

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2015/4408/P	robert mcracken qc	Flat 19 Seven Dials Court Shorts Gardens London WC2H 9AT	27/08/2015 15:43:34	OBJ	Robert McCracken 19, Seven Dials Court, Shorts Gardens, London WC2H 9AT August 28th 2015 Objection to Application by Lincoln's Inn 2015/4408/ P & L. fiao Rob Tulloch 1. I am writing to object to this application. The demolition of the Under Treasurer's house and its replacement with the proposed office/library building would cause substantial harm both to the setting of Grade II* listed buildings, and to the Conservation Area to which the existing building makes a positive contribution. My Interest: 2. I am a barrister member and Benchet of Lincoln's Inn. I was a member of the Inn's Development Working Group charged with working with the Inn's architects and development advisers until I resigned. I am therefore very familiar with the Inn and the project. I very much regret the need to write in objection to a proposal by an institution of which I am very fond. But it is an institution whose physical heritage it is the responsibility of our generation to preserve and hand on to future generations. I live locally in Covent Garden and was a founder and am currently Chair of the Friends of Lincoln's Inn Fields. I write in a personal capacity to make a few of the many criticisms which the poorly conceived project justifies. Rus in Urbe: 4. Lincoln's Inn is an oasis of green tranquility and beauty for those of us who live or work in this part of central London. It is rightly recognised as an "oasis" at page 127 of the Core Strategy. It is in Sub Area 9 of the Bloomsbury Conservation Area ("BCA") and recognised in the BCA Appraisal and Management Strategy 2011 as having a "secluded and peaceful ambience". The Cherry Walk and North Lawn north of the Lincoln's Inn Library may be best described as rus in urbe.. This is very important in an area of dense development whose many residents are short of open space and calm. Hardwick's Library and Great Hall: 5. Hardwick's Library and Great Hall group of buildings are listed Grade II *. Their significance is therefore viewed by Historic England/ English Heritage as "Very High". They make an important contribution to the charm of the whole. The Under Treasurer's (UT's) house is an appropriate supporting building providing accommodation for the Inn's principal officer. Its style and design fits in well with the main group which it supports. It is clearly a subordinate structure apt for its function. The Conservation Area Statement rightly recognises that it makes a positive contribution to the CA. 6. First Harm: The demolition of the existing UT's house, which makes a positive contribution to the CA, would in itself cause substantial harm to the setting of the Library/ Great Hall group and to the Conservation Area, and be unacceptable. 7. Second Harm: The proposed replacement building would be incongruous and discordant when seen next to, and in front of, the Library/ Great Hall group. It would cause substantial harm to their setting and the Conservation Area. It would do great harm to views especially from the Cherry Walk and

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
					North Lawn of the Inn and from Lincoln's Inn Fields. The Cherry Walk and North Lawn are important not only to those who work in the Inn, and its thousands of members, but also to the public who have access to the garden every weekday. It would diminish the attractions of the Inn and its buildings when seen from the Fields. Poor design: 8. The poor design of the replacement building has been criticised by a number of distinguished architects (see for example the representations of Philip Davies). 9.I do not attempt to list all the features which are damaging in the proposed building's context. Overall the building would no longer present as a subordinate building in a style which modestly reflects its supporting function. It would be a competing building which would clash in style, massing and detail with the Library/Great Hall group. It would be in conflict with NPPF and Camden Development Plan policies (see para 10 below) the London Plan Policy 7.8 D which is that development affecting the setting of heritage assets should be "sympathetic to their form, scale, materials and architectural detail" and for example there would be (1) a predominantly horizontal emphasis in contrast to the predominant vertical emphasis of the Library/Great hall group (2) a significantly increased wall height (3) a quite different roof line--not steeply pitched as the existing (4) a different, asymmetrical fenestration--no longer modest as befits its previous function (5) an absence of the blue diagonals/diapers which characterise the other brick structures in this area of the Inn. I note that surprisingly the "Historic Environment Assessment" (7.1.5 p 20) supporting the application does not attempt to consider the impact of the development on upstanding structures of historic structures. Conflict with NPPF and Camden Development Plan Policies: 10.The proposal would be in conflict with the National Planning Policy Framework ("NPPF") 132 & 138, London Plan Policy 7.8 D and Camden's Core Strategy and Development Policies. It would particularly conflict with CS 14 (a) and (b) and DP 25 (b) (c) and (g). No exceptional Circumstances: 11. No exceptional circumstances justify the demolition and new construction. There cannot be said to be a "clear and convincing justification" (NPPF 132). There are no "substantial public benefits" (NPPF 133). (Further the development is controversial among members of Lincoln's Inn) (a)As to the nature of the alleged need: The ordinary needs of educational and professional institutions can hardly ever be regarded as exceptional in this area as such institutions are commonplace. The desire for additional office and reading space is quite ordinary commonplace in the area. (b) As to office use: The building (although often described in the application documents as a "Library Extension") would mainly be used as offices. There is no need for the additional offices. The functions which would be undertaken from there are currently undertaken from modern offices at 33 Chancery Lane (about three minutes walk away). Insofar as there were any need for additional offices, the Inn has vast quantities of office accommodation within its walls which could be used. (c) As to library use: The library has no need of additional reading spaces. There are always plenty of reader's spaces in the library. The underground storage could be provided without demolition of the

