					Printed on: 07/05/2025 09:10:04
Application N	<b>Consultees Name</b>	<b>Recipient Address</b>	Received	Comment	Response
2024/5549/P	Tony Cutler	120 Highgate Road	03/05/2025 14:57:35	COMMNT	I object to the application to flip the affordable housing to market rate housing in this application. Camden's community is being gutted by the lack of social housing in the local area. Granting this application will further deplete access to housing to families who desperately need it.

					1 Hitted OII. 07/05/2025	09.10.0
Application N	<b>Consultees Name</b>	<b>Recipient Address</b>	Received	Comment	Response	
2024/5549/P	PAUL & IEKATERINA	18 WIBLIN MEWS	02/05/2025 18:51:44	COMMNT	We strongly believe the proposed planning application should not be accepted as is.	
	LEHAIR	LONDON NW51BW			Our first observation is that Four Quarters need to finish ASAP the works on Wiblin Mews. Having stopped the works 8 years ago has created massive water ingress issues within the Mews, in particular for the houses adjacent to the works site (where flats should have been built in the first instance). Four Quarters has not taken a single step to fix the issue in this whole time which has led to material degradation of the development.	
					Our key concerns on the proposed application are the following:	
					Significant elevation of an already elevated building (block 2 and 3), blocking sunlight, impacting aesthetic and therefore the quality of life of the neighbors (as well as the value of the houses). In particular, Block 2 cannot be elevated higher than the neighboring, existing houses.	
					Safety: the works (and access to the works) will raise significant safety concerns in the whole area. In particular, the unfinished buildings have been left unsecured by Four Quarters for years creating security significant for all the young children playing in the Mews.	,
					Noise: we disagree with the installation of the Heat Pumps: towering an already high building an noise that will create. The space is a quiet area which was the primary reason we decided to settle here and don't want this to change Properties here are too close to each other for this to be viable.	
					Works: will be hugely disruptive esp. given the limited access to the work sites from the main road. This will have a huge impact on everyone's lives for 18 to 24 months (assuming Four Quarters keeps its timeline – which from experience will likely not).	
					More generally, having dealt (or trying to given how unresponsive they are) with Four Quarters, the following needs to be taken into consideration as they cannot be trusted:	
					Unresponsive: trying to communicate with Four Quarters is impossible. Emails are left unanswered and no phone number is available. No communication whatsoever on works to be carried out or even basic maintenance.	
					Irresponsible: they haven't taken any action to fix the water ingress issues due to the unfinished building (block 2). Even basic maintenance requirements (they have to handle given they are Wiblin Mews owners) are not being taken care of.	
					Misleading: in their Financial Viability Assessment, 4Q has indexed cost already incurred to build the existing houses. Unclear as to why this has been done.	d
					Incompetent: the houses at Wiblin Mews are all experiencing similar issues due to poor	

Printed on: 07/05/2025

09:10:04

Page 3 of 55

mancraftship as well as building and material quality. For instance, many houses have had to

## **Comment** Response

have part of their roof remade due to numerous leaks (after only 7-8 years of being built...): the material used for the roof is disintegrating and the seams of the roof have been built upside down. They are even blocking the insurance process some of the Mews inhabitant are carrying out to have their roofs fixed.

Unreliable: they dropped the ball in the middle of the construction of Block 2 as well as the affordable housing and haven't done anything in the past 7 to 8 years

In a nutshell, they have started a project, not finished it, not managed it and not taken responsibility for their (non) action

We urge the Camden Council and the developer to prioritize completing the project swiftly in accordance with the original commitments without further delay. The whole community has waited long enough and damage and issues .

Thank you for considering our concerns.

