
From: Jean-Sébastien Pelland
Sent: 03 October 2024 16:01
To: Planning
Subject: RE: CONSULTATION LETTER FOR CONSTRUCTION TRAFFIC MANAGEMENT PLAN – 13 BELSIZE CRESCENT

[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.

Hi
The below relates to 2023/0692/P.
Kind regards
JS

From: Planning <Planning@camden.gov.uk>
Sent: 03 October 2024 15:50
To: Jean-Sébastien Pelland
Subject: RE: CONSULTATION LETTER FOR CONSTRUCTION TRAFFIC MANAGEMENT PLAN – 13 BELSIZE CRESCENT

Hi

In order for us to proceed with your query, can you please provide me the planning reference number for the development in question?

I look forward to your response.

Kind regards

Subject: FW: CONSULTATION LETTER FOR CONSTRUCTION TRAFFIC MANAGEMENT PLAN – 13 BELSIZE CRESCENT

[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.

Dear Planning Team

As RGP refused to confirm receipt of my below contribution to the CMP consultation process for the proposed developments at 13 Belsize Crescent, I forward it to you directly to ensure that it is considered as part of your forthcoming review of the condition attached to 2023/0692/P under a S106 agreement.

Meanwhile, I refer you to clause 6.3 of your Members Pack which reads as follows:

“The purpose of a CMP is to ensure public safety alongside development projects, and to ensure that construction traffic does not create or add to congestion in the local area. To ensure that the development can be implemented without being detrimental to amenity or the safe and efficient operation of the highway network, a CMP will be required prior to the implementation of the development. This will be secured via a S106 legal agreement.”

In light of the consultation process, I trust that it is now becoming evident to the Council that the condition cannot be reasonably satisfied.

The door was certainly left open to that eventuality by the Council through clause 4.2.3. of the S106 Agreement which states that “The Owner acknowledges and agrees that the Council will not approve the CMP unless it demonstrates to the Council’s reasonable satisfaction that the Construction Phase of the Development can be carried out safely and with minimal possible impact on and disturbance to the surrounding environment and highway network”.

I remain at your disposal should you wish to clarify the content of my below response to the consultation or any other aspects of the impact it is already having on the local community before the development has even started.

Kind regards

JS Pelland

Subject: RE: CONSULTATION LETTER FOR CONSTRUCTION TRAFFIC MANAGEMENT PLAN – 13 BELSIZE CRESCENT

Dear RGP

Further to our videocall with members of the community yesterday evening, I would like to document the following:

- 1) you repeatedly attempted to argue that your consultation process was “robust”, yet it was noted that you only sent out 75 consultation letters (2 of which ended up in my letterbox!). Whilst it may sound like a large number of letters to the untrained eye, it only represents 37 letters on each side of the streets (assuming I was the only one to receive 2 or your 75 letters). As most properties consist of 5 flats, it means c. 7 to 8 properties on each side of the street. **You have only therefore reached a maximum of 3-4 properties to south of 13 Belsize Crescent and 3-4 properties north of the site on both sides of the street. Given that the project will impact Belsize Crescent and the streets beyond, it should now be obvious for all to see that you have not made meaningful efforts to serve notice on the local residents impacted by the project.**
- 2) you sarcastically thanked me for helping raise awareness to the matter by distributing information through the Belsize Neighbour WhatsApp group. For the avoidance of doubt, the group only includes a small portion of the residents on Belsize Crescent;
- 3) I offered to go through the concerns raised in my previous dated email Fri 27/09/2024 14:59 point by point, however you confirmed that it was not necessary as every point would be documented as part of your consultation whether read on the videocall or not;

