



Dear Mr Campbell,

I am writing to object to planning application 2021/3308/P. I own Flat D (Top Floor) in the same building as the proposed development.

Notice

I first learnt of the application when I received the attached letter from Mr Micanovic. I have only been able to view the drawings in the last few days, as Mr Micanovic did not supply them with his letter.

In his letter, Mr Micanovic purported to give notice under Article 6 of the Town and Country Planning (General Development Procedure) Order 1995. That Order was revoked in 2010 by the Town and Country Planning (Development Management Procedure) (England) Order 2010, which has itself since been revoked by the Town and Country Planning (Development Management Procedure) (England) Order 2015 ("the 2015 Order"). This is not confidence-inspiring; nor is Mr Micanovic's website: <https://vm-arch.com/>.

In any event, the notice was defective, in that it:

- was not served 21 days before the planning application was made, as required by Article 13(7) of the 2015 Order;
- was emailed rather than sent by post, contrary to Article 13(9) of the 2015 Order; and
- it failed to give the address of the premises (omitting any house number from the street address), contrary to Schedule 2 of the 2015 Order.

Substantive Objections

Change of Use

All four flats at 11 Hemstal Road were built as one-bedroom flats with separate kitchens – please see the drawings in the 1976 planning application: 22048 (<http://camdocs.camden.gov.uk/HPRMWebDrawer/Record/3538574/file/document?inline>).

The Basement flat was, at some point, changed into a quasi-two-bedroom flat, by converting the kitchen into a small second bedroom and moving the kitchen into the living room (see the Lower Ground Floor Plan As Existing at <http://camdocs.camden.gov.uk/HPRMWebDrawer/Record/9100317/file/document?inline>). I cannot find any planning application relating to this change.

The second bedroom (Bedroom 2 on the existing drawings in application 2021/3308/P) is currently of such a size (less than nine square metres) that it can only be used as a single bedroom or office. The proposed drawing doubles the size of that bedroom, such that it can now be used as a double bedroom. This means that the flat could be lived in by 3-4 people, rather than the 1-2 people originally intended.

If mirrored across the local area, such a change of use, fitting two double-bed flats into space intended for one double-bed flats, would result in significant population expansion in an already crowded area. More directly, having four people living in the flat would overwhelm the rubbish and recycling facilities that 11 Hemstal Road has, because the space for bins is very limited.

Furthermore, the proposal to add another bathroom, will strain the existing water facilities and could result in reduced pressure to the other flats.

Existing Plan vs 1976 Plan

It appears from a comparison of the Basement level in application 22048 and the existing floor plan in application 2021/3308/P (using the links above) that the Cellar (Dustbin Store) and its access corridor, designed as a communal dustbin storage area and owned by Camden as Freeholder, have been annexed by the Basement Flat. The front door now leads into the space that used to be the Dustbin Store. This has added 7-8 square metres to the Basement Flat, at the expense of having somewhere for communal storage. As far as I am aware, this work was done by Mr Perkins. The relevance to the current application is that the flat is already significantly (>10%) bigger than it was when first built and should not be further extended.

Building structure

There are waste pipes and gutter pipes along the back wall that run straight down the building. There is no suggestion in the application or drawings on how these pipes are going to be routed when the rear walls are moved three metres out of alignment with the rest of the building, nor is it possible to think of any practical solution to this problem.

The removal of part of the shingle-covered garden and replacement with an asphalt roof is liable to increase the water risk to the basement flat. As a long leaseholder, I do not want to be liable for more frequent repairs to the brickwork (which will be instigated by the freeholder, Camden Council) because the Basement flat has reduced its longevity by reducing natural drainage.

Security, aesthetic and disruption issues

The flat roof will make accessing the rear of the property (in particular Flat B on the Ground Floor) easy for burglars. It presents a serious security risk to the building, which (other than the Basement flat) is difficult to access from the street or garden, deterring would-be burglars. Someone who gains access to Flat B would find it easier to gain access to the rest of the building.

The extension's roof design means that the upstairs neighbouring flats will have a view onto a flat asphalt roof rather than a garden. That is not in keeping with the building or surrounding buildings, with only slate roof visible from the front or back.

There is no access to the rear of the property other than by the steps down to the Basement flat. This is liable to cause very slow construction. Four months is likely to be an underestimate of how long the project will take, which will be inconvenient for all neighbours, particularly at a time when many people are still working from home.

For all of the above reasons, this application should be rejected.

Yours Sincerely,

Adam Ross