse and recycling facilities [...] will similarly be utilised for the additional dwellings.) This is a point of concern as the waste management of the building is already extremely poor. Residents recently had to forego significant sums in an attempt to manage widespread infestation in the building caused by such shoddy management. The issue was first brought to the fore when I had to handle the invasion of mice in my home itself (see Annex for photo) and has been ongoing for a year and counting. Occupiers now have to live with bait safes scattered throughout their flats.</p> <p>10. An additional 16 flats will only serve to further exacerbate the pest infestation issue internally in the dwellings and in the surrounding local areas, and place excessive strains on a building that already lacks acceptable management. The proposed development will likely worsen the amenity and living standards for existing flats in the building, much less provide a good standard of accommodation for future occupiers. I urge the Council not to approve development which will negatively impact the already deficient amenity of the residences and furthermore falsely claims to provide acceptable accommodation.</p> <p>Final objections</p> <p>11. Finally, I would like to support and repeat the objections raised by lawyers acting on behalf of Regal Property Investments Limited in their comment of 12 August 2021.</p> <p>⚡ Given that the building is at least 18 metres high, the Application must be accompanied by a report from a chartered engineer (or other competent professional) confirming that the external wall construction of the Property (as existing) complies with paragraph B4(1) of Schedule 1 to the Building Regulations 2010. This is not provided by the current Application.</p> <p>⚡ The Applicant has not adequately demonstrated that the Property is detached within the meaning of Part 20.</p> <p>⚡ The extension of the Property would invalidate our current EWS1 certificate which took significant effort, over the course of a year, on the part of residents to obtain. This would obviously compromise our ability to sell, let or mortgage our properties and could come at significant personal and financial costs.</p>

Application No:	Consultee Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
				<p>Given the above objections, I respectfully request the Council to reject this Planning Application and am confident the right decision will be made.</p> <p>Yours sincerely, Sarah Tan</p>

Application No: 2021/3594/F
 Consultee Name: Sarah Tan
 Received: 13/08/2021 07:58:47
 Comment: OBJ

Response:

Dear Patrick Marfleet,

I would like to register an objection to the above Planning Application for a Single Rooftop Extension at Beaufort Court on the basis that the proposed development does not comply with the conditions as specified under Class A, Part 20, Schedule 2 of The Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) (England) Order 2015 (the Order).

Loss of light

1. Under Schedule 2, Part 20, Class A(A.2)(1)(g) of the Order, any proposed development must consider the impact of the development on the amenity of the existing building and neighbouring premises including overlooking, privacy and the loss of light.
2. The Council has also recognised in its Camden Local Plan 2017 the importance of considering the potential harmful effects of proposed developments on existing and future occupiers as a result of loss of daylight and sunlight, and has committed to protecting the amenity of occupiers and neighbours.
3. As a leaseholder and current occupier of Beaufort Court, I am concerned that the proposed development would result in an unacceptable loss of light for my home (and presumably other similarly affected flats in the building). As one of the flats on the lower levels, two of the three bedrooms which are north-facing already suffer from questionably acceptable levels of natural light. An extension to the building will further reduce the amount of light reaching the rooms. As a consequence, my home may no longer possess sufficient access to light in line with Building Research Establishment guidelines.
4. As stated in a comment of 12 August 2021 from lawyers acting on behalf of Regal Property Investments Limited, the Applicant has not provided an independent assessment of the likely sunlight and daylight impacts of the proposed development. Proper scrutiny is critical before any such Application can be considered to meet the conditions set out in A.2(1)(g).
5. Given the current context, myself and other occupiers of the flat (including occasionally my elderly parents) – as well as other existing and future occupiers of neighbouring flats – are having to spend more time at home, working, living and even isolating. As noted in the Camdens Local Plan, such detrimental loss of light can have an impact on our mental and physical health and influence life chances. During the extended lockdowns I had to install 5 long mirrors in my bedroom just to try to create more natural light and make the space more habitable (to minimal effect).
6. The Council's Local Plan sets out an expectation that new developments provide high quality housing with a focus on good natural light. This is in recognition of the fact that such housing can, amongst other things, support the health and wellbeing of residents in the Borough (especially the elderly), as well as contribute to the energy efficiency of buildings. Approving this proposed development will run directly counter to the Council's policies. I urge the Council to carefully consider and approve only development that furthers and positively contributes to, rather than detracts from, the Council's vision for the Borough.

