

**From:** Yeung, Raymond  
**Sent:** 14 January 2016 13:08  
**To:** Planning  
**Subject:** APPLICATION 2015/7208P CONCERNING 24 QUADRANT GROVE NW5 4JN

APPLICATION 2015/7208P CONCERNING 24 QUADRANT GROVE NW5 4JN

Hello,

Please register this objection for the above app.

Many thanks.

Regards

Raymond Yeung BA(Hons) MPLAN MRTPI

**From:** michael eatherley [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** 13 January 2016 20:19

Camden Planning Department

Dear Mr Yeung

**APPLICATION 2015/7208P CONCERNING 24 QUADRANT GROVE NW5 4JN**

We have observed that our two emails with comments dated 23/12/15 and 06/01/16 have not been included on the Camden website. You have included only four emails, one from the Residents Association and three others from local residents. As you must know there are a number of others that should have been included. You responded to our second email saying that there had been delays owing to the holiday period. The period for comments was extended to 14/01/2016 from the previous date of 18/12/2015 (which predated the application). Presumably the extra time should be sufficient for the comments to be examined and posted. Could you please now rectify this as previously promised and also include this letter.

We have recently been made aware that Mr. Ireland has been advised that should he withdraw his Appeal, he could resubmit his application for a Legal Development Certificate for Permitted Development rights, with the implication that the Council's policy on PD was about to change and that the new application would be recommended for approval. This situation is reminiscent of what happened with the original Planning Application for a basement (2013/7107/P) and its replacement with Application to cover Permitted Development for the same scheme without its lightwell (2014/2070/P). At that time, having had it confirmed that the application failed on engineering grounds, the Irelands were advised to remove the lightwell and apply for Permitted Development instead. The planners subsequently recommended the PD application for approval. One of the arguments advanced

was that because the scheme excluded a lightwell it was no longer an engineering operation, which self-evidently is nonsense. The new application (2014/2070/P) was duly submitted and recommended for approval.

The Planners and Legal Officers at Camden appeared to be unhappy at the decision of the DCC meeting of October 2014 to refuse this PD application (2014/2070/P). Nevertheless other similar applications were put on hold pending the Planning Inspectorate's decision on Quadrant Grove - not Mackeson Road or anything relating to other London boroughs. Now that the Appeal on Quadrant Grove has been withdrawn, it follows that the DCC decision stands and the current application (2015/7208/P) for exactly the same scheme as (2014/2070/P) should be refused. We have already drawn attention to the coincidence of the Irelands' withdrawing their appeal and the Council's meeting last October when it was decided to revoke the change of policy initiated by the DCC decision of October 2014. We are in little doubt that a closed meeting such as this does not have the authority to change a decision made at an open meeting with public attendance. Christopher Sallon's letter and the opinion he attached sets out the reasons for disagreeing with the arguments presented at this private meeting.

The grounds for our objections to the application may be summarised as follows:

1. The scheme is in large part an Engineering Operation that does not benefit from Permitted Development rights.
2. The scheme involves building a reinforced concrete retain and support wall under the party wall that lies within the curtailment of our own dwelling house and in consequence alters our dwelling house. The same applies to the neighbour on the other side. The scheme alters three dwelling houses and is not allowed by the GPDO.
3. The procedural reasons identified in the paragraphs above automatically disqualify the submission.

Yours sincerely

Diana and Michael Eatherley of 26 Quadrant Grove

Previous emails:

Dear Mr Yeung      Email sent 23 /12/ 2015 (i.e date of registration)

I have seen that Application 2015/7208/P concerning a basement at 24 Quadrant Grove has been registered today, conveniently over the Christmas period, and that you are the planning officer dealing with it.

Clearly there is a mistake in the documentation, which states in the Summary that the Application is Registered 23-12-2015 and that Comments are up to 18-12-2015. This would defy logic.

An application for a basement under 24 Quadrant Grove has had a long history. The original application 2013/7107/P was withdrawn when it became apparent that the developers BIA failed on almost all counts. The subsequent application 2014/2070/P for the same proposal as

the current one was refused at the DCC meeting 13-11-2014 and the subsequent appeal to the Planning Inspectorate withdrawn immediately after the Inspectorate decided on a full inquiry. (We can only deduce that the developer had lost confidence in being successful in his appeal.)

We are aware that Camden Council, at the same time, decided to change its policy in relation to applications for Lawful Development Certificates of this kind. It is our contention that the justification for this change is unsound and we will be publishing a properly reasoned opinion in support of our position in due course.

For the moment please take this email as the first of a number of comments objecting to this application, which should be referred to a full DCC meeting.

Our objections are exactly the same as those to the previous application and I ask you to refer to them and to the statements submitted to the Planning Inspectorate.

Yours sincerely

Diana and Michael Eatherley

26 Quadrant Grove NW5 4JN

Dear Mr Yeung      Email sent 6/01/2016

**Planning Application 2015/7208/P: 24 Quadrant Grove London NW5**

We sent you an email on 23 December 2015, the day that you registered this application and also spoke to you on the 'phone. The purpose of the email was to raise our objection to the application and the fact that the date for comments was set before the registering of the application. You promised to change the date and to include the email on the website in the list of objectors. We are pleased to see that the date has been changed to 14 January, but the only letter published on the website to date is the one from Christopher Sallon on behalf of Quadrant Grove Residents Association. Could you please arrange to publish all the emails and letters you have received, including our own. It is important that the Council understands the level of outrage being felt in our street over this new proposal and the manner it has been submitted.

The application should be refused for the reasons already given. You have Gwion Lewis's legal opinion and I hope you consider it carefully. This deals comprehensively with the points raised at Camden's briefing meeting in October. The same basement proposal was refused at a DCC meeting in October 2014, the applicant's appeal was withdrawn immediately before the Council privately decided to change its policy/approach on permitted developments for basements.

As we have said, the application should be refused outright. If there can still any doubt about it, it must not be reconsidered at any level at the Council below a full DCC meeting.

Yours sincerely

Diana and Michael Eatherley of 26 Quadrant Grove