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
					UT's house (as was conceded by RMA in answer to a question of mine at the first presentation to members of Lincoln's Inn in Autumn 2014--and as is apparent from drawings such as RMA Job 597 19427 rev PL1 28/07/15 which show sufficient space to relocate storage from beneath the UT's house to the east of the proposed underground extension) (d) As to loss of residential: Housing is the priority land use for Camden (CS 6 and DP 2). The UT's house is that rarity in central Camden --a conventional house in an enormous garden. Its loss even if it were replaced by a similar floorspace of residential building would not be consistent with CS6 (1) which seeks to promote and protect variety of housing. The proposed replacement is a non ground floor maisonette conversion. Poor Consultation: 11.0 The pre application consultation was poor. 11.1 The replacement of the UT's house has been presented as a "Library Extension" (see eg p 2 of Statement of Community Involvement "SCI"). In fact 2 of the 3 above ground/naturally lit floors are for office use. 11.2 The public exhibition of plans was limited to 1 afternoon event in respect of each of two iterations of the design. At the second, final exhibition (Wed 15th July 2015) the public (non members of the Inn) were allowed only one and a half hours. At the first of them the illustrations were internally inconsistent and misleading. 11.3 The summary of comments is heavily spun. ---outright objections to the design approach are not reported as such (eg reported misleadingly as "library extension needs further refinement" at p 7 of 15 of the SCI). 11.4 Although the architects claim to have taken on board the consultations responses the plans actually submitted suggest otherwise. 12. I am happy to help the Council and its officers in any way that I can both in dealing with the application and thereafter. Please do not hesitate to contact me. ROBERT McCRACKEN QC

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2015/4408/P	John Dagnall	Maitland Chambers 7 Stone Buildings Lincoln's Inn London WC2A 3SZ	27/08/2015 11:41:21	WRUP	I am a barrister member of Maitland Chambers and my own working room is on the ground floor of 9 Old Square (incorrectly referred to in Planning Applications as Old Buildings) with its windows west-facing and looking out onto the Great Hall (and lawn and terrace, and also the Library) of Lincoln's Inn. I write this in my own capacity and not on behalf of Maitland Chambers. My room is quiet and I use it for working with documents, making telephone call, and occasionally conducting conferences. I contend that my room is noise-sensitive and the beneficiary of the Council's noise sensitivity policies. As far as this planning application is concerned, my concern is as to the noise, vibration, dust, nuisance, and loss of amenity which I will suffer during the construction period. My understanding is that there will be substantial vehicle and plant movements and work both to a vehicle/plant parking/storage area in front of my room and generally, over the entire construction period. This will result in substantial noise, including continuous noise and impulses/bangs. The (temporary) loss of amenity in terms of interference with view of historic buildings and garden will be very significant. However, my greater concern is noise and vibration. The area is usually very quiet. I find the levels of sound recorded in the Sandy Brown acoustic report surprisingly high. In relation to the microphone used for Old Square at Location B (i) it was at high façade level rather than at a lower level equivalent to my working room environment, and would have picked up more external noise from vehicles etc. outside the Inn (there being relatively few vehicle movements within the Inn) including from the relatively loud western Chancery Lane (which I would contrast with the relatively quiet eastern Lincoln's Inn fields) (ii) it was placed near to a noisy fan. Therefore, I would request all and each of that (1) the Applicant be required to carry out a noise survey at my ground-floor level of 9 Old Square (2) there be added to the maximum noise limits set out in Paragraph 5.3 of the Report, a maximum noise limit in relation to my level of 9 Old Square (3) in any event the maximum noise limits for Old Square be reduced from those in the Report (4) in any event the Applicant be required to provide a full reasoned estimate of actual likely noise levels prior to the Application proceeding (5) in any event the Applicant should have to measure and publish the actual noise levels during the construction phase and (6) in any event the maximum noise limits be set as a strict condition of any planning permission and so that if they are exceeded at any point then that would be treated as a breach of planning control and construction should cease until sufficient effective attenuation and amelioration measures have been devised. The report also did not mention vibration which is likely to cause substantial nuisance and I would contend that the Applicant should produce an anticipated vibration impact report prior to the Application proceeding. The report also did not mention dust which is also likely to cause nuisance and I would contend that the Applicant should produce an anticipated dust impact report prior to the Application proceeding. I would point out that no details have been given of proposed noise or vibration or dust attenuation or amelioration measures and these and their verification should also be made a reserved matter prior to any full grant of permission. The level of likely nuisance/impact is such that it would not be right simply to assume that they will be dealt with satisfactorily at the construction stage. I would like to attend the committee.