Residential amenity

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
				<p>7. The Applicant fails to comment on the proposed developments impact on the amenity of the existing building. In its Application, the Applicant merely states that the proposed new dwellings were considered to deliver a good standard of accommodation.</p> <p>8. However, the Applicant has to date demonstrated a track record of poor management of the existing dwellings. Recently we faced an emergency in the flat as a result of penetrating damp where water was infiltrating through the external wall and into one of the bedrooms. The room occupants had to move out (of the only room that receives light) and into another room as it was rendered inhabitable and a health detriment. After over four months and numerous follow-ups met by deflection, the Applicant and their management eventually bothered to repair the defective exterior wall. This issue was similarly shared by the flat in the level above.</p> <p>9. The Applicant also states that refuse and recycling facilities [...] will similarly be utilised for the additional dwellings.) This is a point of concern as the waste management of the building is already extremely poor. Residents recently had to forego significant sums in an attempt to manage widespread infestation in the building caused by such shoddy management. The issue was first brought to the fore when I had to handle the invasion of mice in my home itself (see Annex for photo) and has been ongoing for a year and counting. Occupiers now have to live with bait safes scattered throughout their flats.</p> <p>10. An additional 16 flats will only serve to further exacerbate the pest infestation issue internally in the dwellings and in the surrounding local areas, and place excessive strains on a building that already lacks acceptable management. The proposed development will likely worsen the amenity and living standards for existing flats in the building, much less provide a good standard of accommodation for future occupiers. I urge the Council not to approve development which will negatively impact the already deficient amenity of the residences and furthermore falsely claims to provide acceptable accommodation.</p> <p>Final objections</p> <p>11. Finally, I would like to support and repeat the objections raised by lawyers acting on behalf of Regal Property Investments Limited in their comment of 12 August 2021:</p> <p>⚡ Given that the building is at least 18 metres high, the Application must be accompanied by a report from a chartered engineer (or other competent professional) confirming that the external wall construction of the Property (as existing) complies with paragraph B4(1) of Schedule 1 to the Building Regulations 2010. This is not provided by the current Application.</p> <p>⚡ The Applicant has not adequately demonstrated that the Property is detached within the meaning of Part 20.</p> <p>⚡ The extension of the Property would invalidate our current EWS1 certificate which took significant effort, over the course of a year, on the part of residents to obtain. This would obviously compromise our ability to sell, let or mortgage our properties and could come at significant personal and financial costs.</p>

Application No:	Consultee Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
				<p>Given the above objections, I respectfully request the Council to reject this Planning Application and am confident the right decision will be made.</p> <p>Yours sincerely, Sarah Tan</p>

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2021/3504/P	Varun Sarin	12/08/2021 19:45:06	OBJ	<p>Dear Sirs</p> <p>I am a current resident and leaseholder of Flat 48 Beaufort Court, 65 Maygrove Road, London NW6 2DA. I am writing to you in order to raise an objection to the planning applications - 2021/3504/P - which aims to erect a single storey rooftop extension to provide 16 additional residential dwellings at this site.</p> <p>There are 4 primary reasons for this objection:</p> <p>Loss of Light - I occupy the 1st floor that faces into a central courtyard. During the year, the position of the flat is such that we receive direct sunlight for only a few hours in the morning. With the proposed extension, the height of the building will reduce the amount of direct sunlight even further. I have had to purchase SAD lamps as this lack of light has had an impact on my mental health, especially in the winter months, and I am afraid this extension will exacerbate that problem even further.</p> <p>Impact to Amenity - As a full time home worker due to the pandemic, I am extremely worried that the noise and disturbance created by these works will impact my ability to work from home. Sound, especially drilling sounds, travels quite easily through the building, and I have had several instances where minor works have impacted conference calls and my ability to focus on my job. This would be unsustainable for works that would easily take months to carry out, and make the property uninhabitable.</p> <p>Lack of proper notice - I only found out about this application last week and by chance when one of the residents found a sign much further away from the property, at a location I am unlikely to cross when entering or exiting these premises. Upon realisation that the application notice had been discovered, another sign appeared late last week outside the building. I believe that the applicant is not acting in good faith during this process and has neither consulted nor properly notified the residents about the works.</p> <p>Neglected common areas: Having lived in the property for the past 3 years, I have seen the central courtyard fall into steady decay, with mice and foxes inhabiting the space regularly. The wild plant growth have become a safe haven for pests, and I believe that the common areas of the property are not being maintained to a decent standard. The addition of more flats will put further stress on these common areas and the applicant, via its management company, have already demonstrated their inability to maintain the building adequately.</p> <p>In addition, I have had sight of the letter dated 12 August, 2021 from Clyde & Co. on behalf of Regal Property Investments Limited and would like to support and repeat all the objections therein.</p> <p>Given the above grave concerns and strong objections from the residents, I urge the Council to reject this application.</p> <p>Kind Regards, Varun Sarin Flat 48 Beaufort Court 65 Maygrove Road London NW6 2DA</p>

