

From: Alice Gailey, [REDACTED]
To: Kathryn Moran,
Cc: Councillor Stephen Sark,
Date: 30.12.2014

RE: Planning Application 2014/1938/P for 35 South hill Park.

My comments regarding the email from Alex Bushell to Councillor Stark dated 18 December 2014, addressing two of my concerns in my letter dated 8.5.2014. I still have concerns as follows:

1. Only Mrs Markey is still listed as the applicant and not Mr Markey, who is a part owner. I do not know the legal implications of this, especially concerning any possible 106 Legal Agreement with the Council and if damage were to occur to our property. Could you please obtain a legal view on this?

Certificate B has now been completed and put online, however Certificate A remains online and should be withdrawn. The application has not been readvertised. Notices have been received by adjoining owners on 30.12.2014, giving us less than 2 weeks to comment. Have previous respondents been notified?

2. The proposed description of the development is claimed to be a summary. **But it is not.** It excludes excavation of the front forecourt and the whole of the rear garden (the council's summary excludes more than 50% of the excavated site), the erection of garden walls exceeding 3m in height and the formation of the rear light well. This summary would be more accurate if it read:

excavation of existing forecourt, rear garden and to create new basement level under existing house and 2 basement levels under existing rear garden. Demolition of existing rear extension. Formation of rear light well and retaining walls including garden walls 3.6m high. Front light well with cycle storage and new front and back boundary treatment. Replacement of front and rear dormers.

Some people cannot read drawings and will not look at associated documents and will be misinformed if they have only the current inaccurate summary of the proposed development.

3. It is incorrect to describe No. 35 as a 'semi-detached' house, as it is attached on both sides, with party walls to adjoining properties.

4. We were not notified of the Independent BIA Review dated October 2014 until we contacted the Council ourselves on 23.12.2014. This gives us and our Consultants little time to review and comment on it, especially as this is over a holiday period. We have spent a great deal of money on Consultants to review the invalid and inadequate applications, especially as the first invalid, validated application was subsequently withdrawn. We did this in order to try and protect our property from damage and further subsidence.

Is the cost of our Consultants review of the Independent BIA Review commissioned by Camden covered by the applicant?

5. Our property has a ring beam at the top, tying in our flank wall to the party wall with No. 39. No account has been taken of the fact that damage to our 60ft high flank wall could cause collapse of the staircase wall affecting the means of escape.

Regards,
Alice Gailey, (Architect planner engaged for 25 years in Camden's Planning Dept).