

Dear Planning Application Representative,

Please find below our response to the following planning application in detail.

Response to Planning Application no. 2021/3242/P

Thank you for the opportunity to raise our concerns regarding the aforementioned Planning Application by Mr. B. McKay. We are the owners of the First Floor Flat at 141 King Henry's Rd and we, along with our long term tenants will suffer significantly and adversely if this planning application is granted. To be clear, we are strongly opposed to these plans on a number of grounds which we set out below.

- 1. This building is approximately 200 years old and has suffered issues of stability in the past. The building has required underpinning and reinforcement at the top with a steel strap to keep it attached to the main wall. We are concerned that any work to modify or remove the bay would destabilize the whole thing again. Additionally, we are extremely concerned at the structural implications for the wall and bay window to the upper ground floor flat. The bay of the basement and upper ground-floor is a very fragile part of the property's structure.
- 2. We believe that the structural integrity and historic appearance of 141 King Henry's Rd, in a conservation area, is very important. This has been achieved by the remodeling of properties on either side of 141 where bay windows have been retained.
- 3. One of the unintentional effects of the rebuilding of the conservatory to the size requested would be that the wall adjacent to the common wall will provide a narrow, inaccessible corridor for only vermin, rubbish and debris to accumulate. We are concerned about the health risk that this would cause.
- 4. As indicated in the planning application it states the work will be done over 6 months, November 2021 to April 2022. As this work will be over the winter months, this period is likely to be extended due to bad weather conditions. In any case, what is of particular concern to our tenants as they work and study from home, the noise would disturb their quiet enjoyment of their premises. Not to mention the dust, scaffolding installationa and potential inconvenience around the main entrance to our property. (When 137 was developed, our neighbours at 139 had to have internal scaffolding because otherwise their living room ceiling would have collapsed).
- 5. We would also draw your attention to the Access Statement pages of Mr. McKay's planning application: picture 2 shows the bay window in question, not picture 3.
 - a. The plans show part of the garden wall would be demolished. This would be problematic as the garden wall is the party wall demarking the properties of 141/139 KH Rd, and not the property of the basement flat.

- 6. First and Foremost, we have informed Mr. B McKay on several occasions in writing that we do not approve these plans. We, the KHR Residence Association and/or as individual owners or any of the other tenants have not received any official notification, although we were aware anecdotally that Mr McKay wanted to renew his planning application that had been delayed by his long term tenants, not by Covid.
- 7. Mr. Mckay is aware of the absolute covenant in our Lease at Clause 2(20) which states as follows:

 "Not to cut maim alter or remove any of the principal timbers beams columns roofs walls or other structural parts of the demised premises or any part thereof or to make any alterations in the plan elevation or in the nature of the user of the demised premises or any part thereof or affect alter or modify the external appearance thereof or make any erection addition or alteration whatsoever structural or otherwise to the demised premises either externally or internally or to carry out any development as defined by the Planning Acts as previously defined on or to the demises or any part thereof".

We can find no reason why this Clause 2(20) should not apply to Mr. B McKay's application and prevent the plan from preceding further.

The 141 King Henry's Rd Residents Association Ltd has written to Mr McKay twice about our objection to these plans, but he has chosen to ignore the letters and continue with his plans.

We thank you for giving due consideration to our objections and we would be happy to provide any further information that might be helpful. We would be grateful if you could please acknowledge receipt of this email notice by return.

Yours sincerely,

Mr. Alan and Kimberly Rudoff Owner, FFF, 141 King Henry's Rd, London NW3 3RD