

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2021/5963/P	Priya Dasani	23/01/2022 15:03:45	OBJNOT	<p>I wish to object to the planning permission 2021/5963/P on the following grounds:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The existing building which was developed by a company within the same group has fire safety issues and has been deemed unfit. The Council is already taking action on this. In light of this, planning permission for the additional rooftop development should not be granted as it will built on an existing unsafe building.</li> <li>2. All safety and cladding issues need to be resolved prior to any consideration of the planning application.</li> <li>3. The applicant has clearly demonstrated to be untrustworthy and has denied responsibility to fix the existing safety issues and so cannot be relied on do the correct thing.</li> <li>4. The existing flats already have soundproofing issues and footsteps on the floor above can be heard in the flat below. This will just exacerbate the problem as the developer in the same group is involved.</li> <li>5. The development has only 1 lift and addition of flats will make this more of an issue.</li> <li>6. There are already problems with parking on Iverson Road and additional flats will just make this worse.</li> <li>7. The additional floor will result in the height of the building being higher than the surrounding buildings.</li> </ol>
2021/5963/P	MITESH PATEL	23/01/2022 12:42:10	COMMNT	<p>I would implore the council to reject this application due to the following.</p> <p>The building has been deemed unsafe from fire and until the developers (as per the recent government guidance) take ownership and rectify this, further building work should not be considered, liquidating their original company to absolve them of liability and transferring into another of their companies should not make a difference (as they have done for other aspects of the development).</p> <p>I'm not sure of the legality of the application but to allow this would be morally and ethically wrong and against the interests and safety of the residents.</p>
2021/5963/P	Chirag Sachdev	23/01/2022 11:42:49	APP	<p>That this application has been submitted against the backdrop of the building having been deemed unsafe and the Council taking enforcement action against the freeholder to remedy. An application for this (Ref 2021/6057/P) has been submitted, but is not yet determined.</p> <p>It would be wholly irresponsible and possibly negligent of the Council to determine positively the application for extension until this is resolved.</p> <p>The Council should therefore refuse the application and should not entertain any further submissions until (a) the Ref Ref 2021/6057/P application is determined and (b) the works have been undertaken satisfactorily and signed off.</p> <p>We note Policy D12 of the London Plan requires the submission of a fire safety audit / report. Whilst this focusses on ¿major developments¿ there are clearly compelling circumstances why one needs to be submitted in this instance, given the proposal is for additional dwellings on top of an unsafe building. In this respect the application is deficient and should be refused on fire safety grounds.</p> <p>Not adopting such a precautionary approach could lead to further risks to health and safety and fire risk ie Grenfell.</p> <p>Without getting too emotional, The last 5 years have been stressful and painful.</p>

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2021/5963/P	Dr S & Dr M Kaushal	22/01/2022 15:22:53	OBJ	<p>My wife and I profusely and wholeheartedly object to this application, as it has been submitted against the backdrop of the building having been deemed unsafe and has caused nothing but anguish and stress. Camden Council has taken enforcement action against the freeholder to remedy the many issues with the building.</p> <p>We believe that It will be irresponsible and immoral of the Council to accept the application for extension until all matters are resolved. We have had 5 years of hell and just when we can see some light at the end of the tunnel, we are not prepared to have further disruption in our lives.</p> <p>The Council should therefore refuse the application and should not entertain any further submissions until firstly the application Ref 2021/6057/P is determined and secondly that the works have been undertaken satisfactorily and signed off.</p> <p>We also know that Policy D12 of the London Plan requires the submission of a fire safety report. Surely you must agree that there are clear compelling reasons why such a policy needed to be submitted in this instance, given the proposal is for additional dwellings on top of an unsafe building. In this respect the application is deficient and should be refused on fire safety grounds.</p> <p>Not adopting such a precautionary approach could lead to further risks to health and safety and fire risk, for example Grenfell, a situation no one wishes to see repeated.</p>
2021/5963/P	Michael Whalley	22/01/2022 20:17:39	OBJ	<p>I am a resident of 163 Iverson Road, and I strongly object to this planning application.</p> <p>My building already has an existing enforcement action from the council.</p> <p>I can see there is an application to remediate the issues in the enforcement action, but the work hasn't even started.</p> <p>I cannot understand how an application to extend or otherwise alter the building can even be considered until the important remediation (to address fire safety!) has been completed. Indeed i expect the council could open itself to negligence claims if it did not.</p> <p>My expectation is that the council would refuse this application at the very least until existing issues are resolved, and to also take into account the freeholders past record if this is ever re-submitted.</p>