

From: [REDACTED]
To: [Planning Enquiries](#)
Subject: Fw: 19/00590/AOD
Date: 22 March 2020 20:25:36

With the attached photo.

----- Forwarded message -----

From: [REDACTED]
To: planningenquiries@londonlegacy.co.uk <planningenquiries@londonlegacy.co.uk>
Sent: Sunday, 22 March 2020, 20:17:04 GMT
Subject: 19/00590/AOD

Dear Sirs,

As a property owner residing within Legacy House, I wish to object to the planning application referenced above on the grounds that the plans to create play areas at Legacy House are in breach of the contract relating to the purchase of our property in good faith; an interference in our right to enjoy our property; interference in our right to peaceful enjoyment of our property; and impose a financial and health and safety burden on residents which was not known at the time of purchase.

Contract

The building plans and images in the marketing materials for Legacy House do not show play areas.

Had we known at the time we purchased our property that we would be adversely impacted by the proposed changes in the above planning application to the two existing amenity spaces in order to encourage greater use of these then we would not have purchased the particular flat that we bought.

FOI 20-013 Why has it taken so long for the LLDC to realise that the building does not conform with the original planning consent, of which we were not aware, and following the sale of the residential properties to private tenants? If your policies are so strict that they must be adhered to, including retrospectively, why did you not ensure that the building conformed with the planning consent from the outset?

FOI request - what other examples are there where the LLDC has taken similar action in the planning area under its control?

The right to enjoy our property without interference

Since moving into the property, private ownership tenants on floors two to five have been harassed and threatened by the LLDC through communications informing us that changes would be made to the main lift shafts. We were particularly concerned about the LLDC's demands and threats of fines requiring Anderson to make the changes to the main lift shaft, riding rough-shod over the planning process and tenants legal rights, and the rejection of alternative reasonable suggestions to provide dedicated lift access for first floor residents. It now appears, after intervention, that the LLDC may have overreached its authority and backed down.

Apparently, the LLDC is now hell-bent on interfering with private property rights in respect of the second matter, the play areas, despite another reasonable alternative proposal made by Anderson to provide generous funding for wider-community play facilities.

FOI 20-014 FOI request - How many other buildings under the LLDC's planning control, built since planning consent was granted to Carpenter's Wharf, have been required to have play facilities and have these been monitored and adhered to the same level of scrutiny? How many community play-facilities have been funded by developers that would bring together the children of private-ownership properties and social-housing without trampling on the rights (including property) of private citizens?

Has there been any physical assessment by the LLDC of the suitability of the proposed play areas? No-one in their right mind could have missed that the first-floor proposed play area, despite the drawing showing that it is south-facing, is in fact in shade for long periods of the day causing green algae to form on the decking (see attached photo taken on 22 March 2020). This play area is also directly below all residents living on the south-facing side of the building, with no conditions on usage times, suitable ages or supervision.

The sixth-floor proposed play area comprises of materials apparently wholly unsuited to the top floor of the building, not least because it is a particularly windy environment. It is likely that the maintenance of this area will be high, necessitating the use of non-service lifts to carry materials and the use of which will be very minimal given the lack of families in the building.

Right to peaceful enjoyment of our property

We live in an increasingly high-density residential environment bringing with it higher levels of noise and interference. With the vibrancy of the local night-time economy, including loud music playing until the early hours of the morning (apparently these are often illegal raves that are not enforced by any local authority or the police), the proposed plans will reduce the time available to us for peaceful enjoyment of our property and our mental well-being.

To reject Anderson's offer to help fund local play amenities appears to be short-sighted, against local cohesion within the community, and high-handed in respect of the harm to Legacy House residents overall.

Financial burden and health & safety

The proposed plans place an additional and avoidable financial burden both on first floor residents and on private tenants on floors two to five in respect of ongoing maintenance, health & safety requirements and lift repairs.

The LLDC's actions in enforcing this planning matter against Anderson will have an adverse and ill-thought out impact on the residents of Legacy House for which there is minimal support.

For these reasons, I object to the proposed planning application. Please also treat my questions above as freedom of information requests.

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]
