

**Gentet, Matthias**

---

**From:** Whittingham, Gideon  
**Sent:** 06 September 2017 14:13  
**To:** Planning  
**Subject:** FW: Application number 2017/2794/P - objection

Gideon Whittingham BA BSc DipTP  
Senior Planning Officer  
Development Management  
Regeneration and Planning  
Supporting Communities  
London Borough of Camden

Telephone: 020 7974 5180  
Web: [camden.gov.uk](http://camden.gov.uk)

2nd floor  
Town Hall Extension (WC1H 8EQ)  
5 Pancras Square  
London N1C 4AG

Please consider the environment before printing this email.

---

**From:** Ben Williams [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** 31 August 2017 12:59  
**To:** Whittingham, Gideon <Gideon.Whittingham@camden.gov.uk>  
**Subject:** Application number 2017/2794/P

Gideon

I was wondering if there was any update on this application now that works have commenced on site. Furthermore I also wanted to submit the below response to the JLL letter dated 10<sup>th</sup> July 2017 on behalf of my wife and I in 90 Camden Mews.

In response to the letter from JLL dated 10<sup>th</sup> July 2017 I should like to draw attention to the following paragraphs:

“Nature of Application .... For the avoidance of all possible doubt, the description of the development has not altered and the nature of the scheme remains unchanged”. This statement is at best only superficially true as the number of bedrooms to be included in the units has increased by 50% (with the properties now all being 3 rather than 2 bedrooms), the volumes being substantially increased, the design altered and the basements substantially increased. This is major increase in the density of the development. See para 7.1 of the objection from the Camden Square Conservation Area Advisory Committee.

“Basement Works.... The revised layout does not require any greater excavation or relate to a larger area.” This statement is entirely false and misleading. As suspected by local residents the Independent Review of Basement Impact Assessment produced by LBH Wembley quite clearly confirms in para 3.2.3 that, “It is estimated that the revised scheme will increase the area of basement excavation by some 15%,” furthermore it continues, “It is also noted that the new scheme involves a deeper excavation.... This approximate 15% increase.” Therefore the original

statement from JLL is clearly false as the proposed basement would have a volume approximately one third larger than the consented plans.

“Height....The houses are only marginally taller....and this would not be seen from the street” – the increase in height is almost 1m above the established datum from the adjacent building. I believe that this could be seen from further down Camden Mews and certainly from Camden Park Road. Furthermore if it cannot be seen from immediately opposite the properties it is only because of the additional bulk of the revised second floor design that shall be obscuring light, sky and a view of the ridgeline. I am not convinced that an argument for the excessive height that is shielded only by the excessive bulk of other parts of the design (all of which are out of keeping with the mews) is a particularly strong one. It is very notable that as one moves down the mews not one of the properties has either the height nor the massing at second floor level being sought, instead the clearly established architectural vernacular is to have a substantial step back at second floor level as noted in the objection from the Camden Square Conservation Area Advisory Committee.

The Independent Basement review also makes further important points including, inter alia:

- Lack of appropriate qualifications from the developers report providers (para 3.2.1) thus invalidating the documents
- Substantial (>30%) increase in basement volume (para 3.2.3)
- Lack of adequate detail being provided (para 3.2.3)
- Inadequate investigation having been undertaken (para 3.2.4)
- Insufficient detail being provided (para 3.2.5)
- Incorrect application of methodology (para 3.2.6)
- Lack of confirmation on adequacy of mitigation measures (para 3.2.7)
- Complete absence of any monitoring strategy (3.2.8)
- Excessive damage is anticipated to be caused to adjacent structures (para 3.2.9)

The independent assessment paints a fairly damning perspective on the mistruths being provided by the developer's agents and the lack of appropriate consideration being given to mitigate the impact of the proposed additional development on neighbouring properties. The reports provided lack detail, are incorrect, written by underqualified people and even at their conclusion are unable to meet the published requirements. Given the lack of policy compliance it is not clear how such an application could be approved.

Regards,

Ben

**Ben Williams**