- 4) notwithstanding the above, we took the time to expand on some of the concerns raised previously:
- a. you confirmed that you were not aware of the two live construction projects on Belsize Crescent despite the scaffolding covering the properties both of which are visible from 13 Belsize Crescent's living room. You also confirmed that you had never heard of the Belsize Terrace consultation, a high profile local project that attracted hundreds of signatures to a petition by the local community. When challenged, you appeared quite indignant that we would expect you to have a good grasp of local construction activity, let alone that we would expect you to fulfil your duty to mitigate its cumulative impact on us
 - b. in light of the above, it is noted that you had not taken the street design changes to Belsize Crescent itself from the Belsize Terrace project, including a material reduction in the number of parking bays on the street
 - c. **you could not categorically confirm that you had taken into account the scope of the work entailed in relation to a second planning permission for further large scale development work at 13 Belsize Crescent (2023/0693/P), appearing to focus exclusively on 2023/0692/P. It would be highly misleading for the scope of all work on that site not to be included as part of the Construction Traffic Management Plan. Furthermore, it would be maladministration on the part of Camden Council not to seek assurance that all construction traffic associated with 13 Belsize Crescent has indeed been captured and that plans will not change materially once the project starts, particularly given the owners' history of withdrawing a request to cut down trees as part of their original application (2023/0692/P) only to re-apply for the same trees to be cut down under a new planning application (2024/3790/T) immediately upon securing approval for the original one. Camden Council must take into account the obvious risk that such an approach is paving the way for further changes when assessing the plans**
 - d. the concern previously raised in relation to the risk of structural damage to coal rooms under the pavement was illustrated by the need for Camden Council to install bollards outside 20 Belsize Crescent, following the matter escalating from a civil matter to a criminal one
- 5) **you have acknowledged that your report would require revisions and you committed to circulating a revised draft to the community as part of the consultation process; and**
- 6) **everyone in attendance commented on RGP's poor grasp of the details and on the glaringly obvious box ticking nature of this Consultation Traffic Management Plan. Consequently, the local residents have decided to commission their own review of the plans by an independent traffic management consultants.**

Given the inadequacies of the Construction Traffic Management Plan and of the measures it is forcing local residents to take, we would expect RGP to await the findings of our independent traffic management consultants before submitting their "final" draft. Alternatively, as we intend to have our report published at the earliest possible opportunity and to avoid maladministration, we would expect the Council to await the same before concluding its review of the condition attached to 2023/0692/P.

Regards

JS Pelland

Subject: RE: CONSULTATION LETTER FOR CONSTRUCTION TRAFFIC MANAGEMENT PLAN – 13 BELSIZE CRESCENT

Dear RGP

As you are no doubt aware, planning permission 2023/0692/P (basement excavation at 13 Belsize Crescent) is conditional on Camden Council approving a Traffic Construction Management Plan. We are therefore somewhat surprised that RGP, a self-professed “global consultancy specialising in large scale projects for multinationals” would treat this engagement on a high end residential development as a mere box-ticking exercise. That being said, given the community’s keen interest in the matter, we are not entirely disappointed by your approach as **it supports our argument that issuing a planning permission subject to a condition which could not reasonably be satisfied would be misguided and it could be challenged in a court of law.**

Whilst the below is not meant to provide you with an exhaustive list of points in support of our above argument, here are a number of glaring inadequacies contained within your plan:

In reference to the relevant pages of your document

- 1) Page 8 – the Traffic Construction Management Plan was developed independently from the (yet to be appointed) Main Contractor thereby raising questions concerning its validity
- 2) Page 9 – the plan refers to the following timescales

Basement excavation: (Jan25 to May25)

New basement building: 8 months (June25 to December25)

Further work: 5 months (January26 – May26)

Total: A MINIMUM OF 17 MONTHS OF HEAVY WORK

The plan also refers to anticipated traffic levels by types of vehicle, however it contains no assumptions in relation to materials volumes/quantities enabling a third-party assessment of the feasibility of the Construction Traffic Management Plan, a fundamental aspect of the condition.

Not only does the above omission render the Construction Traffic Management Plan inadequate, electing not to share this crucial information with the local community effectively makes the consultation meaningless.