Application No:	Consultee Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2021/3504P	Bela Zavery	13/08/2021 00:28:54	OBJ	<p>Dear Sirs</p> <p>I am one of the residents and long leasehold flat owners of the building 85 Maygrove Road London NW8 2DA (the Building) in respect of which planning application reference 2021/3504/P (the Application) has been lodged by Avon Ground Rents Limited (Avon).</p> <p>I write further to my email of the 2nd of August 2021 to Patrick Marfeet (to which I have not received a reply to date) and would like to formally register my Objection against the Application for the following reasons:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Regal Letter of Objection <p>I have had sight of the letter of objection dated 12 August 2021 lodged by Regal Homes Limited and concur and agree and repeat all of the objections contained therein.</p> <p>In addition as an occupant of the Building I would like to lodge an objection for the additional following reasons:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 2. A lack of due process: <p>The notice advertising the Application I understand ought to have been placed in a location which advertises the proposed development in a prominent location adjacent to the Building. No such notice was placed and had not another resident been notified by an acquaintance, the Building occupiers would not have been notified.</p> <p>I flagged this in my email to Mr Marfeet and the next day a notice was lodged outside the Building. I would flag that the location of this notice is immediately outside of my flat so I would have noticed had it been previously properly displayed.</p> <p>Avon has also omitted to notify and consult the residents of the Building by email or letter of its proposed Application. 3. A loss of Amenity: <p>The Building in respect of which the Application has been lodged will undergo a substantial loss of amenity should the Application be granted.</p> <p>The construction of a further floor of flats on top of the Building will substantially impact the residents of the Building (and me personally) for the following reasons:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. Waste: The Building already undergoes a number of issues with waste disposal - there are insufficient waste receptacle areas in the Building leading to bins overflowing which has in turn led to substantial build up of waste and debris. The local Council waste collection authority already has difficulty in managing the collection of the waste collections. The creation of additional residents will further exacerbate the problem compromising the cleanliness of the Building and the safety of its residents. </p>

Application No:	Consultee Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
				<p>b. Pests: The Building has already had (for over a year) an uncontained pest problem leading to mice and rats entering the Building (photographs of the same can be provided) and the build up of waste from additional residents will further exacerbate the problem for the reasons above and we no longer have confidence in Avon or their agent in resolving the issue.</p> <p>c. Safety: The waste from the Building is collected from the rear of the Building immediately outside the fire escape. The build up of waste and the lack of appropriate collection of waste from the Building has led as a consequence to the fire escape routes to the rear of the Building frequently becoming blocked by waste receptacles whilst collection is awaited. This will be exacerbated should more residents occupy the Building leading to potential safety concerns in the event of a fire emergency.</p> <p>d. Crime: It appears that the Application contemplates additional bicycle spaces in the basement to the Building. The Building has had an ongoing issue with crime as a consequence of the bicycle parking storage already in the basement which has led to criminals coming into the Building to steal the bikes on a frequent basis and there has been little to no deterrent in these incidents. This has been a repeated issue and the advent of even more bicycle spaces with additional bikes will further worsen the problem and compromise the safety of the residents.</p> <p>All of these issues are already of immense concern to me as a resident of the Building and I have many months of correspondence with the agent employed by Avon in respect of these matters. The fact that they have not been willed to date convinces me that the problem is likely to worsen should the Application be granted which will cause further substantial adverse impact on my well being and amenity as a resident of the Building.</p> <p>4. Impact from noise</p> <p>As a hybrid home worker located on the ground floor of the Building, I believe additional residents occupying the Building and the noise and disturbance of any construction works carrying out the Development will also impact my ability to work from home.</p> <p>More generally and to me of utmost importance I Object to the approval of the Application largely due to the issues we have faced in managing the fire safety of the Building.</p> <p>Post Grenfell all residential tenants have had grave concern about the safety of the buildings in which they reside and we have in this Building felt substantial trouble in establishing whether the Building is adequately protected against the horrors of Grenfell.</p> <p>ACM cladding exists on the top floor of the Building and for the last year I and the other residents have faced uncertainty and anguish of residing in an unsafe building with inability to sell or mortgage our flats and also facing for some time, a waking watch whilst the cladding and fire safety of the Building was investigated.</p> <p>This worry was only recently alleviated with the issue of an EWS1 certificate but in light of the works proposed by Avon we understand that this will invalidate the certificate we presently hold and potentially need to procure a new certificate which will require substantial additional expense and period of uncertainty.</p>

Application No:	Consultee Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
				<p>It is unbelievable that in a world in which Grenfell has occurred, the fire concerns and the mental and physical well being of tenants occupying an apartment building can be so disregarded by a Planning Authority and so I trust you will in good conscience not do so.</p> <p>On the basis of the above I would request that the Application is unconditionally and irrevocably refused.</p> <p>Many Thanks</p> <p>Bela Zavery</p>

