

Hazelton, Laura

From: David Sweetnam [REDACTED]
Sent: 14 September 2015 20:56
To: Hazelton, Laura
Subject: Re: Planning application No 2015/2952/P

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Completed

Dear Laura,

Thank you for meeting with me in 24 Carlingford Road, NW3, on 27th August 2015 to discuss Planning Application No 2015/2952/P.

In addition, thank you for discussing the revised plans regarding the above Planning application with me on the telephone on 11th September 2015.

Basically I am extremely disappointed that the The London Borough of Camden, despite my best efforts, currently appear to be mindful to approve the revised plans dated 8th September 2015.

It would appear despite my e mails of objection on 16th and 23rd July 2015 including comments regarding the recent roof conversions at 1 and 8 Carlingford Road, the roof space openings contained within Planning Application No 2015/2952/P now appear to be larger in the revised plans than in the original submitted plans, as the number of windows facing my property has now increased and gone from three up to four. Therefore, me objecting, as strongly as possible, to the possible loss of my privacy in my flat, appears to have had the reverse effect, resulting in The London Borough of Camden negotiating plans which will further and additionally erode this loss of privacy to my flat

I have respectfully tried to explain how in 1 Carlingford Road, the roof space openings are relatively small and the glass used is opaque, no doubt to protect the privacy of the facing properties. Similarly in 8 Carlingford Road, the roof openings are relatively small 'sash windows'. In addition, the roof space conversion at 8 Carlingford Road incorporates side windows and a skylight no doubt to protect the privacy of the facing properties. I am unaware of any negotiation that has taken place between The London Borough of Camden and Alexander Martin Architects to try and incorporate in 21 Carlingford Road the previously mentioned design features, at 1 and 8 Carlingford Road, which provide some privacy for facing properties. Instead, it would appear The London Borough of Camden appear mindful to approve the revised plans dated 8th September 2015, these plans would produce an oversized, four windowed, roof conversion, similar to the one at 15 Carlingford Road, which Alexander Martin Architects themselves condemn as being oversized.

It would seem The London Borough when allowing roof conversions at 1 and 8 Carlingford Road, affect on the privacy of facing properties has been considered resulting in relatively small roof openings. It would seem now, when considering 21 Carlingford Road, The London Borough of Camden are using a different set of criteria, which possibly will result in a four windowed, oversized, roof conversion similar to the one at 15 Carlingford Road.

With respect, in your e mail of July 17th 2015 you say 'when coming to a planning decision, possible impacts on neighbouring amenity will be considered and assessed. Amenity impacts which are classed as material planning considerations include privacy. In addition, you say 'objections from neighbours are considered when coming to a final decision'. With these statements in mind, I am wondering at what point, does loss of privacy, become a possible impact on neighbouring amenity and therefore become worthy of consideration

before coming to a final planning decision. The roof conversion at 24 Carlingford Road which forms my flat was made prior to my occupancy in 1987 and as stated in my e mail of 23rd July 2015 the flat afforded a home with a degree of privacy and was in fact one of the main attractions of the flat. However, over the years this privacy has been continually eroded by roof conversions allowed by The London Borough of Camden. Again with respect, for you to say during our meeting of 27th August 2015, that because my roof conversion/flat was already in situ/existing, The London Borough of Camden could not refuse a facing planning application which would further or wholly remove the privacy from my main living area. This reasoning I cannot accept, as surely the impact on neighbouring amenity includes myself as an existing neighbour? Or am I to understand the loss of privacy to my flat, that the Planning Application in question may possibly produce, is not sufficiently worthy of consideration by The London Borough of Camden, is therefore not classed as a material consideration and is therefore not valid when making a planning decision? Surely The London Borough of Camden has a duty to be mindful of existing neighbours when protecting their existing privacy when determining a new planning decision?

In addition, at our meeting of 27th August 2015 you said the relatively new neighbours (moved in this year), facing my flat, were aware of my grave concerns regarding the loss of privacy to my flat from the planning application in question. Obviously they are not sufficiently aware to leave the roof space design unaltered, or perhaps lessen the invasion of privacy, by reducing the size of window openings looking directly into my flat, but instead are pushing ahead with their planning application. You said part of their approach to the planning department was to say, if successful with their planning application, they would install some window shutters which may protect their privacy and reduce the erosion of privacy to my flat. These window shutters have not been included in the existing application plans and as far as I am aware, are completely unenforceable by The London Borough of Camden. What if these neighbours in question were to change their mind and not install these shutters? or perhaps new occupiers may decide to take down the shutters in question. From my perspective it seems a pity and a continued source of annoyance that my new neighbours have chosen not to lessen these privacy issues by installing some curtains or shutters in the existing, relatively large window, which was created during the roof conversion in 1999/2000 and currently looks directly into my main living area.