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2015/4408/P	robert mcracken qc	Flat 19 Seven Dials Court Shorts Gardens London WC2H 9AT	27/08/2015 15:43:55	OBJ	Robert McCracken 19, Seven Dials Court, Shorts Gardens, London WC2H 9AT August 28th 2015 Objection to Application by Lincoln's Inn 2015/4408/ P & L: fiao Rob Tulloch 1. I am writing to object to this application. The demolition of the Under Treasurer's house and its replacement with the proposed office/library building would cause substantial harm both to the setting of Grade II* listed buildings, and to the Conservation Area to which the existing building makes a positive contribution. My Interest: 2. I am a barrister member and Benchet of Lincoln's Inn. I was a member of the Inn's Development Working Group charged with working with the Inn's architects and development advisers until I resigned. I am therefore very familiar with the Inn and the project. I very much regret the need to write in objection to a proposal by an institution of which I am very fond. But it is an institution whose physical heritage it is the responsibility of our generation to preserve and hand on to future generations. I live locally in Covent Garden and was a founder and am currently Chair of the Friends of Lincoln's Inn Fields. I write in a personal capacity to make a few of the many criticisms which the poorly conceived project justifies. Rus in Urbe: 4. Lincoln's Inn is an oasis of green tranquility and beauty for those of us who live or work in this part of central London. It is rightly recognised as an "oasis" at page 127 of the Core Strategy. It is in Sub Area 9 of the Bloomsbury Conservation Area ("BCA") and recognised in the BCA Appraisal and Management Strategy 2011 as having a "secluded and peaceful ambience". The Cherry Walk and North Lawn north of the Lincoln's Inn Library may be best described as rus in urbe... This is very important in an area of dense development whose many residents are short of open space and calm. Hardwick's Library and Great Hall: 5. Hardwick's Library and Great Hall group of buildings are listed Grade II *. Their significance is therefore viewed by Historic England/ English Heritage as "Very High". They make an important contribution to the charm of the whole. The Under Treasurer's (UT's) house is an appropriate supporting building providing accommodation for the Inn's principal officer. Its style and design fits in well with the main group which it supports. It is clearly a subordinate structure apt for its function. The Conservation Area Statement rightly recognises that it makes a positive contribution to the CA. 6. First Harm: The demolition of the existing UT's house, which makes a positive contribution to the CA, would in itself cause substantial harm to the setting of the Library/ Great Hall group and to the Conservation Area, and be unacceptable. 7. Second Harm: The proposed replacement building would be incongruous and discordant when seen next to, and in front of, the Library/ Great Hall group. It would cause substantial harm to their setting and the Conservation Area. It would do great harm to views especially from the Cherry Walk and