Application N	Consultees Name	Recipient Address	Received	Comment	Response	Printed on:	07/05/2025	09:10:04
2024/5549/P	S.Polli	7 Wiblin mews	02/05/2025 22:14:20	OBJ	As homeowners in Wiblin Mews we would like to raise the following application from 4Q.	g matters relati	ng to the	
					We are concerned about the proposed works due to past experient and standards, lack of safety compliance, absence of communicativery legitimate concerns about the existing development. It is vital are closely scrutinized to prevent the repetition of these issues in the the applicant changes its current practices in relation to the mews	on from 4Q rec that any future he future, but a	arding our developments	
					A key concern regards Health and Safety Risks, especially in relati managed construction, dust and debris, unsecured work areas (als the context of actual break-ins and thefts having occurred recently leads to the construction site), ineffective barriers leading to fall risk in various sections of the mews.	o raising the ri in the garage a	sk of theft, in area which also	
					We are also concerned about material and prolonged disruption. M been suffering for years because of the consequences of incomple which have caused significant water ingress (e.g. leaking roofs, ga and other damage and issues. What's worse, is the apparent lack communication about remedial action, which has caused material i perform repairs or claim some of the expenses on insurance. There the applicant will approach communication with the residents abou a materially different way than what is currently occurring, which is	ete or botched k rage area regu of care and abs ssues for those e is absolutely t the proposed	building work, larly flooded) sence of e seeking to no comfort that development in	
					We are also concerned about access to our properties, notably to the congestion at the entrance of the mews. We also highlight a risk the areas might get damaged and not be repaired. Of course noise poll activities is expected and should be minimised, but considering 4Q with residents there is a concern that this may not be effectively mit	at the floor slat llution from con i's track record tigated.	os in common struction in engaging	
					We also object to the change in purpose for affordable housing, inc commitments	dicating a lack of	of trust in 4Q's	
2024/5549/P	Nicolas Trindade	19 Wiblin Mews	02/05/2025 19:50:43	COMMNT	We would encourage the council to separate the issues of the hous the building for affordable housing.	ses at 13-16 W	iblin Mews and	
					We've been living at the mews for 7 years now and the end of our completed despite repeated promises by the developer. Therefore, houses at 13-16 Wiblin Mews built in a reasonable timeframe.			
					We would also like that as part of the approval process the develop dealing with the water ingress issues in the common garage area w the developer's carelessness.			

Application N	Consultees Name	Recipient Address	Received	Comment	Response	Printed on:	07/05/2025	09:10:04
2024/5549/P	Emmanuel Guillot	10 Wiblin Mews	02/05/2025 11:15:41	COMMNT	Dear Sir or Madam			
					As is, the proposed planning application 2024/5549/P should not be a	accepted.		
		NW5 1BW			Firstly, and most urgently, Four Quarters need to complete ASAP the Wiblin Mews - and put an end to the misery our neighbors at #12 and over the past 8 years of safety and risk hazards.			
					Having stopped the construction 8 years ago has created massive wa the Mews, in particular for those 2 houses adjacent to the works site issues, degradation of the buildings etc). Four Quarters has not take issue in this whole time which has led to material degradation of the o	(not mentioni en a single st	ing insulation ep to fix the	
					My key concerns on the proposed development application are the fo	ollowing:		
					<ul> <li>Significant elevation of an already elevated building (block 2 and 3), impacting aesthetic and therefore the quality of life of the neighbors (a houses). In particular, Block 2 cannot be elevated higher than the nei - Safety: the works (and access to the works) will raise significant safa area. In particular, the unfinished buildings have been left unsecured creating security significant for all the young children playing in the M they'll do better this time around.</li> <li>Noise: we disagree with the installation of the Heat Pumps: towering and noise that will create. The space is a quiet area which was the pr settle here and don't want this to change. Properties here are too close be viable.</li> <li>Works: will be hugely disruptive esp. given the limited access to the road. This will have a huge impact on everyone's lives for 18 to 24 me Quarters keeps its timeline – which I'm doubtful of)</li> <li>Economics: though not a specialist, the numbers shown by the devermisleading as accounting for an extra £3m cost due to indexation of Unclear as to why this has been presented this way. Hopefully removing now make the affordable housing viable.</li> </ul>	as well as the ighboring, ex fety concerns by Four Qua lews. Struggl g an already rimary reasor se to each ot e work sites fr onths (assum costs already the existing	e value of the isting houses in the whole rters for years, ing to see that high building n we decided to her for this to om the main ning Four to be incurred (and Wiblin Mews.	
					More generally, having dealt (or trying to given how unresponsive the the following needs to be taken into consideration : - Unresponsive: trying to communicate with Four Quarters is next to in unanswered and no phone number is available. No communication we carried out or even basic maintenance. When buying our house about thought Four Quarters went bankrupt given how unresponsive they we - No responsibility taken: they haven't taken any action to fix the wate unfinished building (block 2). Even basic maintenance requirements ( they are Wiblin Mews landlord) are not being taken care of	impossible. E vhatsoever or ut 2 years ago vere! er ingress iss	mails are left works to be o, our solicitor ues due to the	