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2021/3504/P	Jonathan May	12/08/2021 18:03:49	OBJ	<p>Dear Sirs, Application for a Single Rooftop Extension at Beaufort Court, 85 Maygrove Road, London, NW8 2DA Application Reference number: 2021/3504/P</p> <p>I am the leaseholder and resident of Flat 55, Beaufort Court and I object to the above referenced planning application.</p> <p>I concur with the points detailed in the letter from Clyde & Co on behalf of Regal Property Investments Ltd dated 12 August 2021 and I wish to register my strong objection to this planning application.</p> <p>In particular, I wish to bring the following to your attention:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. For the application to qualify under permitted development right, the building must be detached which is not demonstrated within the application. The building appears to be attached to the neighbouring building on the left-hand side when facing the building. 2. The impact on the occupants amenities might be compromised and there is not sufficient evidence in the application to prove otherwise. 3. The proposed works require greater scrutiny with regards fire safety and would also pose a foreseeable risk that extensive works could be required to remove and replace existing material in the external wall, changing the look and feel of the building. 4. The building is at least 18m high and as such the application must include a fire engineers report confirming external wall complies with Building Regulations. The current application does not provide such a report. 5. The proposed extension works are likely to require retrospective installation of sprinklers throughout the building. This would include residential sprinklers in the apartments and corridors and commercial grade sprinklers in larger ancillary areas e.g. the basement car park. 6. In the context of the matters raised in 5 above, the application does not offer sufficiently detailed proposals for fire safety. This does not allow me and other residents/leaseholders to determine: (i) the possible disruptive impact that the works may have regarding required access to install sprinklers in our apartments, (ii) the impact these systems have on the usable internal area of the apartments and consequential redecoration works, (iii) additional maintenance charges that may be required for the suppression systems, (iv) changes in the ancillary areas in the lower levels of the building to accommodate the plant to support the suppression systems, (v) possible changes to the external walls and balconies of our apartments and (vi) the potential invalidation of the current EWS1 form for Beaufort Court. 7. If the development were to take place the EWS1 form, which has taken over a year to obtain, would most likely become invalid which would have a significant impact on being able to sell leases within the building due to the inability to obtain mortgages without such a form. It also therefore brings into question the safety of the building. This is likely to lead to a significant detrimental impact on the mental health and wellbeing of the residents of Beaufort Court.

Application No:	Consultee Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
				<p>In addition to the points stated in the letter from Regal Property Investments I would like to add the following:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The addition of 16 new flats will overwhelm the current waste disposal system which already regularly overflows and has attracted mice to the building. 2. The significant levels of buildings work is likely to cause extreme levels of disruption during working hours. Given the work from home context post pandemic, I do not believe that the hours of permitted building work hours can be restricted to a satisfactory level to avoid significant disturbance and a consequential detrimental impact on the health and wellbeing of the residents of Beaufort Court and surrounding buildings. Either my ability to work from home to earn a living or my ability to sleep will be significantly impacted. 3. The building works will require upgrades to the lift system meaning that this will have a major detrimental impact on disabled or elderly residents. In addition, disabled friends and family will be excluded from visiting. 4. The potential loss of light is of a serious concern. Given the situation of the flat looking into the courtyard the extension of the roof is likely to reduce the amount of direct sunlight that hits both the living areas of the flat and the balcony. This reduction will have significant impacts on both physical and mental wellbeing. There has been no independent research into the impacts that the extension will have on the direct sunlight hours for the flat. This is unacceptable and represents a basis for rejection of the application. <p>Furthermore, I would like to add that I am disappointed with how the application has been communicated to me as a resident and leaseholder. I have received no direct notice of this application and notice of it was only put up on a tree in our road on 5 August 2021. This seems to have been done in bad faith and as a new resident of the area I am disappointed.</p> <p>Yours faithfully, Jonathan May</p>
2021/3504P	Sherislav Varkalov	13/08/2021 10:40:32	OBJ	<p>As a leaseholder and resident of the Flat 25 at Beaufort Court, the building subject to this application, I strongly object to this application. Accordingly, I request that the council refuses permission for this application.</p> <p>This is, inter alia, on the basis that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - it would inconvenience me and other residents for an extended period during the proposed construction, - that it would put additional pressure on the structure of the building, and that - the building is not detached as per the requirements of the rules for any additional construction. <p>The building is also more than 18 meters in height therefore the fire safety of the external wall must be ensured with the necessary report by a chartered engineer provided per Paragraph B4(1) Schedule 1 to the Building Regulations 2010.</p> <p>I kindly ask the council to refuse its permission for this development.</p>

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2021/3504P	Elizabeth Mabey	13/08/2021 10:53:50	OBJ	FAO Patrick Marfleet (patrick.marfleet@camden.gov.uk)

13 August 2021

Beaufort Court Planning Application Objection Comment

Application Reference: 2021/3504P

Re: Application for a Single Rooftop Extension at Beaufort Court, 65 Maygrove Road, London NW8 2DA, Class A, Part 20, Schedule 2 of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) (England) Order 2015 (as amended)

