
From: [REDACTED]
Sent: 07 August 2015 21:17
To: English, Rachel
Cc: Minty, Stuart; McDonald, Neil; Planning
Subject: UPDATED COMMENTS 9.15 pm 7th August 2015 : Applications 2015/4053P and 2015/4157/P and follow up on today's telephone conversation
Attachments: 2015-4157-P Friday 9pm 07 08 15 (4).docx; 2015-4035-P Friday 07 08 15.docx; Westminster Council.docx

Correction

Subject: Applications 2015/4053P and 2015/4157/P

Attention:
Rachel English,
Senior Planning Officer
Camden

9.15 pm version Friday 7th August 2015

Dear Rachel,

Applications 2015/4053P and 2015/4157/P

Thank you for today's telephone conversation.

Following my email of 30th July, our subsequent telephone conversation on that day and my email of yesterday I would like to bring to your attention the latest updated enclosures (Friday) and the following revised comments after today's telephone conversation:

During our conversation last week and today, you mentioned that the application is on hold until the Inspectorate has ruled on the Quadrant Grove case on Permitted Development ("PD") regarding basements, but I commented that this application should not in any circumstances fall under PD for a number of reasons some of which are outlined below.

1- Engineering operation

As previously evidenced in the application 2012/5825/P, refused in April 2014, due to the complexity of the terrain where water has been found close to the surface next to the proposed new applications, and due to the unusual sensitivity of the nearby house, and especially with the presence of a flying freehold at 10 Pilgrim's Lane, this would clearly be an extremely complex engineering operation.

CPG4, paragraph 1.8, removes PD rights for engineering operations.

2- Both DP 27 (e.g. maintaining the structural stability of the neighbouring properties) and DP 23 (risk of flooding) would be breached.

3- A number of features in the proposed PD applications are outside the footprint of the house.

4- Other matters: e.g. overdevelopment, no traffic management plan, other previous objections by the Council... (Please see enclosure)

I enclose herewith more detailed explanations of the above four points.

Please note that in general, this collection of the 3 separate applications lodged this July 2015 by the applicant is essentially the same as the one that was overwhelmingly rejected by the Council on April 2014, save for the absence this time around of an extended basement throughout the outside patio.

Last but not least, all of these matters - which were refused during the DCC of April 2014 - are the subject of an appeal that is due to take place around Q4 of this year.

Taking all the above into consideration, I strongly believe the whole matter should be put on hold and debated in front of the Inspector.

I also enclose an article published last week in the Evening Standard which reports that some Councils are taking positive steps to systematically refuse basement applications under PD and instead request a full-fledged planning application.

In any instances, the PD should be refused for many of the above reasons, each one of which is a reason for refusal in its own right.

I look forward to your early reply.

Thank you.

Best Regards

Oliver

Oliver R Froment and family
10 Pilgrim's Lane
NW31SL