					<ul> <li>Poor building quality and poorer mancraftship: the houses at Wiblin Mews are all experiencing similar issues due to poor mancraftship as well as building and material quality. For instance, many houses have had to have part of their roof remade due to numerous leaks (after only 7-8 years of being built): the material used for the roof is disintegrating and the seams of the roof have been built upside down. The developers are even blocking the insurance process some of the Mews inhabitant are carrying out to have their roofs fixed.</li> <li>Unreliable: they dropped the ball in the middle of the construction of Block 2 as well as the affordable housing and haven't done anything in the past 7 to 8 years</li> <li>In a nutshell, they have started a project, not finished it, not managed it and not taken responsibility for their (non) action.</li> <li>We urge the Camden Council and the developer to prioritize completing the project swiftly in accordance with the original commitments without further delay. The whole community has waited long enough and damage and issues.</li> <li>Im happy to discuss the above in-person / over the phone if helpful</li> <li>Emmanuel Guillot 10 Wiblin Mews London, NW5 1BW</li> </ul>
2024/5549/P	Yosha	6 Wiblin Mews 6 Wiblin Mews 6 Wiblin Mews	02/05/2025 23:29:02	COMMNT	As a resident of Wiblin Mews, when I bought the property we were told the end houses/maisonette would be completed within a year. 7 years on construction of the end maisonette have not started. While it is important to finish the construction of the maisonettes, we will need a construction management plan and strict timeline along with start date, rather than delays as have been the case for 7 years. We will need proper communication with the developers. We will also need more details as to how the construction will take place, how materials will be brought on site and level of noise and disruption to the Mews and neighbouring roads. The completion of these maisonettes should be a priority as it has impact on some of the houses in the Mews.
					The new proposals of heat pumps will need more information on height and disruption of light as well as noise that will be generated due to them.
					The withdrawal of affordable houses is not appropriate and the initial planning permission was granted with affordable housing.
					Bin collections and the number of bins for all residents have to be considered as well.

Application N	Consultees Name	Recipient Address	Received	Comment	Response	Printed on:	07/05/2025	09:10:04
2024/5549/P	Emily Thompson	Flat 2, 24 College Lane NW5 1BJ	02/05/2025 19:13:20	OBJ	I am the owner and occupier of Flat 2, 24 College Lane, and can ob bridge/balcony on the first floor on the South-East façade of Block concerns regarding the wider development (e.g. noise and disruptic changes to affordable housing) however as my flat will be uniquely proposals, I will focus on those issues here. I have not been contact developers, despite both my amenity and privacy being undoubted changes. I have consulted both an architect and a lawyer and would concerns as follows:	3. I share my independent in the second s	neighbours' uction, and the r affected by the nt by the he proposed	
					1. Encroachment on land within my title			
					My Land Registry title plan includes the full depth of the bridge-ball proposed plans show a "new pop-out box increasing landing depth balcony area. The applicant does not have legal rights to build on r is therefore factually incorrect and the development cannot be impl aware, planning officers are entitled to refuse or defer an application certificates or red-line boundaries are incorrect.	ns" that projects my land/structu lemented as sh	over my re. The drawing own. As you're	I
					2. Outward-opening front door & implications			
					Even if point #1 were not the case and the balcony belonged to the further incorrect in stating I have an inward-opening front door. My the balcony (as it was originally constructed), with the width betwee workable now. Should the facade be built and the door open outwa believe the design standard regulations should be 1200mm betwee when fully opened. The proposal does not meet the required safety	front door oper en the two door ards, the doors en the edges of	ns outward onto rs only just will clash. I	
					3. Loss of safe access to my flat			
					During construction the only route to my home will be blocked by fa Construction Management Plan has been provided. Should any of Block 3 go ahead, there needs to be a CMP, approved before work resident access and a temporary fire strategy. Under the current pl which I can maintain safe 24/7 access to my flat.	the proposed o ks start, guaran	changes to Iteeing 24-hour	
					4. Privacy, overlooking and noise from roof changes			
					I am greatly concerned by the changes to the roof of block 3. I belies service-only, however, I do wonder why a balustrade is needed if the assured that the roof access is maintenance-only with provisions in the ladder locked and no seating/lighting. Additionally, the balustration my window. I would also like to reiterate other concerns raised regat the closest existing property to these and I strongly object to the no inevitably bring. I share my neighbours' beliefs that the inclusion of greenwashing.	his is the case. ncluding, and n ide would also l arding the heat oise pollution th	It needs to be ot limited to, be visible from pumps. I am nat they will	

5. New windows overlooking my living room

A window has been added which directly overlooks my habitable area. No glazing spec is given. If this window is added, it must be non-openable and the glass must be obscure, for obvious reasons.