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
					North Lawn of the Inn and from Lincoln's Inn Fields. The Cherry Walk and North Lawn are important not only to those who work in the Inn, and its thousands of members, but also to the public who have access to the garden every weekday. It would diminish the attractions of the Inn and its buildings when seen from the Fields. Poor design: 8. The poor design of the replacement building has been criticised by a number of distinguished architects (see for example the representations of Philip Davies). 9.I do not attempt to list all the features which are damaging in the proposed building's context. Overall the building would no longer present as a subordinate building in a style which modestly reflects its supporting function. It would be a competing building which would clash in style, massing and detail with the Library/Great Hall group. It would be in conflict with NPPF and Camden Development Plan policies (see para 10 below) the London Plan Policy 7.8 D which is that development affecting the setting of heritage assets should be "sympathetic to their form, scale, materials and architectural detail" and for example there would be (1) a predominantly horizontal emphasis in contrast to the predominant vertical emphasis of the Library/Great hall group (2) a significantly increased wall height (3) a quite different roof line--not steeply pitched as the existing (4) a different, asymmetrical fenestration--no longer modest as befits its previous function (5) an absence of the blue diagonals/diapers which characterise the other brick structures in this area of the Inn. I note that surprisingly the "Historic Environment Assessment" (7.1.5 p 20) supporting the application does not attempt to consider the impact of the development on upstanding structures of historic structures. Conflict with NPPF and Camden Development Plan Policies: 10.The proposal would be in conflict with the National Planning Policy Framework ("NPPF") 132 & 138, London Plan Policy 7.8 D and Camden's Core Strategy and Development Policies. It would particularly conflict with CS 14 (a) and (b) and DP 25 (b) (c) and (g). No exceptional Circumstances: 11. No exceptional circumstances justify the demolition and new construction. There cannot be said to be a "clear and convincing justification" (NPPF 132). There are no "substantial public benefits" (NPPF 133). (Further the development is controversial among members of Lincoln's Inn) (a)As to the nature of the alleged need: The ordinary needs of educational and professional institutions can hardly ever be regarded as exceptional in this area as such institutions are commonplace. The desire for additional office and reading space is quite ordinary commonplace in the area. (b) As to office use: The building (although often described in the application documents as a "Library Extension") would mainly be used as offices. There is no need for the additional offices. The functions which would be undertaken from there are currently undertaken from modern offices at 33 Chancery Lane (about three minutes walk away). Insofar as there were any need for additional offices, the Inn has vast quantities of office accommodation within its walls which could be used. (c) As to library use: The library has no need of additional reading spaces. There are always plenty of reader's spaces in the library. The underground storage could be provided without demolition of the

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
					UT's house (as was conceded by RMA in answer to a question of mine at the first presentation to members of Lincoln's Inn in Autumn 2014--and as is apparent from drawings such as RMA Job 597 19427 rev PL1 28/07/15 which show sufficient space to relocate storage from beneath the UT's house to the east of the proposed underground extension) (d) As to loss of residential: Housing is the priority land use for Camden (CS 6 and DP 2). The UT's house is that rarity in central Camden --a conventional house in an enormous garden. Its loss even if it were replaced by a similar floorspace of residential building would not be consistent with CS6 (1) which seeks to promote and protect variety of housing. The proposed replacement is a non ground floor maisonette conversion. Poor Consultation: 11.0 The pre application consultation was poor. 11.1 The replacement of the UT's house has been presented as a "Library Extension" (see eg p 2 of Statement of Community Involvement "SCI"). In fact 2 of the 3 above ground/naturally lit floors are for office use. 11.2 The public exhibition of plans was limited to 1 afternoon event in respect of each of two iterations of the design. At the second, final exhibition (Wed 15th July 2015) the public (non members of the Inn) were allowed only one and a half hours. At the first of them the illustrations were internally inconsistent and misleading. 11.3 The summary of comments is heavily spun. ---outright objections to the design approach are not reported as such (eg reported misleadingly as "library extension needs further refinement" at p 7 of 15 of the SCI). 11.4 Although the architects claim to have taken on board the consultations responses the plans actually submitted suggest otherwise. 12. I am happy to help the Council and its officers in any way that I can both in dealing with the application and thereafter. Please do not hesitate to contact me. ROBERT McCRACKEN QC

