

Printed on: 26/08/2021 09:10:05

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2021/2911/P	D. Bates	25/08/2021 13:22:44	OBJ	This is unsuitable use in a residential area with many young families and several elderly residents. There is a care home nearby and the residents regularly take exercise in the local streets. They would be intimidated and threatened by the young people it is proposed to house there.
2021/2911/P	Marina Ross	25/08/2021 19:49:20	PETITNOBJE	As a tenant of Lady Margaret Road whose property was at one time a children's home for wayward teenagers prior to my tenancy beginning 1996 my neighbours shared their disturbing stories of living beside the home and having to deal with abuse, noise, police presence and vandalism before its closure. If having such a children's home was deemed successful in this residential environment then my home would still be a children's home and I would be residing elsewhere. I suspect private enterprise is at the heart of this scheme NOT professional care, counselling, rehabilitation of vulnerable children.
2021/2911/P	Saul Margo	25/08/2021 19:30:17	OBJ	This does not seem to be a suitable location for a residential home of this sort. The street is full of young families as well as a number of vulnerable elderly people who live alone and walk to the shops on their own. It is very hard to understand the plans themselves but 1 FTE employee to look after vulnerable young people seems woefully inadequate. I am also very concerned about the complete lack of consultation with the local community. A home of this sort could transform the street and we have been told little about it in this application - with there being zero consultation. I entirely understand that these young people need homes but those homes need to provide proper care and support and be in appropriate locations.
2021/2911/P	Charles Reid	25/08/2021 18:00:39	APP	As a resident of Dunollie Road - I would very much appreciate more information as to the planned usage of the building.

Printed on: 26/08/2021 09:10:05

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2021/3183/P	Peter H. Hufschmid-Hirsch buehl	25/08/2021 10:34:12	AMEND	Dear Sir / Madam The owners of flat 6 (A. Moret) and flat 5 (Hirschbuehl / Hufschmid) jointly request that the erection of the enclosure referred to in planning application 2021/3183/P at 4.1 [Formation of new enclosure to existing flat roof stair hatch to enable installation of Automatic Opening Vent (AOV) smoke control system with associated maintenance door access to flat roof] can be dispensed with. They request that the AOV (Stirling CR140 Casement Ventilator, as proposed) be placed directly on the now existing hatch, thus eliminating the need for the enclosure. Justification: - As of today, the property at 6 Regents Park Road does NOT qualify as an HMO because more than 50% of the seven flats are owner occupied (flats 1, 2, 5, 6). - Due to the very tight space on the roof of the property and the proximity of the two extensions, which are just 1300mm apart, the enclosure would lead to undesirable and severe consequences for the owners of the roof extensions, and indeed for the remaining flats in the building. - Since the privacy screen and the enclosure with its door to the roof are mutually exclusive, the privacy screen would have to be removed. This would remove the protection of the amenities of both flats. - The patio and its window of flat 6 would be completely covered by the enclosure and lose its important function for the well-being of the residents. In particular, the southern incidence of light in flat 6 would be massively reduced. - Camden Planning proposed to install 'angled fins' instead of the privacy screen on the two windows of flat 6 and 5 which face each other. This solution is not acceptable because it would lead to a further significant reduction in light in both flats. - Both owners suggest that the erection of the enclosure and its undesirable consequences on flats 6 and 5 would result in a significant reduction in the material value of their flats. - The owners of the flats ask the Council to consider that the enclosure must be erected solely because of the existence of the two roof extensions. - The two owners have already had to invest significantly in fire safety measures as part of the construction of their extensions: fire-safe and self-closing three-hinged entrance doors, electric fire alarms in each room, AOVs above the internal staircases, sprinkler systems, and even fire-safe doors between rooms. - It can be objectively questioned whether the enclosure really adds to the safety of the two flats in the rare event of a fire. What is certain, however, is that the consequences of the enclosure would massively reduce the daily quality of life in both flats. - Moreover, the physical reality is that the enclosure would not benefit the residents of the other flats below. On the contrary, the almost three-metre-high enclosure will act as a resistance in the event of a fire and massively obstruct and delay the flow of smoke out of the stairwell and the AOV. - To sum up, doing without the enclosure would mean that the patio of flat 6 would be preserved, the massive reduction of light entering both flats would be prevented, the amenities of both flats would be preserved, the material value of both flats would not be endangered, the quality of life of both flats would be preserved, and the safety of the lower flats would not be reduced by hindering the outflow of smoke through a resistance on the roof. - Based on Article 34 of 'The Regulatory Reform (Fire Safety) Order 2005', the owners of flats 6 and 5 conclude that the erection of the enclosure is not 'reasonably practicable' and ask the planning authority to waive the requirement to erect it.

Application No: Consultees Name: Received: Comment: Response:

Printed on: 26/08/2021 09:10:05

Yours sincerely,
Oscar Moret, Tina Hirschbuehl Hufschmid, Peter H. Hufschmid-Hirschbühl