6. Workmen and contractors on site

I have lived here for four years, of which time despite the building being empty and barely worked on, I have witnessed concerning behaviour by workmen, as other neighbours have raised. I am keen for Block 3 to be finished, but I am highly concerned about who will have access to the site during construction, and the code of which they conduct themselves. They must specify the hours they will be on-site during any completion of the building.

For all of the above reasons, I object to the proposed application.

Application N	<b>Consultees Name</b>	<b>Recipient Address</b>	Received	Comment	Response
2024/5549/P	Peter Anderson and Abigail Bulley	11 Wiblin Mews	02/05/2025 12:40:22	COMMNT	We are very concerned about the proposed works outlined in the 4Qs application. Having witnessed first hand considerable and frequent malpractice, lack of compliance with key safety standards and zero communication or engagement from 4Q about any concerns raised, we feel it is essential that any future works by 4Q or any developer planned at the site do not allow any abhorrent practice to be repeated and are further scrutinised so that concerns can be fully taken into account.
					Our concerns are many but are essentially two fold - risk of repeated health and safety malpractice and risk of severe disruption due to clear history of lack of quality development/management as a developer. We also object to the change of purpose of the affordable housing and see this as just another indication that 4Q says one thing but cannot be trusted to deliver what it says.
					<ul> <li>Health &amp; Safety Malpractice</li> <li>If delivered by 4Q the proposed plans will cause:</li> <li>-Significant health hazards and risks if not managed well. 4Q has a history of leaving the building site in an unsafe way with</li> <li>Risk of death by falling from a height - the lack of inadequate barriers to prevent risk of falling from a height to residents is appalling. There is significant risk of falling due to existing barriers/ railings being completely ineffective; no signage at all to alert people about risk; and significant risk at ground level to children or small pets who can access a number of these points with ease</li> <li>see photos</li> <li>Doors to works areas left unsecured - these bang in the wind which can be dangerous and also signal to opportunist thieves that the site is not secure. 4q also leaves equipment insecure on site which can be dangerous or presents opportunity for theft</li> <li>Dust and debris - 4Q has frequently used the existing site to dump or leave rotting waste or debris from its works without clearing it promptly and responsibly. With a number of new families here on site - we are very concerned about the risk to health and safety of ours and other families</li> </ul>
					Disruption We are extremely concerned about this plan to undertake development work 7 years after it was initially proposed to take place. Back when we moved here we understood the development would be finished promptly. Now 7 years later, our experiences of 4Q tells us that we will have considerable disruption:

- Incomplete works left unattended - 7 years on from moving in the incomplete works have contributed to significant water damage at our property and others. There is a considerable water ingress issue in the basement and we need assurances that this will be done and done well to a high standard. Lack of completion has left us unable to use our property as purposed such as garage space which gets flooded.

Printed on: 07/05/2025

09:10:04

-ZERO Communications - no written comms, letters, signage, engagement or any communications about works or when or by whom work will be done. This has caused significant inconvenience as we are at their whim

-Issues to access our homes by car - 4Q has been completely remiss in putting in any clear signage to ensure the development can be accessed by car, this means the area is frequently

Application N	Consultees Name	<b>Recipient Address</b>	Received	Comment	Printed on: 07/05/2025 09:10:04 Response
					congested. This will only worsen if 4Q brings in construction vehicles to site. - Noise - building works of this scale will create considerable noise pollution
2024/5549/P	Lucian Randall	14 College Lane	03/05/2025 12:30:58	OBJ	I live directly next to the development, in a property in College Lane.
		NW5 1BJ			I would not be in favour of changing the conditions which oblige the developer to provide affordable housing. This should not become market-rate housing under any circumstances.
					I'm very concerned by any proposal which would lead to a greater height of the development, particularly as it is already higher than it was proposed to be when first built.
					The development is anyway half-finished and the focus should be on completing it to original specifications.