1. **CPD Planning Process**

Camden owns and operates the planning process on behalf of our community. The process encapsulates a set of rules ensuring fairness and equal treatment and we acquiesce by abiding by the rules. It represents the majority view and protects against the tyranny of the minority. It restrains those who don’t respect the rules and thus don’t respect us.

1.1 It protects all interests and property rights equally. It restrains those who would damage others property.

1.2 It ensures no person nor their interests are of greater merit than others. We are equal in the process and before the law that underpins it.

1.3 It protects from uncivilised and guttural behaviours, where the bully rallies support to provide cover for unseen private agendas.

1.4 The majority view is heard and voiced through Camden and its planning process.

**2. CPD Reasons for Objection**

2.1 Section 91 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended)

**2.1 Non-compliant whereas;**

2.2 All new external works shall be carried out in materials that resemble, as closely as possible, in colour and texture those in the existing area in accordance with the requirements of policy CS14 of the London Borough of Camden Local Development Framework core strategy and policy DP24 and DP25 of the London Borough of Camden Local Development Framework Policies.

**2.2.1 Non-compliant: Iron gate**

2.3 In order to prevent unreasonable overlooking of neighbouring premises in accordance with the requirements of policy CS5 of the London Borough of Camden Local Development Framework Core Strategy and policy DP26 of the London Borough of Camden Local Development Framework Development policies.

**2.3.1 Non-compliant: Rear window**

2.4 CPG6 guidance stipulates a minimum distance of 18 metres between the windows of habitable rooms of different units facing each other. For example; Planning Application number 2015/0931/P granted in April 2015 for 12 Willes Road required an extension to be moved back 1 metre from an existing footprint to accommodate this rule. The new window to the rear of the newly created self-contained flat inside number 8 Willes Road is overlooking numbers 3-9 Alma Street. It is less than 18 metres from the Alma street properties and does not meet with guidance CPG5 and CPG6. Should the owners of these properties wish to undertake future development works they may be unable to do so due to position of the newly created rear window.

**2.4.1 Non-Compliant: Rear window**

2.5 Had the application been made prior to the changes undertaken the changes may have been subject to control under the Building Regulations and / or the London Buildings Acts which cover aspects including fire and emergency escape, access and facilities for disabilities and sound insulation between dwellings.

**2.5.1 Non-compliant: Rear window / Iron gate**

2.6 Number 8 and number 10 Willes Road are owned by the applicant This enforcement action pertains to developments at number 8 Willes Road that circumvented the planning process during 2011-2012. The unauthorised development converted a large part of the house into a self-contained flat. This retrospective planning application (RPA) emanates from a separate parallel enforcement action 2015/6313/P. Camden will adjudicate a Certificate of Lawfulness for unauthorised developments at both 8 and 10 Willes Road for the retention of the conversion of two dwelling houses into one dwelling house. Reference 2.5 applies. The self- contained flat is in commercial service having been let and tenanted twice since 2012. It is not used by “friends and family”, nor is it “integral to the whole of the house” as the application form states. The original window was side facing, its outlook was to number 10 Willes Road. This window was bricked up during conversion works in 2011-2012 and a new window was instated to the rear overlooking Alma Street, it was not “rebuilt” as the application form states. There are multiple further inaccuracies in the application form which I am confident Camden have identified.

**2.6.1 Non-compliant**

2.7 In relation to the Inkerman Conservation Area Statement

**2.7.1 Non-compliant: Rear window / Iron gate as follows;**

**2.7.1.1 Ink14**

**2.7.1.2 Ink15**

**2.7.1.3 Ink17**

**2.7.1.4 Ink 8: Iron gate only**

2.8 General Permitted Development Order 1995 and Unitary Development Plan UDP & SPG specifically changes to windows, not in roofs and UDP Policy EN31.

**2.8.1 Non-compliant: Rear window**

2.9 The RPA emanates from an enforcement order. National Planning Policy Framework NPPF 2012 and the Planning Practice Guide operates.

**3. Conclusion**

A sophisticated understanding of the planning process is evidenced by;

3.1 a successful application to build an additional storey to ground floor extension at number 10 Willes Road CTP/G11/11/8/18940

3.2 campaigning on behalf of application 2012/0631/P for 4 Willes Road. The application was settled on appeal by the Planning Inspectorate on 30/04/2012 2012/1929/P in parallel with the ongoing unauthorised developments referenced at 2.6.

3.3 campaigning against application 2015/0931/P for 12 Willes Road granted in April 2015.

A layperson's observation may be that empirical data suggests obviation. The fact of multiple enforcement procedures and an RPA for works undertaken in 2011-2012 in a conservation area largely covered by 20-foot trees and overgrown foliage further supports this observation.

It is an acknowledgement that both we the community and the rules we all abide by have not been respected.

Adverse possession is juxtaposed to the principles and rules of the process, ergo, we ask before we take, not vice versa.

Camden is the arbiter; Camden will apply its and our rules, Camden will decide.