1 December 2014

Attn: Ms Sally Shepherd London Borough of Camden Regeneration and Planning Development Management Town Hall Judd Street London WC1H 8ND

Dear Ms Shepherd,

Air-conditioning plant on roof of new Co-op shop at 72-74 Parkway Planning Applications Nos. 2014/4013/P and 2014/6343/P

We are writing as the owners of nos. 6,7,8,9 and 10 Gloucester Crescent to object strongly to the proposed enclosure of the air-conditioning plant on the roof of 72-74 Parkway, originally described in Planning Application 2014/4013/P, and subsequently revised in Planning Application 2014/6343/P.

We present the following to you without prejudice to provide background to our objections and in the hope of reaching a realistic and satisfactory conclusion for all concerned.

The earlier Planning Application was not adequately advertised, and none of the inhabitants of the houses in Gloucester Crescent that would be most affected by the proposed plant were notified. So it came as a nasty surprise when the plant descended, literally out of the sky via giant crane, and came down to rest only a few metres at most from our properties.

Rudolf Fara of no.9 raised the lack of notification with your officers and he was told that a site notice had been placed on 72-74 Parkway and was advertised in the Ham & High (the local newspaper of choice should have been the free Camden Journal) - hardly an effective way of informing the relevant neighbours in Gloucester Crescent. The Planning Permission was inspected and it was found that on the consultant Wellsfield Associates' drawings a 1.4 metre high fence surrounding the plant was proposed. This was clearly inadequate as some of the plant is considerably higher than 1.4 metres, and in any case the plant is very visible from the ground floor upwards of the houses in Gloucester Crescent.

In order to find a way of achieving a satisfactory solution the owners of nos. 8,9, and 10 Gloucester Crescent and the Contractor and Contract Manager for the plant installation met on the site of the plant on 11 September. The neighbours present explained that they had no objection to the plant as long as it was both inaudible and invisible. The Contract Manager quite understood their concerns, and a proposal for an open-textured timber enclosure to cover the plant was developed with him. He put this to the Co-op in September.

The Co-op subsequently opened and continues to operate currently, with no form of enclosure being erected, in open breach of the planning permission. Nothing was heard for some weeks about the proposal and Fara contacted the Contract Manager mid-November to find out what was happening. The result was the new application 2014/6343/P, with revised drawings by Wellsfield Associates. These show an added piece of trellis on top of the fence that was originally proposed in application 2014/4013/P. It is shown on one side of the plant

enclosure on one drawing and on the other side on the other drawing, so it is wrongly described as submitted. But it bears no resemblance to what had been discussed in September, and is still clearly totally inadequate. Please find attached a very rough sketch of what we had discussed and developed with the Co-op Contract Manager, Mr Steve Bracey, at our meeting with him in September.

This problem should be easy to resolve without getting involved in debating the rights and wrongs of a shop opening without complying with a valid Planning Permission, and the like. We reiterate that we have no objection to the plant, but we do not want to see it or hear it. The timber enclosure that was discussed in September would be simple and cheap to erect. We will not accept that the current proposed variation is in any way adequate.

Yours sincerely, Ann Pennington: ... 6 Gloucester Crescent Josephine Wood: ... 7 Gloucester Crescent Lauro Martines:... 8 Gloucester Crescent Rudolf Fara:... 9 Gloucester Crescent Sam Price:.... 10 Gloucester Crescent Encl.

Cc'd electronically:

Gideon Whittingham Margaret Richardson Richard Simpson Marcus Lincoln Steve Bracey



