



Subject:

Fwd: Consultation comment for additional rooftop Barrie House 2022 3705/P



I (Ross Cameron) am a resident of three years in Flat 4 Barrie House. I am a Chartered engineer and have extensive professional experience in Mechanical/Electrical/Plumbing in residential and communal living facilities.

In principle I do not object to the development of an additional apartment on the top of the existing structure, but have the following observations that I would recommend guide any conditions and/or handling of the planning application.

1. The application form (redacted)- 31/08/2022 09:09, includes details and features of a future state of the building (for example car parking & cycle parking) that do not currently exist and are planned to be constructed as part of a separate, disputed development on the same site. This is inconsistent and in-conflict with A. the drawings that have been submitted supporting the application and B. features described the covering letter 31/08/2022 09:05.

2. The Application form (redacted)- 31/08/2022 09:09 includes a proposed time-line that would conflict with the proposed timings of the above mentioned separate development. The combined effect of these two developments simultaneously could and likely would have a significantly different effect to the local traffic, surrounding residential noise disturbance, immediate and local property values and quality of life of the immediate residents. Assessment or addressing of how this proposed development will interact with the alternative development should be addressed

3. No (or extremely limited) consultation has been conducted with residents as to how the proposed changes to come up to standard (i.e. fire standards) will be conducted. This includes fire doors, fire systems and a replaced lift. Given the limited mobility of many of the senior residents and the reliance on the communal staircase for access the planning and execution of this process needs to be made very clear including specific timelines such that vulnerable or mobility impaired persons can make alternative arrangements.

4. The funding model for the above upgrades needs to be understood and consulted on if any part relies on funding coming from residents or communal contributions as this may impart an unviable burden on existing residents and/or owners resulting in a deterioration in quality of life.

5. The existing largely original plumbing systems including cold water supply, hot water supply, wastewater (grey) and sewage (Black) have all had significant reliability issues in the recent past resulting in damage to flats, electrical systems, lower floor structural components and communal areas. This has resulted in numerous very serious electrical and waste water related safety hazards. Additional load relying on the existing deteriorated systems will increase the incidence of uncontrolled releases of fluids. No assessment of the condition of these existing systems appears to have been conducted or considered in the development plan or application, nor any outline of how the additional load will contribute towards rate of deterioration.

6. The above plumbing conditions may or may not have contributed towards the dual near-fatality incident in February 2022 resulting from carbon monoxide emissions from an aging gas fired boiler. The incident attended by London Fire brigade and resulting in emergency evacuation of all residents, condemnation of the boiler and gas supply, is indicative to the general infrastructure conditions within the residence. These two elements are highly correlated due to the long-term maintenance and renewal strategy within the building. The application assumes a standard of serviceability of the existing infrastructure (Structural and MEP) which I professionally do not believe should be relied upon without independent verification ahead of planning application approval as this may be introducing or contributing additional serious safety hazards not currently addressed.

Ross Cameron



