

From: Sarah Safieddine [REDACTED]
Sent: 13 July 2016 09:56
To: Nicholls, John; Beaumont, Elizabeth
Subject: Objection to application 2016 2827/p

Der John and Elizabeth

I would like to formally lodge my objection to the above 'revised' application. In my opinion this application does not differ materially from application 2015/3684/p which was refused last year and therefore I'm surprised that the council is considering the applicants requests. My objections first and foremost concern the safety of this proposal and in particular the issue of line of sight. I also have other concerns detailed below and would ask the council to refuse this application once and for all.

1. Road safety:

There are over ten school campuses in the roads parallel to Maresfield Gardens and therefore a large number of children and families using the road during term time. These children are usually on scooters or running and pass in front of flats parking space in question. I have 2 young children who use this road daily and am gravely concerned for their and other children's safety given the proposals in the above application. The limited vehicle to pedestrian sightline, as identify by Doyle in their letter dated 17th July means that the driver of a vehicle exiting the northern parking space has almost non-existent sight of the road until they clear the wall. This is an accident waiting to happen.

This application is a result of the current owners reconfiguration of the previously open forecourt outside Flats 1 & 2 which allowed 2 cars to be parked safely. An ill thought out and unnecessary reconfiguration that involved putting up brick pillars, built without planning permission and iron gates, all out of character with other properties on our road. A reconfiguration that resulted in the user of the northern parking space only being able to exit their space by driving over an upright curb and a manhole (illegally) with no view of any pedestrians crossing until the car is literally upon them. Furthermore the applicant drives a powerful 4x4 which is used precisely at the busiest times of the road when children are whizzing by on scooters or running. In the absence of any field of vision the driver can only be relying on sensors to back out of the parking space. This is highly dangerous.

2. Loss of already limited residential parking:

The covering proposal is misleading in claiming that "there will be no loss of Resident Parking opportunities". In actual fact, the application is proposing that the Resident Parking bay directly outside Flats A-F April House is reduced from a four car bay to a three car bay? I pay Camden council for a parking permit and as it is I find it difficult to park on my own street. This will reduce available resident bays further. This has a particularly big impact on elderly people and those with very young children who live adjacent to flats 1&2 45 Maresfield Gardens.

In summary. We, the neighbours of the applicant, are being penalised by the withdrawal of a parking bay and our children's lives placed in danger because of an ill conceived and voluntary reconfiguration of the layout of the subject property. This should never have happened in the first place and under no circumstances should Camden Council authorise application 2016/2827/p. I strongly object to this planning application.

Yours sincerely

Sarah Safieddine