

---

**From:** [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** 15 August 2015 19:54  
**To:** English, Rachel; Planning; Wheat, Frances  
**Subject:** Applications 2015/4053P and 2015/4157/P

Dear Rachel English

We were surprised and alarmed to learn of the above planning applications under "Permitted Development" status and feel compelled to both question and oppose these new submissions, as they cannot surely be considered under such terms.

As previously shown 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, 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 a complex engineering operation, which means it cannot be regarded under PD status.

Furthermore these applications are substantially the same as the previous application, which was refused. Under The Town and Country Planning Act of 1990, a local authority has the right to decline an application if the condition is that a similar application is the subject of an appeal under section 78 and the Secretary of State has not issued his decision.

Thus on the issue of maintaining the structural stability of the neighbouring properties and the risk of flooding, there would be serious breaches with PD conditions.

There are numerous other reasons why these plans are so damaging to the surrounding area : the matter of overdevelopment, problems of traffic management, the damage to this narrow one-way street and the sewage system, etc. Such a serious development cannot be considered without taking in the whole context and history of the application.

It appears that the 3 separate applications lodged this July 2015 by the applicant remain essentially the same as the one that was overwhelmingly rejected by the Council on April 2014, save for the absence of an extended basement through 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 this year.

Surely the whole matter should be put on hold and debated in front of the Inspector as many of the deficiencies common to all these applications will be scrutinised during the forthcoming enquiry for application 2012/5825/P.

It has been widely reported in the press that many London councils are taking positive steps to systematically refuse basement applications under "PD" status. I hope Camden follows suit. In this specific case it seems deeply suspect that the applicant believed the plans could be considered eligible.

Kind Regards

Mary Horlock and Darian Leader

1 Pilgrim's Lane

London

NW3 1SJ