As a current leaseholder and occupier in the building in question, I would like to lodge my objection to Planning Application No. 2021/3504P in the strongest possible terms. The reasons for this objection and subsequent recommendation that this application is rejected outright are all made in line with Camden Council Planning Guidance on Amenity (January 2021) and the Camden Local Plan (2017), and are as follows:

1. Adverse effect on the property's residential amenity of neighbours WITHIN Beaufort Court

1.1. Waste Management – The additional burden of 16 flats worth of waste would further exacerbate the buildings already poor waste management. Due to the applicants poor management of the buildings waste and recycling facilities, pest contractors have been engaged in the waste management area and across the building to exterminate vermin such as mice and rats. The applicant documentation states that sufficient facilities will be provided within the refuse storage areas on the basement floor and that space within the corridor of the basement will be used to store 2x1100ths bins for waste, 2x1260ths bins for recycling and 1x500ths bin for food waste. The addition of more large bins will worsen what is already a risk to residents and waste removal professionals, as well as exacerbate the already high risk that vermin will proliferate further within the building and beyond to the surrounding neighbourhood and Peace Park. Policy CC5 (Waste) of the Camden Local Plan states that the Council will make sure that developments include facilities for the storage and collection of waste and recycling – the current application documentation falls well short of demonstrating that this will be provided safely.

1.2. Access – Cycle storage – Adequate cycle storage for all residents of the development, including for the 16 additional flats proposed by this extension, is of key importance given that the building is a car-free development. The applicant documentation states that (Thirty cycle spaces will be provided for the new development. These will be accommodated in the basement with the existing provision.) However, it must be pointed out that the buildings current provision of cycle storage already falls well short of the required standard, even without the additional burden of 16 additional flats worth of necessary storage. Firstly, the provided cycle storage is not a safe or secure environment, with at least 3 separate burglaries of multiple bikes from the current cycle storage facility reported to Police (15 August 2019, 27 July 2020, 11 January 2021). Secondly, the documentation has not adequately evidenced how 30 additional cycle storage berths will be accommodated. Proposed plans show that only 56 bicycles will be able to fit into the reconfigured main cycle storage room, when, with an additional 16 flats, over 100 total cycle berths will need to be provided to accommodate the additional 30 berths that the application states must be added on top of current provision. Even with an additional 20 berths in another cycle room the number of cycle storage berths falls well short of

Application No:	Consultee Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
				<p>the recommended number for the building as stipulated by The London Plan 2021. As per the Fortune Green & West Hampstead neighbourhood plan as adopted by Camden, Policy 6.5 recommends the provision of appropriate bicycle storage in residential and commercial development in order to meet the aims of Camden Local Plan Policy T1 - Prioritising walking, cycling and public. The Council must seek to ensure that this development provides for accessible, secure cycle parking facilities exceeding minimum standards outlined within the London Plan, and taking into account the size and location of the development and proposed extension as well as local cycle route infrastructure, the applicant should be demonstrating how to accommodate higher levels of provision. The current and proposed cycle storage provision means that the proposed extension will fall far short of meeting these requirements.</p> <p>1.3 Relating and critical to both points above, it is my understanding that the Applicant does not own the basement space and must therefore demonstrate how it will gain the right to make the necessary changes (including building reconfiguration) and additions to waste and cycle storage despite having no ownership of these spaces.</p> <p>2. Impacts of the proposed extension development on the amenity of residential neighbours surrounding Beaufort Court.</p> <p>2.1 Overlooking - As the application itself states, the proposed additional storey would make the roof more prominent and highlight a more horizontal element of the scheme when viewing the site from the front than the rear. As per the Fortune Green & West Hampstead neighbourhood plan as adopted by Camden Council: 'Roof extensions should fit in with existing rooflines [...] Such extensions should be in proportion to the existing building and should not block views [...] C7. Maygrove Road: a number of large developments have been built and are planned for this road. Any further developments should be no higher than existing buildings on the street and should be mindful of the impact of other recent developments.' The proposed extension will not fit in with existing rooflines, making the tallest building in the surrounding area even taller and therefore more overbearing.</p> <p>2.2 Loss of privacy - Furthermore, given that balconies are considered to impact on the privacy of neighbours even more than windows, the provision of 16 additional balconies will have a significant impact on privacy levels to the surrounding area and neighbours, especially those at 61-80 Maygrove Road.</p> <p>2.3 Visual impact of the extension on the open aspect of the neighbourhood - an additional floor will enlarge the physical 'presence' of the building - its scale and mass will create an overbearing effect and oppressive feeling on surrounding neighbours and amenities; this will affect both residential neighbours along 61-80 Maygrove Road and users of the adjacent Peace Park.</p> <p>2.4 Impact on use of local green spaces - The proposed development, in the absence of a legal agreement to secure a financial contribution towards the provision of, improvement to and maintenance of public open space in the surrounding area, would be likely to contribute unacceptably to pressure on the Borough's open space facilities which are already under significant load such as the Maygrove Peace Park, contrary to policies Policy A2 (Open space) and Policy DM1 (Delivery and monitoring) of the London Borough of Camden Local Plan Framework Core Strategy.</p> <p>2.5 Loss of light - It is particularly important in this densely developed part of the borough to prevent</p>

