

Mohammed Ahmed

From: Donald Benton [REDACTED]
Sent: 03 September 2021 15:55
To: Patrick Marfleet
Cc: Planning Planning
Subject: Objection to Application 2021/3504/P
Attachments: Planning objection.pdf

[EXTERNAL EMAIL] Beware – This email originated outside Camden Council and may be malicious Please take extra care with any links, attachments, requests to take action or for you to verify your password etc. Please note there have been reports of emails purporting to be about Covid 19 being used as cover for scams so extra vigilance is required.

FAO Patrick Marfleet:

Dear Patrick,

Please find attached my objection to Application 2021/3504/P.

With best wishes,

Donald Benton.

Dear Patrick,

I am writing to strongly object to the plan (2021/3504/P) entitled "Erection of single storey rooftop extension to provide 16 additional residential dwellings"

I am a leaseholder within the [REDACTED]. My objections are similar to a number previously lodged, particularly those from Regal homes and other current leaseholders and residents. The objections fall into a number of categories:

The building is not a detached property: This application is made under the "*PART 20: Construction of New Dwellinghouses: Class A*" provision within "*The Town and Country Planning (Permitted Development and Miscellaneous Amendments) (England) (Coronavirus) Regulations 2020*" act. This states that this application is only valid "... on a building which is a purpose-built, detached block of flats ...".

The technicality of whether this building is detached or not is clearly known to be a contentious issue, as the developer has provided a report from an external surveyor. The RICS (of which this surveyor is a fellow) defines a detached building as "... a stand-alone residential structure that does not share outside walls with another house or building".

As demonstrated in images in this report and in many of the other objections presented this block clearly does share an outside wall with the neighbouring 61 Maygrove Road. The surveyors report does not provide an accurate referenced definition of what a detached property is or the makeup of the current built structure. The report relies on the opinion and CV of the surveyor rather than providing any substantive evidence.

Issues related to refuse disposal: Beaufort court currently has a refuse problem, with inadequate disposal facilities for the 91 current dwellings, which would be clear after consultation with the residents and staff employed by the managing agents. The suggested development proposes to use existing waste disposal routes, which is unacceptable.

Fire safety: As detailed in many of the objections, this block has only recently been granted an ESW1 certificate after remedial works were carried out at the expense of the leaseholders, at long last making the block safe for the residents. Alterations to the exterior of the block will invalidate this ESW1 certificate, causing great disruption to the leaseholders by again making it impossible to sell or obtain a mortgage on their properties. The developer needs to give in depth consideration to fire safety issues and the validity of the ESW1 certificate and the impacts for current leaseholders.

External appearance: The addition of an additional storey will disrupt the visual appearance of Maygrove Road. The current building was planned and built to a similar height to the neighbouring 61 Maygrove Road as well as other properties not attached but adjacent to Beaufort court.

Disruption throughout work: I also object on the grounds of disruption to the residents of the current structure during the building. There is inadequate detail given as to the plans for roof access and ongoing disruption to services within the block over and above generic legal requirements of all building sites in residential areas.

For the above reasons I request you reject this plan.

Yours sincerely,

Donald Benton, PhD.