- 3) Page 11 – as pointed out in my earlier email to you (20 September 2024 16:48), the consultation process is grossly inadequate (and therefore meaningless) for many reasons, including:
 - a. community reach – the awareness campaign was limited to an innocuous single folded A4 size letter akin to junk mail dropped through letterboxes without regards to the number of residents per property and limited to a small portion of the local community (and excluding the local businesses)
 - b. informational distribution – you require individual members of the local community to email you in order to request a copy of the Construction Traffic Management Plan thereby restricting access to information and impeding our ability to respond. Furthermore, you only invited those requesting a copy of the plan to your sole scheduled consultation event
 - c. timeline - 2 weeks from start to finish and sending your limited invitations to the consultation event at short notice (3 business days)
 - d. technology barrier – avoiding face to face meetings and using a videoconferencing technology which is not accessible to many interested members of the local community

The following extract from the guidance accompanying Camden Council’s Construction Traffic Management Plan template is duly noted:

“The Council expects meaningful consultation”

- 4) Page 12 – when considering “affected receptors” the plan fails to acknowledge the construction traffic impact on the community beyond the “residential properties located immediately to the north and south of the site”. It therefore fails to consider a large number of residents and businesses who rely on the free flow of traffic and parking bays on Belsize Crescent. Again, this makes your plan and consultation meaningless
- 5) Page 12 & 13 – the validity of your construction traffic management plan is undermined by the dismissive nature of your comments throughout the document including; “This CMP has been prepared despite the relatively small nature of works”, “no formal consultation events are currently planned owing to the relatively small scale of the works” and “given the relative simplicity of the scheme and the limited quantum of development the construction phase is not considered to be sensitive or contentious and consequently a Construction Working Group is not considered necessary”
- 6) Page 13 – you have elected not to answer Camden Council’s request to provide details of your Considerate Constructors Scheme (CCS) registration which Camden Council clearly set out as a condition to be fulfilled
- 7) Pages 14 & 21 – no apparent measures have been taken to identify existing or anticipated construction sites in the local area in order to mitigate the cumulative impacts of the construction in the vicinity of the site, instead relying on the “project team [simply being] unaware of nearby construction works”
- 8) Page 15 – a claim is made that the principal contractor has confirmed that they do not use vehicles over 3.5 tonnes despite the principal contractor having yet to be appointed...
- 9) Page 17 – **the plan contains no practical feasibility assessment of the proposed routes based on actual vehicle dimensions with obvious pinch points located at the bottom of Belsize Crescent and in the bend towards the top of the street. The local community’s experience of the area is that large vehicles invariably get stuck in those two locations when attempting to use our busy, narrow and bending single lane street. The local community’s experience is that based on the proposed plans we will suffer permanent road congestion, daily road blockages and frequent damage to our vehicles while also facing non-negligible risk to our health and safety. Such as feasibility assessment is fundamental to the condition being satisfied, if it is even capable of being satisfied**
- 10) Page 20 – Whereas the Traffic Construction Management Plan proposes for the site traffic to operate from 9.30am to 4.30pm, Camden Council clearly and unambiguously requires deliveries to be restricted to the hours of 9:30am and 3pm on weekdays during term time when there is a school on the proposed access and/or egress routes or in the vicinity of the site. **There are several schools located along your proposed route which you have failed to identify. Furthermore, should the route be amended, there are also multiple schools that fall within the legal definition of vicinity of the site. The fact that this has not been taken into account serves to highlight the inadequacy of the Construction Traffic Management Plan as well as to demonstrate complete disregard for the community’s health and safety**
- 11) Page 21 – as per point 2) above, the Construction Traffic Management Plan asserts that the basement excavation period will be limited to 4 months (January25 to April25), a period containing 120 working days when vehicle access is possible. You also claim that the development will require 1 muck away skip per day every day. Whilst this is already an enormous amount of traffic, please share the detailed calculations in support of the anticipated “maximum of 120” loads together with contingencies (e.g. in relation to sustained periods of rain)?
- 12) Page 23 – the plan incorrectly suggests that a traffic marshal would be positioned “to the rear of the vehicle, on the footway immediately north of the site”. Based on the proposed direction of access, this would position the traffic marshal at the front of the vehicle rather than its rear for pedestrian safety
- 13) Page 28 – **contrary to the plan’s repeated assertions in relation to the “small nature” of the development, it is noted that the basement excavation would block 3 parking bays. This is more than the number of bays available on the street throughout most of the day (each and every day), which represents a major concern for local residents with reduced mobility bearing in mind the sloping nature of the street. For the avoidance of doubt, parking further from their property would increase the risk of injury, particularly in wet and/or icy conditions, or when the street is covered with dust, leaves or other detritus (construction related or otherwise).**

