Dear Mr. Tulloch,

I am a resident of the top floor flat at 10 Old Square which overlooks the Great Hall and Library and the North Lawn

I attended the last meeting of the Planning Committee on my own behalf and on behalf of a number of other tenants both residential and commercial who oppose the development of this site.

Mr McCracken was delegated to speak on behalf of us all because he is a planning expert. The architectural objections have been eloquently put by others but I thought I would write because I don't think the resident's views have really been aired. In all the discussions about the excavation of the East Terrace, no one mentioned what the development would mean to those actually living here let alone come up with a proposal as to how we might be protected if the Applications are proceeded with. I would like the residents' perspective to be taken into consideration in the upcoming Committee meeting on Thursday.

Lincoln's Inn is a very special place. I would not like the Committee to think, however, that the Inn is nothing except a commercial property on a rather grand scale. There are 65 residential flats occupied by all sorts of people including families with children and retirees (one of whom has lived in Lincoln's Inn for over 40 years) Indeed a number of tenants are still protected by old rent act tenancies. I made my home here just over two years ago. The peace and tranquility of this beautiful place is one of the reasons I did so.

I don't think that it is at all controversial to say that the impact upon residents and commercial tenants of the works to the East Terrace (conditionally approved) and the demolition and rebuilding of the Under Treasurers House will be huge. There is of course yet further massive basement excavation proposed. The noise and dust will be horrendous over a very protracted period This all will happen within yards of my bedroom window.

To date, there have been no discussions with us at all as to how the excavation, demolition and construction impact is to be managed. Indeed, there has been no process to specifically involve tenants in the proposals at all and the kicking off the planning process in holiday time when most people were away means here are still tenants who have no idea of the scale and extent of the works.

Nor has there been any discussion with us about how we might be affected when these works, if approved, are completed. What of the additional people/cars and other traffic generated by those for whom these new facilities are intended? As it is, it can be disruptive when groups of people congregate late at night to chat smoke etc on the East Terrace. With the massive expansion envisaged will residents have to put up with the equivalent of a pub or student union bar spilling out? That would change the entire character of this conservation space.

Those who have taken the decision to proceed with the Applications which are now before you are not representative of the people who live here or even the people who work here. The Benchers who take the decisions are all barristers of at least 20 years experience. Many are retired Judges and/or barristers who neither live nor work in the Inn. The Benchers have (by a small margin - 59% to 41% I believe) ) approved the works in general. Although during the summer an exhibition was held of the proposals regarding the Under Treasurers House there has never been a vote by Benchers on the proposals now before the Committee.

Although it is agreed by everyone (I think!) that the aims of the Inn which drive this Application are valid and praiseworthy – (essentially education – although the demand is overstated given the number of people currently coming to the Bar the predictions that it will shrink and ) the real issue is whether these aims could be met in some other way without risking damage to the site/listed buildings in all the ways that Mr McCracken and the various architectural and heritage experts have raised and without causing upset and disruption to the tenants both residential and commercial. LSE, St Mary's University of London etc all have educational buildings around the area. They seem to be able to ask students to walk a few minutes so I am not clear why these aims must be met onsite when there are many office buildings in the immediate area which could be used. Its one thing to start demolishing listed buildings when there is no alternative in order to meet important needs. This just isn't such a need.

I would be grateful if you could disseminate my views to the Committee members.

With kind regards Amanda Milne Top Floor Flat 10 Old Square Lincoln's Inn LondonWC2A 3SU