From:	Stephen Robinson <
Sent:	14 September 2015 15:23
То:	Marfleet, Patrick
Cc:	Pietragnoli, Lazzaro (Councillor); Callaghan, Patricia (Councillor); Johnson, Heather (Councillor); Rea, Flick (Councillor); Freeman, Roger (Councillor); Cotton, Richard (Councillor); Lorna Bradbury
Subject:	2 Albert Terrace Mews 2015/3137/P

Dear Mr Marfleet.

Below is a an email I sent to Clr Lazzaro Pietragnoli earlier today. Please could you ensure you place it on the file as a further and final objection from us at 2 Albert Terrace Mews in advance of tonight's Members' Briefing.

Given that past promises you have made to keep me informed of developments, I must ask, please, that you confirm asap that this has been attached to the file.

Yours sincerely

Stephen Robinson

Dear Lazzaro

It was good to speak on the telephone last week and here, as you requested, in an email outline of my profound concerns about the planning department's handling of the above application at 2 Albert Terrace. Despite being assured by Stuart Minty that I would be told when the application was cleared to go before the Members' Briefing, I learned about it only because a sharp-eyed neighbour had spotted that it was to be considered tonight (14/9/2015).

This application has been cloaked in secrecy and flawed process from the beginning. First, the planning officer, Patrick Marfleet, has refused the requests of residents in Albert Terrace Mews to visit our properties to assess how the proposed new windows facing our properties will grossly diminish our privacy and amenity. Given that this is the nub of the objections from us at 2 Albert Terrace Mews, and from our two neighbours at One and Three, this seems a shocking omission. His argument that these new windows are fine because a much smaller window, further set back, already exists is absurd as would become very apparent had anyone come to visit the homes in the mews. I am also advised it is an error in fact to base planning decisions on precedence.

Further, Mr Marfleet made a basic error in his first report in calculating how much of the garden in 2 Albert Terrace will be bricked over. He was out by 50 per cent, but when this error was pointed out by us and others, the figure was quietly amended in his report without informing the objectors. How a planning officer who made such an elementary mistake can not be moved off a contentious application is beyond us and our neighbours. Now it is admitted that one-third of the garden is to be lost, in obvious and blatant violation of Camden's vaunted commitment to protect garden

space. Nor were the objectors told that the timber cladding had quietly been quietly withdrawn from the application. In other words, the objectors were not told that what they objected to had materially changed, while we feel the planning department are effectively assisting the developer at all points in this application.

You expressed shock when I told you how Camden planning and building control officers are complicit in the flouting of the regulations. In anticipation of permission being granted, the developer has demolished a window and frame, and blocked up another window. They have levelled what was a pretty and well-maintained garden. They have removed interior loadbearing walls. But none of this is of any apparent concern to Stuart Minty at Planning and John Nicholls, an enforcement officer. Mr Minty told me on the telephone that Camden dare not take on developers who begin work in Conservation Areas without permission for fear the developer will ultimately get permission, and then sue Camden for costs. These seems to me to be a feeble and illogical argument which essentially gives developers the green light to do as they please.

He said (or at least seemed to be saying) that it was all right to tear out windows in a Conservation Area so long as the developer has promised to restore it to as it was before should planning permission be declined. I could not secure evidence that this has happened. And as the window has been taken out without authorisation, I very much doubt Camden has visual records of how it looked before.

Mr Nicholls wrote an email in response to my query which was just as troubling to me. He did not seem quite clear whether planning rules had been broken, but made the following confusing point. "Furthermore, I have already exchanged emails with the planning agent and told him that they should not conduct any more work to the outside of the property until such time that they have a planning decision in their hands which say that they can undertake further works. I trust that provides some comfort."

Why should the developer stop now if he allowed to knock about a house in a Conservation Area; and if he is erring, why is not being told to restore the work he has already undertaken without permission? Moreover, I wonder if you agree it is rather peculiar that Camden enforcement officers see their job as to "provide comfort" rather enforce their own rules.

The ground floor of a distinguished, blue plaque house has been gutted internally, its outdoor appearance radically altered, without any planning permission or permits from Building Control. Yet the planning department meekly recommends the developer be rewarded for flouting these rules at tonight's Members' Briefing. This seems to me to be a recipe for planning anarchy across Camden. As I said to Mr Minty, should I ever be minded to change the outside of our mews house, I would be a fool to wait for approval, and would just on with it, confident Camden says it does not take action.

I am copying this to your colleague Pat Callaghan, who kindly intervened to frustrate Mr Marfleet's effort to put his inaccurate report and recommendation before the meeting 13 days ago. I hope you and your colleagues will ensure that the members

considering the application are aware that Camden's entire planning process would be held in ridicule if this application is nodded through tonight.

Please let me know if there is any further information you need from me.

Warmest regards, and thanks

Stephen Robinson