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2015/4408/P	Jonathan Crow	4 Stone Buildings Lincoln's Inn London WC2A 3XT	28/08/2015 07:55:39	OBJ	Objection to Applications by Lincoln's Inn 2015/4408/P 'Library extension' 2015/4404/P 'Education centre' 2015/4402/P 'Works to the Great Hall' 1. This is an objection to the above applications. The proposed works are unnecessary and would cause substantial harm both to the setting of Grade II* listed buildings, and to the Conservation Area to which the existing buildings make a positive contribution. 2. I am a barrister member and Benchers of Lincoln's Inn. I work in the Inn, and have done so all my working life. I was on the Inn's Buildings Committee for several years. I am devoted to the Inn and to its legal and physical heritage. It is the responsibility of any generation to preserve and improve its inheritance for future generations. The Inn's current proposals do neither. On the contrary, they would significantly diminish the existing qualities of the Inn. 3. Lincoln's Inn is an oasis of fine architecture and green spaces, surrounded by the towering modern office developments and busy traffic along Holborn, Kingsway and Fetter Lane. In particular, the Library and Great Hall are listed Grade II *. They make an important contribution to the charm of the whole Inn, which is important both from a historical perspective and also for the ambience it offers to those working in or near the Inn, and to the many visitors they attract from outside. 4. The Inn's proposals would cause significant harm: a. They would involve the construction of very substantial and utterly incongruous structures immediately adjacent to the Library and the Great Hall, which are the most important and beautiful collegiate buildings in the Inn. b. They would intrude upon and detract significantly from the garden setting. c. Their design is poor. d. They would involve the demolition of an existing building (the Under Treasurer's House) which currently makes a sympathetic contribution to the whole setting. e. No exceptional circumstances justify the proposals. There cannot be said to be a 'clear and convincing justification' (NPPF 132). There are no 'substantial public benefits' (NPPF 133). The ordinary needs of educational and professional institutions can hardly ever be regarded as exceptional in this area because such institutions are commonplace, and there is also an abundance of accommodation within and immediately outside the Inn without the need for any new structures. f. The pre-application consultation was exiguous. It is also a matter of concern that the Inn chose to lodge these applications in early August, in the middle of the holiday season, thereby minimising the likelihood of objections.

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2015/4408/P	robert mcracken qc	Flat 19 Seven Dials Court Shorts Gardens London WC2H 9AT	27/08/2015 15:43:41	OBJ	Robert McCracken 19, Seven Dials Court, Shorts Gardens, London WC2H 9AT August 28th 2015 Objection to Application by Lincoln's Inn 2015/4408/ P & L. fiao Rob Tulloch 1. I am writing to object to this application. The demolition of the Under Treasurer's house and its replacement with the proposed office/library building would cause substantial harm both to the setting of Grade II* listed buildings, and to the Conservation Area to which the existing building makes a positive contribution. My Interest: 2. I am a barrister member and Benchet of Lincoln's Inn. I was a member of the Inn's Development Working Group charged with working with the Inn's architects and development advisers until I resigned. I am therefore very familiar with the Inn and the project. I very much regret the need to write in objection to a proposal by an institution of which I am very fond. But it is an institution whose physical heritage it is the responsibility of our generation to preserve and hand on to future generations. I live locally in Covent Garden and was a founder and am currently Chair of the Friends of Lincoln's Inn Fields. I write in a personal capacity to make a few of the many criticisms which the poorly conceived project justifies. Rus in Urbe: 4. Lincoln's Inn is an oasis of green tranquillity and beauty for those of us who live or work in this part of central London. It is rightly recognised as an "oasis" at page 127 of the Core Strategy. It is in Sub Area 9 of the Bloomsbury Conservation Area ("BCA") and recognised in the BCA Appraisal and Management Strategy 2011 as having a "secluded and peaceful ambience". The Cherry Walk and North Lawn north of the Lincoln's Inn Library may be best described as rus in urbe... This is very important in an area of dense development whose many residents are short of open space and calm. Hardwick's Library and Great Hall: 5. Hardwick's Library and Great Hall group of buildings are listed Grade II *. Their significance is therefore viewed by Historic England/ English Heritage as "Very High". They make an important contribution to the charm of the whole. The Under Treasurer's (UT's) house is an appropriate supporting building providing accommodation for the Inn's principal officer. Its style and design fits in well with the main group which it supports. It is clearly a subordinate structure apt for its function. The Conservation Area Statement rightly recognises that it makes a positive contribution to the CA. 6. First Harm: The demolition of the existing UT's house, which makes a positive contribution to the CA, would in itself cause substantial harm to the setting of the Library/ Great Hall group and to the Conservation Area, and be unacceptable. 7. Second Harm: The proposed replacement building would be incongruous and discordant when seen next to, and in front of, the Library/ Great Hall group. It would cause substantial harm to their setting and the Conservation Area. It would do great harm to views especially from the Cherry Walk and