I sincerely hope that you are going to include my e mails and objections to the Planning Application in question when 'writing up' your planning report. Am I to understand the planning department is to report this planning application to the planning sub committee at one of their regular meetings?, if so what would be the date of this meeting and would members of the public be allowed to attend?

Again, as stated I do not want to appear a nuisance, or take up your valuable time, however for the reasons previously indicated the planning application in question is causing me continued concern.

Thank you again for your continued kind attentions and I look forward to an early reply.

Best and kindest regards,

David Sweetnam.

On Thu, Jul 30, 2015 at 4:27 PM, Hazelton, Laura <Laura.Hazelton@camden.gov.uk> wrote:

Dear Mr Sweetnam,

Thank you for your email.

Please accept my apologies for the failure to redact your name from the document. I have made sure this has now been removed from the website.

I still have not managed to arrange an appointment yet, so will keep you posted if I do.

Kind Regards,

Laura Hazelton

Planning Officer

Development Management

Culture & Environment


London Borough of Camden

Phone: 020 7974 1017

Web: camden.gov.uk

5 Pancras Square

London N1C 4AG

From: David Sweetnam [mailto:
Sent: 23 July 2015 15:30
To: Hazelton, Laura
Subject: Re: Planning application No 2015/2952/P

Dear Laura Hazelton,

Re: **Planning Application No 2015/2952/P**

Thank you for your e mail dated 17th July 2015 in response to my e mail dated 16th July 2015.

I was also very appreciative to be able to discuss the above Planning Application, on the telephone on 20th July 2015. Thank you also, for your computer link of 20th July 2015 which enabled me to view the plans, design and access statement regarding the above Planning Application.

With reference to my initial letter of objection dated 6th July 2015, I would like to broaden the points made within this communication. I moved to Flat 5, 24 Carlingford Road, London, NW3 1RX in 1987, because at the time, the flat afforded a home with a degree of privacy. However, over the years this privacy has been continually eroded by roof space conversions allowed by The London Borough of Camden through the Planning process.

With reference to Alexander Martin Architects submission, the roof space conversion at 15 Carlingford Road, NW3, since being built, has partially eroded the privacy of my flat. From memory in 2009/2010 I attended a meeting at Burgh House, Hampstead entitled 'Has Planning failed us?', the particular roof space development at 15 Carlingford Road, NW3 was shown on an overhead projector and discussed/described during the meeting as inappropriate and excessive development. Attending the meeting at Burgh House were Planning Officer(s) from The London Borough of Camden and shortly after this meeting, I had understood, roof conversions had been banned by Camden Council within The Hampstead Village Conservation area. Now, perhaps, due to the recent, huge influx, of 'New' (possibly International) money, into The Hampstead Village Conservation area, perhaps this banning of roof conversions, is now been relaxed by Camden Council.

Again, with reference to Alexander Martin Architects submission the roof space conversion he sites at 1 Carlingford Road, NW3 has window space openings, facing the other side of Carlingford Road, which are considerably smaller than proposed in Planning Application No 2015/2952/P. In addition the glass in these window space openings is opaque, 'frosted', glass, no doubt to limit the invasion of privacy to the facing properties.

I would now like to draw your attention to a recent roof space conversion at 8 Carlingford Road, NW3 which has relatively small 'sash windows', facing the other side of Carlingford Road, which again are considerably smaller than the roof space openings proposed in Planning Application No 2015/2952/P. In addition, this roof space conversion at 8 Carlingford Road incorporates side windows and a roof skylight, again, no doubt to limit the invasion of privacy to the facing properties.

Again, with reference to Alexander Martin Architects submission, the three proposed window space openings contained within Planning Application No 2015/2952/P facing and looking directly into my flat would seem wholly excessive and in reality would remove any remaining degree of privacy from my living room area. In addition, in Alexander Martin Architects submission he makes no mention to the removal of privacy from my flat, however, I understand this, as he is solely acting for his client. Also, the remarks made by Alexander Martin Architects regarding the condition/design of the roof area in relation to the above Planning Application I would hope would have absolutely no influence on the determination of the above Planning Application, as the very recent new owner/occupiers would have known of the roof area condition/design when they recently purchased the property in question.

In my experience, London Planning departments keep very detailed records of planning decisions they administer. In my view, the roof conversion in Denning Road, which looks directly into my bedroom, that I mentioned in my original letter dated 6th July 2015 may perhaps unfortunately be a case of mal administration by The London Borough of Camden. As previously mentioned successive roof space conversions in Carlingford Road have resulted in continued loss of privacy to my flat.

