

From: Amir Chen [REDACTED]
Sent: 13 July 2016 00:49
To: Beaumont, Elizabeth; Nicholls, John
Subject: RE: Planning Application Ref: 2016/2827/P [FLAT 1, APRIL HOUSE, 45 MARESFIELD GARDENS]
Attachments: busy daytime1.JPG; busy night1.JPG; busy night2.JPG; busy daytime5.JPG; busy night3.JPG; 45MG off street1.JPG; 45MG off street2.JPG; 45MG off street3.JPG; 45MG off street6.JPG; 45MG off street8.jpg

Dear Ms Beaumont and Mr Nicholls,

At the outset, I would like you to consider the following points:

This planning application is a retrospective one. Had the applicant followed the required procedures and applied for planning approval prior to illegally undertaking the works, would Camden ever permit a planning application that involves:

1. Potential pedestrian safety compromises
2. A reduction in Camden's on-street parking spaces, concurrent with
3. No improvement in off-street parking spaces

Please consider this point when assessing the Appeal and do not let the fact that the works have already been carried out sway your decision.

My objections to the above planning application are as follows:

There have always been 2 parking spaces in the forecourt of 45 Maresfield Gardens, which did not (1) compromise pedestrian safety, nor (2) encroach on existing on-street resident parking spaces. The owners of Flat 1 45 Maresfield Gardens decided, unilaterally and without planning permission, to move their forecourt parking space from the centre to the north. This change, if permitted, will result in a loss of 1 Camden on-street parking space, add no off-street parking space and put the safety of pedestrians at risk.

Loss of 1 Camden on-street parking space

I understand that this is contrary to Camden policies. This situation has arisen by the unilateral action of the owners of Flat 1 purely for their own cosmetic reasons to the detriment of nearby residents. There will be no additional off-street parking spaces as a result, but one less on-street space.

I would like to explain why any reduction to Camden's on-street parking bay directly in front of 45 Maresfield Gardens would be detrimental to the residents of the nearby properties:

1. The bay can comfortably accommodate 4 cars - see attached photographs. As you can see, this includes at least 2 oversized cars. However, any small reduction in the size of

the parking bay, as proposed by the Appellant, would result in the loss of 1 on-street parking space, in direct contradiction to Camden policies.

2. All 4 parking spaces in this bay are heavily used by the residents of 45 Maresfield Gardens for the following reasons:
 - It is the only parking bay directly opposite 45 Maresfield Gardens, where there are 6 flats and currently 9 cars with no access to off-street parking.
 - It is the only bay near 45 Maresfield Gardens which is illuminated by street lighting. It therefore provides more security when parking at night. As we know, the area is prone to muggings and car burglary and there is therefore added security when parking in this bay.
 - Our section of road gets extremely busy during school pick-up and drop-off times, when every available resident parking space in the area is occupied.

Camden's on-street parking spaces in Maresfield Gardens are very busy as parents use the street when dropping-off and picking-up their kids from the many schools in the area. In addition, most tenants on this road have at least 2 cars, putting a strain on on-street parking spaces at many times during the day (see attached images). What is the logic of reducing Camden's existing on-street parking capacity by 1 space? Would Camden ever consider reducing their on-street parking space, against their stated policy, if this unilateral and illegal action by Flat 1 did not take place?

Statements made in the planning application are incorrect

1. This planning application is flawed. There have always been 2 parking spaces at the forecourt of 45 Maresfield Gardens. The current retrospective application became necessary due to the unpermitted change of layout within the existing forecourt of 45 Maresfield Gardens. It also states falsely that in the past there were 3 on-site parking spaces - this has not been the case for at least the last 20 years that we've lived here and is actually physically impossible.
2. This section of road is a thoroughfare for children and adults on their way to and from the schools located on this road and within its close vicinity. Therefore, there is heavy pedestrian traffic on this section of road during the pre-school and post-school periods. Most of the pedestrians are children & teenagers, often running, scooting or listening to music with their earphones. There is no way for a vehicle to exit the proposed new forecourt parking space, which is tight against the boundary wall, without endangering these pedestrians. If this will be permitted, it is only a matter of time before an accident will happen and Camden's approval of such new parking arrangement will surely be carefully scrutinised.

The owners of Flat 1 should be required to reinstate the original parking arrangements for 2 cars in their forecourt. This would not necessitate an extension to the existing crossover and therefore loss of Camden's on-street parking space for the adjoining residents, as well as risk the safety of pedestrians.

Best regards

Amir Chen

[REDACTED]