

From: Ian Green [REDACTED]
Sent: 12 July 2016 08:15
To: Beaumont, Elizabeth; Nicholls, John
Cc: [REDACTED]
Subject: FLAT 1, APRIL HOUSE, 5 MARESFIELD GARDENS: Planning Application Ref: 2016/2827/P
Attachments: Original Photo.docx; Residents Parking Bay (2).pdf; Residents Parking Bay (3).pdf
Importance: High

Dear Ms Beaumont and Mr Nicholls

I am writing regarding the above retrospective planning application.

Will you please ensure that my comments below are noted:

1) **Planning Application: Section 10 – Existing number of on-site parking spaces**

The response to this is incorrect and highly misleading.

This has been previously pointed out to the owners of Flat 1 and their advisers, but they have sought to ignore this and to continue to mislead Camden.

It is stated that the existing number of on-site parking spaces is three and that it is proposed to reduce these to two.

The existing number of on-site parking spaces is not three. It is two, one of which, the left-hand parking space, is held by my wife and me on a long lease.

The owners of Flat 1 are seeking to claim that three cars could and did park on the forecourt area and that they are now seeking to restrict this to two cars. This is simply incorrect:

- a) There is not sufficient area for three cars to park on the forecourt without our left-hand parking space being encroached upon – this cannot be done as we have a lease of a specified area with measurements.
- b) My wife and I have been using the left-hand parking space for nearly 20 years and, throughout this period, the forecourt area has only ever been used for the parking of two cars – see attached Original Photo showing the position before the recent works were carried out by the owners of Flat 1.

Therefore, what in reality is now being proposed by the owners of Flat 1 is that the number of on-site parking spaces will remain at two as before, with the right-hand parking space being moved from its original position to a position next to the right-hand boundary.

2) **Residents Parking Bay outside the adjoining property (Flats A to F, 45 Maresfield Gardens)**

The residents parking bay outside the adjoining property (Flats A to F, 45 Maresfield Gardens) can and regularly does accommodate four cars – see attached Residents Parking Bay (2) and Residents Parking Bay (3).

The applicants claim that it can only accommodate three cars – this is not correct.

Again, they are seeking to mislead Camden.

If the crossover was to be extended to enable the owners of Flat 1 to use the right-hand parking space, which they have moved from its original position to the right-hand boundary, this would result in a reduction in this residents parking bay.

Any reduction whatsoever in this residents parking bay will result in the loss of one parking space and this is unacceptable.

3) **Visibility**

Due to the line of planters, the gates and the brick pillars which have now been put in place, emerging vehicles have poor vehicle to pedestrian sightlines of pedestrians travelling in both directions.

As mentioned in paragraph 1 above, the left-hand parking space belongs to my wife and me. We constantly use our parking space and our view has been severely restricted by reason of the line of planters, the gates and the brick pillars which have now been put in place.

During school opening and closing times, there is heavy pedestrian traffic, with many children passing, often without an adult next to them.

This issue of visibility is, therefore, of great concern.

The consequence of what the owners of Flat 1 wish to do is that there will remain two off-street parking spaces as before. However, there will be the loss of one residents parking space and a situation will have been created where exiting from the two off-street parking spaces will be hazardous and a danger to the many pedestrians, including children, passing by.

I strongly object to the present planning application..

Regards

Ian Green

Apartment E
April House
45 Maresfield Gardens
London NW3 5TE
England



THIS E-MAIL AND ANY FILE TRANSMITTED WITH IT ARE CONFIDENTIAL.

THEY ARE INTENDED SOLELY FOR THE ADDRESSEE(S). IF YOU HAVE RECEIVED THEM IN ERROR, PLEASE DELETE THEM AND ADVISE ME IMMEDIATELY.