- 14) Page 29 – you have elected not to answer Camden Council’s request for you to provide details of your discussions with utilities providers with respect to the development’s requirement for new “incoming electric, gas, water, telecoms connections” which is unacceptable
- 15) Page 32 – you have elected not to answer Camden Council’s request for a “predictions for noise levels throughout the proposed works” which is also unacceptable
- 16) Page 32 – given that the Main Contractor has yet to be appointed, please explain your claim that “onsite training given with regards to assessing noise and vibration levels on site”
- 17) Page 24 & 33 – there appears to be a conflict between the two separate sections of your plan addressing wheel-washing (claiming not to wash the wheels when it suits you and then claiming to wash them when it does...). Assuming that wheel washing will indeed be required, what provisions have been made in relation to runoff water management given the streets history of flooding?
- 18) Page 33 & 34 – again, the local community notes with great displeasure your dismissive tone concerning the scale of the project and its impact on the local community through the following assertions and proposed conduct:
 - a) “Noise, vibration and dust levels are unlikely to be material issues owing to the small scale of the development”
 - b) “The generation of any dust would be limited to the minor demolition at the onset of the works and not thereafter”
 - c) “The GLA guidance confirms that Air Quality (Dust) Risk Assessments apply only to “major” developments and therefore do not need to be completed for this site”
 - d) “Dust monitors and regular monitoring reports are not considered necessary for a development of this scale and nature”

The local community perceives the scale of the development completely differently to you and we care deeply about the anticipated levels of noise, vibration, dust and general impact on air quality. We would therefore expect a considerate property developer to insist on the same. As it is unfortunately not the case, the local community relies on Camden Council to ensure its planning decisions take the wellbeing of the local community into account.

- 19) Drawings – drawings are required in reference to various part of the construction traffic management plan and yours do not appear to be to scale in relation to the size of the construction vehicles accessing and leaving site. **The local community asserts that the narrowness of our busy sloping and bending single file street is an important reason why the planning condition cannot reasonably be satisfied.**
- 20) Drawings – no drawings have been provided in relation to the narrow pinch points at the bottom of the street and where it bends. **Again, the local community asserts that the narrowness of our busy sloping and bending single lane street is an important reason why the planning condition cannot reasonably be satisfied.**

In reference to concerns raised by a number of local residents

- 1) **As Belsize Lane and Ornan Road are prone to traffic jam when Belsize Crescent is obstructed, the local community is concerned with the impact of your plans on emergency services, including the London Fire Brigade and ambulances heading to nearby Royal Free Hospital amongst several other local medical and care facilities**
- 2) **The Construction Traffic Management Plan fails to address the risk of structural damage (and potential collapse) to coal storage rooms located under the pavement for properties alongside the terrace by providing details of survey and calculations in relation to the same. In fact, your own limited drawings clearly demonstrate that the project team intends for its construction traffic carrying heavy loads to drive and park directly on top of these structures for at least 4 of the local properties!**
- 3) **The plan fails to address the impact on local businesses. As we now know, none of the local businesses were even consulted, again making the consultation meaningless.**

If you were serious about consulting with the local community, I would suggest that we agree to a suitable date and time for your project team, the local community and interested members of the Council to witness a mock operation of your construction fleet accessing and departing from 13 Belsize Crescent on a typical day. The local community has no doubt that this would allow everyone, including the Council, to witness why the Construction Traffic Management Plan condition attached to 2023/0692/P could not reasonably be satisfied. If you are looking for suggestions on dates and times, I would propose 31 October (naturally outside of the busy school runs) as Halloween would be an ideal date to preview your proposed horror show!