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
					North Lawn of the Inn and from Lincoln's Inn Fields. The Cherry Walk and North Lawn are important not only to those who work in the Inn, and its thousands of members, but also to the public who have access to the garden every weekday. It would diminish the attractions of the Inn and its buildings when seen from the Fields. Poor design: 8. The poor design of the replacement building has been criticised by a number of distinguished architects (see for example the representations of Philip Davies). 9.I do not attempt to list all the features which are damaging in the proposed building's context. Overall the building would no longer present as a subordinate building in a style which modestly reflects its supporting function. It would be a competing building which would clash in style, massing and detail with the Library/Great Hall group. It would be in conflict with NPPF and Camden Development Plan policies (see para 10 below) the London Plan Policy 7.8 D which is that development affecting the setting of heritage assets should be "sympathetic to their form, scale, materials and architectural detail" and for example there would be (1) a predominantly horizontal emphasis in contrast to the predominant vertical emphasis of the Library/Great hall group (2) a significantly increased wall height (3) a quite different roof line--not steeply pitched as the existing (4) a different, asymmetrical fenestration--no longer modest as befits its previous function (5) an absence of the blue diagonals/diapers which characterise the other brick structures in this area of the Inn. I note that surprisingly the "Historic Environment Assessment" (7.1.5 p 20) supporting the application does not attempt to consider the impact of the development on upstanding structures of historic structures. Conflict with NPPF and Camden Development Plan Policies: 10.The proposal would be in conflict with the National Planning Policy Framework ("NPPF") 132 & 138, London Plan Policy 7.8 D and Camden's Core Strategy and Development Policies. It would particularly conflict with CS 14 (a) and (b) and DP 25 (b) (c) and (g). No exceptional Circumstances: 11. No exceptional circumstances justify the demolition and new construction. There cannot be said to be a "clear and convincing justification" (NPPF 132). There are no "substantial public benefits" (NPPF 133). (Further the development is controversial among members of Lincoln's Inn) (a)As to the nature of the alleged need: The ordinary needs of educational and professional institutions can hardly ever be regarded as exceptional in this area as such institutions are commonplace. The desire for additional office and reading space is quite ordinary commonplace in the area. (b) As to office use: The building (although often described in the application documents as a "Library Extension") would mainly be used as offices. There is no need for the additional offices. The functions which would be undertaken from there are currently undertaken from modern offices at 33 Chancery Lane (about three minutes walk away). Insofar as there were any need for additional offices, the Inn has vast quantities of office accommodation within its walls which could be used. (c) As to library use: The library has no need of additional reading spaces. There are always plenty of reader's spaces in the library. The underground storage could be provided without demolition of the

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
					UT's house (as was conceded by RMA in answer to a question of mine at the first presentation to members of Lincoln's Inn in Autumn 2014--and as is apparent from drawings such as RMA Job 597 19427 rev PL1 28/07/15 which show sufficient space to relocate storage from beneath the UT's house to the east of the proposed underground extension) (d) As to loss of residential: Housing is the priority land use for Camden (CS 6 and DP 2). The UT's house is that rarity in central Camden --a conventional house in an enormous garden. Its loss even if it were replaced by a similar floorspace of residential building would not be consistent with CS6 (l) which seeks to promote and protect variety of housing. The proposed replacement is a non ground floor maisonette conversion. Poor Consultation: 11.0 The pre application consultation was poor. 11.1 The replacement of the UT's house has been presented as a "Library Extension" (see eg p 2 of Statement of Community Involvement "SCI"). In fact 2 of the 3 above ground/naturally lit floors are for office use. 11.2 The public exhibition of plans was limited to 1 afternoon event in respect of each of two iterations of the design. At the second, final exhibition (Wed 15th July 2015) the public (non members of the Inn) were allowed only one and a half hours. At the first of them the illustrations were internally inconsistent and misleading. 11.3 The summary of comments is heavily spun. ---outright objections to the design approach are not reported as such (eg reported misleadingly as "library extension needs further refinement" at p 7 of 15 of the SCI). 11.4 Although the architects claim to have taken on board the consultations responses the plans actually submitted suggest otherwise. 12. I am happy to help the Council and its officers in any way that I can both in dealing with the application and thereafter. Please do not hesitate to contact me. ROBERT McCRACKEN QC