Application No:	Consultee Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
				<p>overheading of amenity space and open spaces given the limited amount of open spaces and the existing amount of overshadowing, this extension will create an intrusive feeling as a result of the development for those residents of 51-53 Maygrove Road opposite Beaufort Court whose rooms are most sensitive to overlooking, ie. The main living areas and bedrooms will be in the line of sight, negatively affecting the quality of life of occupants and enjoyment of their properties by adjoining residential occupiers, and users of the Maygrove Peace Park, including children who use the playgrounds. Impact on one of a small number of Local Green Spaces within the area - The NPPF states as a core planning principle (17) that 'planning should contribute to conserving and enhancing the natural environment' - this additional floor will do the opposite, hindering local users enjoyment of this award-winning public park that forms a focal point for the community in this part of the area and a highly significant local asset.</p> <p>2.6. Independent verification of loss of light - As per the application documentation on the planning portal, no independent verification of the sunlight and daylight implications of the Development has been undertaken by a qualified surveyor on behalf of the Council. We would ask the Council to do so. Without this, it cannot conceivably be the case that the pre-application advice provided by officers was predicated upon any definitive or accurate (i.e. expert) conclusion that the Development would not give rise to unacceptable impacts in terms of loss of light and outlook for neighbours. This absence of proper scrutiny of the likely sunlight and daylight impacts of the Development represents a further basis on which the Application must be rejected.</p> <p>2.7. For all of the reasons above, the proposed extension, by virtue of its additional height, mass and scale would result in an overdominant form of development causing harm to the streetscene and negatively impacting on enjoyment of neighbourhood amenity along Maygrove Road and the adjoining Peace Park, contrary to Policy A1 (Managing the impact of development) of the London Borough of Camden Local Plan -> that the Council will seek to protect the quality of life of occupiers and neighbours.</p> <p>3. The proposed extension, in the absence of a legal agreement to secure the proposed affordable housing on-site, would fail to maximise the contribution of the site to the supply of affordable housing in the borough, contrary to policy H4 (Maximising the supply of affordable housing) of the London Borough of Camden Local Plan.</p> <p>4. In line with the objection letter from lawyers instructed by Regal Property Investments Ltd sent on 12 August 2021 regarding this application, I would also like to highlight, repeat and strongly agree with the following further points which further strengthen the case for this application to be rejected outright:</p> <p>4.1. The building is at least 18 metres high and so an application for prior approval should include a fire engineers report confirming the external wall complies with Building Regulations. The current application does not provide such a report. Additional to this, the Council are currently investigating the external wall of the development.</p> <p>4.2. The application does not sufficiently demonstrate that the building is detached, which it must be to qualify under permitted development rights.</p> <p>4.3. The current compliant EVS1 form for the building would become invalidated (having taken over a year to obtain). Since the tragedy at Grenfell Tower and the concurrent heightened importance of fire safety in residential apartment buildings across London, it would be catastrophic to invalidate the work done by current</p>

Application No:	Consultee Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:	Printed on:
				leaseholders to acquire this certificate by granting this extension application. Please consider the above objections and reject this Application.	16/08/2021 09:16:05

Application No: 2021/3594P
 Consultees Name: Gemma Fenniman
 Received: 12/08/2021 19:33:52
 Comment: OBJ

Response: Also sent by email to patrick.marfleet@camden.gov.uk

Dear Sirs

I own the long leasehold interest in a top floor flat on Beaufort Court, 65 Maygrove Road (the Property). I am writing on my behalf and also on behalf of the holders of the long leasehold interest in three other top floor flats in the Property, Manaton Nominees Ltd.

We understand that Avon Ground Rents Limited (the Applicant) has submitted an application for a single rooftop extension at the Property (the Application). We do not live at the Property and neither us, nor our tenants, have received any notification from the Applicant about the Application. At the very least, this is not in accordance with good practice and we feel that it is in fact underhand and deceitful, especially considering the huge negative impact this Application will have if it goes ahead (please see below).

We have seen the letter dated 12 August 2021 from Clyde & Co on behalf of Regal Property Investments Limited (the Letter). We agree and repeat all of the objections raised in the Letter.

In addition, we strongly object to the Application on the grounds set out below.

