
From: Stephen Coe [REDACTED]
Sent: 28 March 2023 10:13
To: Kate Henry
Subject: COMMENT Latest Points - Re. 17RM / 2023/0416/P

[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.

Just to clear up the applicant's latest assertions, (17/3) - the underlying retaining wall never was a *party-wall" .. & it was built 30+ years before No.17RM - & not together with .. & Originally it had a wooden fence above it - to safely separate a higher garden area of Lupton residents.

In Fig.1 (The new garden trellis and temporary fence posts - wired for the clematis were erected in 2021 - These do not mark a new boundary - as that would have required special cranked metal posts - to be inserted - to extend the 1A Lupton garden arrangements closer to the (east side) boundary wall of No. 17 Railey Mews.

*Area of old fence at right of photo - is the additional fencing added later by the applicant for extra security. This is also shown in the applicant's own photo - fig. 3. - Above the row of soldiers capping the retaining wall.

My New Photo below.. The 2 separate layers of metal flashing are clearly shown in this photo. The second skin starts from the wall vent.



To combat dampness inside house by shielding rainwater further over - onto (Lupton) neighbour's retaining wall

I recall the applicant bridging (with a lead skirt of protective flashing) - sealing the gap left against the flank wall of No. 17
- to avoid rainwater causing damp ingress to the eastern side - from its own 'amenity' (garden) area.
- bordering the somewhat higher earth level extant in the Lupton gardens. This was done for corrective reason; against prior failure to provide a waterproof seal for internal east wall of No.17 - along garden wall to Lupton.
(Repaired to combat failure of an in-adequate cap or vertical DPC membrane either partly installed or omitted.)

No excess land was left unbuilt - on what was the very confined in-fill site, on a plot sold by Lupton landholder.
Therefore **NO ADJACENT** area of (a party-wall nature existed) or **could ever be 'over-sailed' - before or since.**

Any question of actual 'Trespass' is avoided - when necessary 'access' is sought and permitted for maintenance under the Neighbouring Lands Act 1996 Act, but does NOT allow for new build installation, to encroach.

It is regrettable if advantage is sought, by 'threading' this proposal through two separate council departments - to avoid more active scrutiny of what is more relevant elsewhere. Planning should take heed of these tactics.
If there ever had been an intention to create a 'Party Wall' - there would be a document in evidence of this fact:
No such document was issued or exists. & The builder had simply added a row of 'capping - soldiers' in red engineering bricks to restore the old - neighbouring retaining wall - damaged or displaced - during the pile-driving process. (The builder assured me, this would be done - to satisfy the neighbour and protect the wall.)

As I had suggested earlier - as far back as the initial meeting in October 2017 - The front wall needed to be set back at the junction with No.16 RM & thereby recessed, to accommodate any extra bulk from 'cladding' width. Re. REVISED DRAWING - THIS FAILS TO SHOW AN OBTUSE ANGLE OR ANY GAP PROMISED -between frontages - but further emphasises UNACCEPTABLE, ABRUPT TRANSITION 'error' on building line.

The mass use of any *non-functional cladding* is not appropriate - NOR entitled to exceed boundaries. The outer surface of that eastern flank wall lies territorially **beyond** the Applicant's home at 17RM. & the Angled Louvres of Fins or any form of protruding 'cladding' - created above a garden - couldn't extend around to the street frontage - where there is no margin within Building Line. Therefore no justification to continue any FINS in front of No.17 - running along the street elevation to north side of Railey Mews.

In conclusion : The context with neighbouring buildings - especially at junction with No. 16 RM is too abrupt and offers no justification or ease. & It is confrontational - Not a "beautiful" idea for a domestic building setting in a London Mews & far more relevant for a themed timber display in a garden setting - elsewhere.

Regarding the total area of clad walls 25% - is the general limit on combustible cladding, respecting the FIRE risk involved.

Even 'ceramic 'painted cladding' is not immune - to such easy access by 'troublemakers' with bad intentions.

SC