



**From:** Graham Croft [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** 12 May 2013 20:39  
**To:** Planning  
**Subject:** Twyman House planning application



11 / 5 / 13

Dear Minheer Mehta,  
I am writing in response to your letter of April 23<sup>rd</sup> regarding the planning application  
consultation for Twyman House.

28/05/2013

Firstly I have to ask that future letters from the council are written in comprehensible, plain English. I have a degree in English and am a habitual reader, yet I found the wording of your letter obstructive rather than conducive to understanding. When communicating with the general public it is not appropriate to use a specialist register of language, such as you employ in this letter, unless your intention is to baffle and disempower.

Having waded through the letter's impenetrable prelude in search of the actual changes sought by the developers, a dispiriting and frustrating experience in itself, I think I finally worked out that the actual proposed changes are: "to vary the wording of the condition from providing 7x wheelchair accessible units to provision of 5x wheelchair accessible and fully adopted units and 2x wheelchair accessible adaptable units." What does this actually mean? In what ways might "the proposal affect your neighbourhood"? How do you expect ordinary members of the public, often stressed by the avalanche of demands life today imposes on them, to find the time and the will to decode writing like this?

As you should be aware, most local residents have been seriously disappointed and disturbed by the way the council allowed this massive, unpopular development to go ahead. It is out of all proportion to the scale of the area and offers cramped accommodation which, if occupied, will put further strain on already inadequate local infrastructure. There is a widespread assumption that the council puts the appetites of developers above the rights and needs of residents & local people. Driven by a desire for profit, developers are inevitably going to push for more and bigger building projects. It is regrettable but unsurprising they seem indifferent to the damage they do to communities, their concerns are overwhelmingly commercial. However the public has a right to the protection of the council planners. Nobody believes the claim that these projects are driven by a wish to offer badly needed housing; advertising of the Twyman House units for sale as investment opportunities to speculators in Singapore & Hong Kong indicates the real purpose. I will not vote for those who fail to take into account the needs and wishes of the electorate, and I know many others feel the same way.

People want councils to live up to their responsibility to protect and preserve London as a place where people can live, rather than allowing it to become nothing but an arena for the speculative ambitions of commercial interests. Elected representatives have a duty to address the alarming drift toward dysfunction caused by the lack of adequate housing, medical services, school places, transport provision and places for children to play. People's living conditions are creating more and more dangerous levels of stress.

If your consultations are intended to engage the public, to find out what they want and need, you have to present information in a way that makes sense to people. This letter looks like something one developer might send to another.

As far as any changes to the Twyman House development goes, generally speaking any changes that would further increase the invasion of privacy for residents is unacceptable. Anything that extends the height, footprint or number of units of the building is unacceptable.

Sincerely,

Graham Croft