

From: Kristina Smith
Sent: 05 January 2023 14:20
To: Planning Planning
Subject: FW: Planning Application - 2022/4469/P Additional concerns

Please could this comment be uploaded to the application, M3 and Trim.

Many thanks,

Kristina Smith
Principal Planning Officer

Subject: Planning Application - 2022/4469/P Additional concerns

[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.

Dear Kristina

Further to our previous correspondence on the Planning Application - 2022/4469/P

I am adding Dilip Shah into this email.

I have spoken to Flats 1 and 2 and they would like their names added to the objections. Jill and Michael in Flat 1, 50 Britannia Street do not have internet access and Jill has asked that I attach their names. Jill is very worried and anxious about this, as are all the residents I have spoken to. People are shocked and anxious. It has ruined Christmas for many. After speaking with residents, it is my intention to look into setting up a 'residents association' for the block and I have asked Dilip for advice on this.

The developers have finally distributed letters to all residents but I do feel that this was an afterthought and only as a result of voices raised. The letters state 'As a key part of the proposal, the opportunity is being taken to reconfigure and improve the conditions for existing residents' When looking at the plans, it is perhaps clear why our entrance and facilities are being moved to where they suggest. Our entrance, the bin/refuse area and the basement cycle store are hindering their intended commercial space plans. Our entrance, where it currently is, would split their intended commercial space and that is the real reason they want to move our entry to our flats. They don't want to simply leave it where it is, or extend our existing exit forwards to the pavement/front of the new space, because it would split the intended

ground floor commercial space in two. It is a falsehood to say that it is to improve conditions for us.

They also plan to put mailboxes in the entrance rather than having our post come to our doors. Again, this is not acceptable. We have never been consulted on this. Many residents are elderly or disabled. For example, I am disabled and I am also a carer. I have severe mobility issues and I will not be able to repeatedly go downstairs to get my post. Mail that might be intended for my caring role. Mail left downstairs will go missing. Inevitably, mail that will not fit in such a box will be left on top and this will go missing. Again, we have not been consulted and this is simply being imposed upon us. It would prove deleterious.

Looking at the plans it looks like the commercial space might be offered for a restaurant or bar. This is not acceptable. The noise etc that such a business would create would make life intolerable for us. We have single glazed windows and night time noise pollution has already increased to intolerable levels. We already hear noise from the Water Rats, the deliveries at the CO OP etc and this has been increasing exponentially since I moved here in 1993. In addition, given the area in which the developers are intending to 'dump' our entrance, this type of business will result in anti social behaviour, such as its use as a toilet, drunken louts, will be attracted to that part of the build making it very unsafe for residents to access - especially so for disabled people and elderly trying to get through.

The duration of work, that such a development would take, would impose severe conditions and restrictions upon us as residents. We will be paying our rents, mortgages and leases whilst having to endure noise, dirt, unsafe access etc. We will be the losers as the developers profit.

Those of us living on the second floor have already endured a long period of awful noise and dirt during the refurbishment of the offices and basement area by these developers and they paid scant regard to our needs and concerns. We were ignored. Some work took place outside permitted hours. On 2 occasions workers tried to gain access to my flat by mistake. I had to complain to Dilip Shah about it I was so frightened. When I asked workers to not block step free access or put ramps down I was mocked or ignored. They broke our lift on more than one occasion by overloading it. The lift was out of action for a while making it very difficult for those of us with mobility issues to live our daily lives. It made my caring role very difficult and put me at risk of injury by having to use the stairs. Other vulnerable residents were also impacted.

So the developers claim to sign up to the 'Considerate Constructors Scheme' is simply a cosmetic exercise on their part. Since purchasing the leasehold, the new developers have paid scant regard to our safety, needs, comforts or concerns. As stated, the noise, dirt, unsafe areas were unbearable, during their previous build work, and they didn't even have the courtesy to inform us that it was to take place nor to its duration etc. So forgive us if we do not believe that they are taking the opportunity 'to reconfigure and improve the conditions for existing residents' That simply is to sell it to the council and not based on anything good for us. It is based upon what profits them and at our expense.

There are also concerns as to what increase the extra flat occupation will have upon the lift and other areas of the building. Who will maintain said areas?

The design of the development is also not in-keeping with the area. It looks awful from every aesthetic consideration.

As I have said, their letter states 'As a key part of the proposal, the opportunity is being taken to reconfigure and improve the conditions for existing residents'. Well if that is a 'key part of the proposal' then, by our refusal because they are inadequate for our needs and are in fact deleterious, a 'key part' fails to pass the test. We have not been consulted, it is being imposed based upon what best suits the developers profits at our expense. I am a disability campaigner and a phrase we often use in our campaigns seems apt in the case of this proposed works
- 'Nothing about us, without us!'

It is outrageous and it is being imposed upon us. We do not want it. It will prove deleterious, everything will be at our expense and will offer up no advantages for us. We are therefore objecting to it now and will continue to do so at every level.

I thank you for your kind consideration of my email and look forward to your response.

All the best

Christopher John Ball BA (Hons) MA