I am surprised, embarrassed and saddened to see that The London Borough has brought my letter of 6th July 2015 into the public domain. In one version my name has been blanked out - perhaps this is due to Camden Council recognizing my letter was of a personal and sensitive nature. In effect publishing my letter twice, with my name blanked out in one version strikes me as an inconsistency.

Again, I was very appreciative of your comments contained within your e mail of 17th July 2015 where you indicate you will view Planning Application No 2015/2952/P from my property. As stated in no way do I want to appear a nuisance or take up your valuable time. However, for the reasons previously indicated Planning Application No 2015/2952/P is causing me continued concern.

Thank you again for your kind attentions and I look forward to an early reply.

Best and kindest regards,

David Sweetnam.

On Mon, Jul 20, 2015 at 1:58 PM, Hazelton, Laura <Laura.Hazelton@camden.gov.uk> wrote:

Dear Mr Sweetnam,

Following our telephone conversation a few moments ago, please see the link below to view the documents for this application:

http://camdocs.camden.gov.uk/webdrawer/webdrawer.dll/webdrawer/search/rec&sm_ncontents=2015/2952/P&template=reclistplanning&rows=1000

Kind Regards,

Laura Hazelton

Planning Officer

Development Management

Culture & Environment

London Borough of Camden

Phone: 020 7974 1017

Web: camden.gov.uk

5 Pancras Square

London N1C 4AG

From: David Sweetnam [mailto:

Sent: 16 July 2015 16:13

To: Hazelton, Laura

Subject: Planning application No 2015/2952/P

Dear Laura Hazelton,

I understand from Contact Camden that you are the Planning Officer dealing with the above planning application.

On the 6th July 2015 I delivered by hand a written letter of objection to the above planning application to The Town Hall, Judd Street, London, please see attached copy. So far this letter has not been acknowledged by The London Borough of Camden.

At 2.35 pm on the 15th July 2015, I tried to telephone you on 020 7974 1017 to discuss the above planning application. However, you were unavailable, so instead I left my name, telephone number and the nature of my telephone call on your answer machine. I also stated, the matter, I felt, had a degree of urgency. Unfortunately, for whatever reason this telephone call was not returned.

Today, at 10.35 am I again tried to telephone you on the above number. However, again you were unavailable, so again I left a similar message as the one above on your answer machine. As of 12.30 pm today, again unfortunately, this second telephone call had not been returned.

Therefore, I am sending you this e mail, which I am sincerely hoping, may result in a degree of success. As I explained, in the above letter, I have spent approximately ten-fifteen years, working in various local planning departments in London, therefore I perhaps, have some understanding, as to why telephone calls are perhaps not returned by Planning Officers.

In no way do I want to personalize this communication from me to you, as I fully understand your professional position, within the The London Borough of Camden. However, as explained in the above letter dated 6th July 2015, the above planning application is causing me increased levels of concern and anxiety.

Currently, I am not completely familiar of how The London Borough of Camden procedurally administer and then determine their planning applications in line with published Central Government best practice guidelines. However, I have direct and (acutely) painful experience of a London planning department's complaint procedure, involving personal court appearances, then culminating in being interviewed by The Local Government Ombudsman, in a one to one meeting room, in order for me, to try and explain my actions to the Ombudsman.

Again, in no way do I want to create 'a storm in a tea cup' (or appear in anyway threatening), however, I am sure if you were in my position, facing a serious loss of privacy and possible monetary value to my home, you may be sharing similar feelings of concern and anxiety. Therefore, I am sincerely hoping I do not have to go down a possible complaint procedure possibly leading to The Local Government Ombudsman.

I invite you to my home, so that you can fully understand and see for yourself, my point of view, however I fully understand if you wish to reject this offer. I would sincerely hope you have/or are going to make a site visit to Carlingford Road, London NW3 before the above planning application is determined.

Finally, I would respectfully request that The London Borough of Camden reply to my letter of 6th July 2015, my telephone calls of 15th July 2015 and 16th July and finally this email, either verbally on the telephone or by written communication, hopefully before 21st July 2015 (the above planning application's closing date).

Best and kindest regards,

David Sweetnam.

This e-mail may contain information which is confidential, legally privileged and/or copyright protected. This e- mail is intended for the addressee only. If you receive this in error, please contact the sender and delete the material from your computer.

This e-mail may contain information which is confidential, legally privileged and/or copyright protected. This e- mail is intended for the addressee only. If you receive this in error, please contact the sender and delete the material from your computer.