1. The impact on the existing building:

a) We understand from our tenants and those occupying other flats in the Property that the Property is already struggling to cope with refuse. There are not enough bins/a big enough bin storage area for the existing tenants, leading to a build of refuse and lack of collection by the Council. This is particularly concerning as we understand that fire escape routes to the rear of the Property are often blocked by refuse which has not yet been collected. This problem will of course be exacerbated with the addition of 16 flats, not least of all because it is our understanding that the Applicant does not own the basement space where the bins are kept. We therefore fail to see how it will even make the necessary changes to accommodate additional bin storage.

b) There has also been a serious pest issue in the Property with numerous sightings of mice and rats over the last couple of years. Some tenants have had to live with pest issues for months on end, which has not only had a horrendous impact on their quality of life but is a real health issue. Again, the addition of 16 flats and the resulting additional waste is only going to make this problem worse.

These issues have arisen at a time when we have seen both soaring service charges and the considerable worsening of general amenities within the Property, for example lifts being out of order, damage to the roof not being repaired for over two years causing considerable leaks, and numerous bike thefts. The Applicant, via its management company, has continually failed to address these issues and we can only imagine how much worse this will be for the Property if the Application is successful - firstly with all attention turning to the building works and then with the additional strain on the Property with 16 new flats.

2. The noise and disturbance resulting from having flats above those which were previously on the top floor: we paid a premium for our long leasehold interest in top floor flats so as to avoid having noise and disturbance from people living above. We recognise that our leases state that an additional floor could be built but, at the

Application No:	Consultee Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
				<p>time of signing, we understood this to be a standard clause and not something that would ever be enforced. Even if we put aside the noise and disturbance of months of building work (particularly hard to do at a time when tenants are working at home and so will not want to rent out flats at the Property), if the Application is successful there will be a loss of amenity for those tenants as it will forever take away the essence of the existing top floor flats and they will have to put up with noise and disturbance from flats above. Personally, having previously had noisy neighbours living upstairs me for years, I know what a detrimental impact noise in ones home can have on amenity, quality of life and wellbeing.</p> <p>3. Loss of light: we note from paragraph 3.15 of the Letter that there is no definitive or accurate (i.e. expert) conclusion that the Development would not give rise to unacceptable impacts in terms of loss of light and outlook for other properties within the Development. As the owners of long leaseholds in top floor flats, the loss of light and outlook is of particular concern and this of course must be fully and independently investigated in advance if the Application is to proceed.</p> <p>4. Fire safety/EWS1: After learning that there was ACM cladding on the top floor of the Property, we have been extremely concerned about the fire safety of the Property as a whole. The leaseholders have finally been able to obtain an EWS1 certificate, after nearly a year of battling with the Applicant's managing agents to undertake the necessary work to the Property. We understand that, if the Application is successful, it is likely that the certificate will be invalid. This is going to cause considerable worry to the residents from both a fire safety and financial point of view as any remedial works at this stage will be extensive. Post-Grenfell, we feel that this is something that will undoubtedly be taken extremely seriously when considering the Application.</p> <p>5. The external appearance of the building: this is going to be considerably impaired if the Application is successful. As the Application itself states, the proposed additional storey would make the roof as a whole more prominent. This goes against the Fortune Green & West Hampstead neighbourhood plan (which has been adopted by Camden Council) as the proposed extension will not fit in with existing rooflines, making the tallest building in the surrounding area even taller and, as a result, more overbearing.</p> <p>Please carefully consider all the objections above and reject the Application.</p> <p>Yours faithfully</p>
2021.3504P	wai ting wifred	15/08/2021 09:12:23	OBJ	<p>We are a leaseholder of the above property. We strongly object to the applicant's attempt to extend upwards of property. We worry about fire and safety. The construction will bring pollution and nuisance. Construction will bring damage to the outlook of the property.</p>
2021.3504P	wai ting wifred	15/08/2021 09:12:28	OBJ	<p>We are a leaseholder of the above property. We strongly object to the applicant's attempt to extend upwards of property. We worry about fire and safety. The construction will bring pollution and nuisance. Construction will bring damage to the outlook of the property.</p>

Application No:	Consultee Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2021/3594P	Phil Gray	16/08/2021 03:14:45	OBJ	<p>I would like to register my objection to this proposed development, as a resident of the building concerned.</p> <p>I would like to object on a number of grounds, the first being that planning documents are not accessible on this portal (there appears to be some sort of website issue).</p> <p>Secondly, that the building is not a detached building, which it must be under permitted development rights. A social housing development forms part of the development, which is inextricably physically connected this address.</p> <p>Thirdly, that the building's general areas are not large enough to cope with an additional 16 households. The refuse area is already overflowing, on street parking is already maxed out, and the resultant traffic & traffic noise on the road outside horrendous.</p> <p>Fourth, that the freeholders have demonstrated their incompetence even in building and seeking approval for the construction of the main building. As I'm sure you are aware there is a basement carpark, which is completely unused because the freeholder did not ensure that the proper permissions and licences were granted at the proper time. This proves that they clearly cannot be trusted to construct further on top of the roof of the development.</p> <p>Fifth, that the significant detrimental impact to residents has not been taken into account. This is self-evident, given I have received no consultation nor communication from the applicant whatsoever. To lodge an application of this sort without consulting the very people who live immediately below the application is wrong. The various detrimental impacts I can foresee are listed below - none of which have been acknowledged, discussed, nor as far as I can see considered at all:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">- on the advice of my professional agent, this project will reduce the value of my property, which is currently on the top floor of the development.- the noise and disruption of construction immediately on top of our apartment will be unbearable.- I cannot see any details documenting what steps have been taken to ensure there will be no intrusion of noise (from those people living on an abode on our roof, which in the original building design is not built with this in mind) or light (over our balcony). <p>That in the current day & age a developer can lodge such an application without proper consultation with residents is frankly abhorrent, and I cannot understand how it is allowed.</p>

