

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2016/6323/P	Adrian Phillips	Flat 3 16 Lyndhurst Gardens London NW3 5NR	19/12/2016 18:00:52	OBJLETTE R	<p>I am writing to object to both elements of the above planning application:</p> <p>A. Varying the design B. Disbanding the Construction Working Group (CWG).</p> <p>A. VARYING THE DESIGN</p> <p>The proposed change in design extends the floor plan of the second lower basement and introduces a light well that would drop down two levels. I object to this because:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. It will involve further loss of green space at the first basement level. 2. It will further increase light pollution in breach of LB Camden's regulations: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Excessively large lightwells will not be permitted in any garden space. • Lightwells to the side or rear of a property should be set away from the boundary to a neighbouring property. 3. The engineering design has not been independently checked. In the Structural Methodology, the project engineers MNP state that they "would welcome these proposals being audited by ARUP once again." As far as I am aware this has not been done. <p>B. DISBANDING THE CWG</p> <p>I object to the Developer's request to disband the CWG and ask that LB Camden dismiss it out of hand:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The time to remove the CWG was at the outset. It is now in place and should not be removed just at the most critical stage – excavation. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • At the Planning Committee there was much concern about the impact of the development on neighbours, especially the adjacent Grade II listed building. • The original S106 negotiated with the Developer prior to the Public Appeal contained a CWG by mutual consent. • Subsequently, despite the Planning Inspector's decision that the CWG was not required, LB Camden felt otherwise and gave planning consent and signed the S106 retaining the CWG. 2. The CWG is the only vehicle enabling neighbours to hold the Developer to account. Of course, it is this very scrutiny and loss of freedom to do as they wish that is behind the Developer's request. Despite the Developer avoiding, delaying or failing to resolve matters, the CWG has been extremely effective at raising them – otherwise they would have been completely ignored or swept under the carpet: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Concrete and rubble blocking a shared drain • Noise exceeding acceptable levels over 40 times • Unauthorised entry to a neighbours property • Ongoing negligence of the raking prop system securing shared walls • No attempt to monitor or control air quality and emissions • Damage to an adjoining flat roof and ornate brickwork • Damage to street paving outside the site • Refusal to let the S106 appointed Structural Engineer have access to the site • Refusal to pay the S106 appointed Structural Engineer's fee for attending the CWG

Application No: **Consultees Name:** **Consultees Addr:** **Received:** **Comment:** **Response:**

- Refusal to meet the neighbours legal costs associated with preparing the Party Wall Award
- 3. The CWG provides our only hope of influencing what continues to be a difficult relationship as well as an intrusive development.

If this proceeds to committee please notify me of the date.