Regards

JS Pelland

Subject: RE: CONSULTATION LETTER FOR CONSTRUCTION TRAFFIC MANAGEMENT PLAN – 13 BELSIZE CRESCENT

Hello,

Many thanks for your correspondence regarding Belsize Crescent, Camden, your comments shall be reviewed by the project team.

Also attached is a copy of the draft Construction Management Plan for your information.

If you would like to ask any questions of the project team, or to find out more, we are hosting an online event on Monday 30th September 2024 20:00-21:00 hosted online via the meeting link below.

[Join the meeting now](#)

Kind regards

The RGP team

Transport Planning and Infrastructure Design Consultants



RGP is a registered company in England No. 0207910. VAT Reg number is 264 020 000. This email and any attachments are confidential. If you are not the intended recipient, please do not use, disseminate or otherwise rely on the information contained within. The information is the property of RGP and is not to be used for any legal action or activities arising from claims or professional advice expressed which do not relate to the business of RGP. RGP engineers limited

Subject: CONSULTATION LETTER FOR CONSTRUCTION TRAFFIC MANAGEMENT PLAN – 13 BELSIZE CRESCENT
Importance: High

Dear RGP

Thank you for your attached letter dated 17 September and for your invitation to comment on your Construction Traffic Management Plan. To that effect, please send me a copy of the same for review.

Your proposed deadline of 4 October is noted, however it would be entirely unreasonable to expect interested parties to comment comprehensively on such an important document the existence of which was only revealed through your letter dated 17 September and a copy of which we have yet to receive from you. Furthermore, as you elected to deliver your consultation letter to some rather than all interested parties, the neighbourhood is having to rely on WhatsApp channels for distribution, introducing further delays in our responses.

Notwithstanding the fact that a response to your consultation could not genuinely be expected from us until such a time when we have all been given the opportunity to fully consider your Construction Traffic Management Plan, here are some preliminary concerns in no particular order which we will be looking to address with you and the Council as part of the process.

- 1) Belsize Crescent and some of the surrounding streets you are proposing to use are narrow and therefore only allow for the movement of one vehicle at the time. Consequently, it is essential to fully understand the level of anticipated traffic disruption in the context of the proposed level of activity (number of loads, frequency, hours of work and timeline).
- 2) As Belsize Lane and Ornan Road are prone to traffic jam when Belsize Crescent is obstructed, we must understand the impact of your plans on emergency vehicles, including ambulances heading to nearby Royal Free Hospital
- 3) We look forward to reviewing details of anticipated blocked parking bays versus the limited stock of available parking space and to assess basic feasibility of vehicle movement in the context of the risk of damage to cars parked in the area with the help of illustrations drawn to scale
- 4) We also look forward to reviewing the result of your survey, drawings and calculations in relation to the risk of structural damage (and potential collapse) to coal storage rooms located under the pavement for most properties alongside the terrace
- 5) We most eagerly await details of your risk assessments pertaining to the environment (noise, pollution, dust, CO2 emissions, etc) and health & safety for motorists, cyclists, pedestrians, and above all in relation to our young children whose safety should trump any property development aspirations

Naturally, beyond the above, we expect to be presented with all standard information expected of a construction traffic management plan prepared to a professional standard.

For the avoidance of doubt, this construction traffic management plan cannot be treated as a mere paper exercise. On the contrary, it must aim to demonstrate that the traffic management condition set by the Council in relation to planning permission 2023/0692/P is capable of being satisfied in the first place. This remains to be demonstrated.

We look forward to hearing from you in due course.

Regards

JS Pelland

This e-mail may contain information which is confidential, legally privileged and/or copyright protected. This e-mail is intended for the addressee only. If you receive this in error, please contact the sender and delete the material from your computer. See our new Privacy Notice [here](#) which tells you how we store and process the data we hold about you and residents.