Application No:	Consultee Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2021/3504/P	Claire Jolly (nee L.egg)	12/08/2021 17:22:38	OBJ	<p>Dear Mr. Marfleet,</p> <p>As a current leaseholder and occupier of Flat 21, Beaufort Court, 65 Maygrove Road, London NW6 2DA, I am writing to raise a number of objections in connection with Planning Application - 2021/3504/P, an Application for a Single Rooftop Extension comprising 16 flats on top of Beaufort Court, 65 Maygrove Road, London NW6 2DA.</p> <p>Lack of Due Process - The proposed application was made without proper notification or consultation with residents. I understand that an attempt was made (after complaints) to loosely attach a couple of notices to lamp posts outside the building. I feel this is insufficient, especially so given the nature and scale of the works.</p> <p>Pests & Waste Collection - Beaufort Court residents have had to pay significant sums recently in order to manage a major pest issue. Mice and rats have infested the building, including the cavity walls. This has taken over a year to get under control and works are ongoing. The problem, as documented by a private pest control management company, and recorded with photographic evidence by them and multiple residents, is coming from the outside perimeter of the building and has been exacerbated by poor waste collection and management practices by the applicant's managing agent and in the Maygrove Road and broader Camden area. This, in addition to other ongoing issues, has led to ever escalating service charges. Additional building works and potentially tens and tens of additional residents (e.g. 16 flats with at least 2-4 occupants) will inevitably disrupt the steps that have been taken to manage this upsetting issue which poses an ongoing threat to the health of residents.</p> <p>Residential Amenity - I am concerned that residential amenity will be severely impacted. In line with Camden Planning Guidance Amenty January 2021, it's clear that the proposed works will impact privacy, outlook and light. Furthermore, noise/vibration and the general disruption generated by additional building works will make for deteriorating living conditions for all residents. Given the likelihood that further COVID-19 restrictions will mean that residents will have to spend more time in the building, this will inevitably compound the already challenging times in which we all find ourselves.</p> <p>Fire Safety/ EWS1 - As I am sure you will appreciate, recent fire safety regulations resulting from the Grenfell tragedy have necessitated additional works and the issue of an EWS1 Form. An EWS1 Form has only just been issued to Beaufort Court after over a year. Residents had to lobby the applicant's managing agents to address the issue and the execution of their responsibilities in this regard was found to be subject to undue delay and lacked attention to detail. This led to a "waking watch" in the building and slow resolution of key works thereby posing a threat to the safety of residents. The issue of an EWS1 was a result of significant works to the building which caused extreme disruption. These works were also very costly, residents had to find additional funds at short notice. Disturbingly, I understand that the planning application submitted will compromise our current EWS1 Form, which would impact the ability for residents to sell, let or mortgage their properties, violating the right to protection of property.</p> <p>I have also seen the letter dated 12 August, 2021 from Clyde & Co. on behalf of Regal Property Investments Limited and would like to support and repeat all the objections therein, namely:</p> <p>The building is at least 18 metres high and so an application for prior approval should include a fire engineer's report confirming the external wall complies with Building Regulations. The current application does not provide such a report. Additional to this, the Council are currently investigating the external wall of the</p>

Application No:	Consultee Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
				<p>development.</p> <p>The application does not demonstrate that the building is detached, which it must be to qualify under permitted development rights. We will support this objection with photos showing the neighbouring building connected to Beaufort Court.</p> <p>The amenity impact on occupiers would be detrimental and the Council do not have sufficient information to make an informed assessment of the impact on the amenity. We have asked them to seek independent advice on the impact this would have.</p> <p>The compliant EWS1 form would become invalidated (having taken over a year to obtain).</p> <p>Given the objections raised and the persistent inability of the applicant and their managing agents to execute their current duties in connection with the building, I call on the Council to reject this application outright.</p> <p>I also deem there to be a broader public interest in drawing the Council's attention to this particular case which may be being replicated across the borough. I have therefore copied all Camden Councillors, including our local Fortune Green representatives, into this correspondence via email.</p> <p>Kind regards,</p> <p>Claire Jolly (nee Legg) 21 Beaufort Court 65 Maygrove Road London NW8 2DA</p>
