

## Gentet, Matthias

---

**From:** Will Carter <will@northwoodcarter.com>  
**Sent:** 10 December 2018 12:41  
**To:** Gentet, Matthias  
**Cc:** Hazelton, Laura  
**Subject:** Final Decision reference: 2017/6954/P - The Pryors, East Heath Road - Extension of Time  
**Attachments:** Decision 2018-03-02.pdf; Hikvision PTZ.pdf; Hikvision bullet camera.pdf; 14-062-E Planning Application for The Pryors CCTV works.

Dear Matthias,

Further to my email on 6<sup>th</sup> December 2018, I have spoken with your colleague Laura Hazelton over the phone earlier this morning and I am summarising the discussion together with our proposal below.

### 1. Background

The client has a contractor on site undertaking the CCTV replacement works as per the planning permission granted at the Pryors (reference 2017/6954/P). Unfortunately the bullet cameras proposed have been discontinued and therefore cannot be used for the installation, which also means the PTZ (dome) cameras will have to be changed for compatibility within the system. It also transpires that the dome cameras sent across as an example have more limited capabilities than would meet the client requirements. Quantity and location of cameras are unchanged.

We have checked the planning permission and whilst it references our attached email of 5<sup>th</sup> February 2018 which provides data sheets of the discontinued camera and confirms “*..this is only an example of what we will be exploring with different manufactures also being looked at...*” Alongside this email with the caveat, the permission also includes the two data sheets we provided as examples of the likely cameras. It also has an informative comment confirming exact sizes from the example data sheets but this doesn’t include the mounts which are required in any event.

### 2. Concerns

Although the permission includes our attached email alongside the data sheets and the quantity and locations of the cameras will not change, we are concerned that it could be argued that by installing different cameras to those on the example data sheets, this could be seen as a breach of the planning permission.

### 3. Discussion

In talking with your colleague over the phone this morning and from the information we provided to her, we understand that it is unusual for the permission to be so prescriptive on product types. As the quantity and location of cameras will not change your colleague informed us this will likely be considered a non-material amendment. We understand that the installation of different cameras but in the same quantities and locations prior to an amendment being approved is not something the council will take action over.

As the decision contains differing information i.e. our attached email together with the example data sheets we are wondering whether using different cameras in the same numbers and locations would be considered to be a variation?

### 4. Proposal

As we cannot use the example cameras from the datasheets referenced in the permission, we are proposing to use the bullet camera and PTZ (dome) camera shown in the attached two data-sheets. These are a

different manufacturer from that in the example data sheets referenced in the permission (Hikvision not Dahua), however, are visually similar. Whilst smaller than the existing bulky CCTV cameras at the property, these proposed cameras do have slightly increased dimensions from the example cameras from the datasheets referenced in the permission. From our research these are the most discrete whilst achieving the site requirements, the bullet cameras whilst smaller in the body have a longer bracket but this is not a straight comparison as Dahua do not include the mounting box dimension in their overall diagram whereas Hikvision do.

The main visual change is for the two PTZ (dome) cameras which are approx. 80mm larger in diameter, however, similarly with the bullet camera dimensions whilst the height is approx. 80mm taller, this includes the mounting box whereas the Dahua dimensions did not. These larger PTZ cameras are not on the principle elevations overlooking East Heath Road but to the rear of Block A and on the carpark elevation of Block A.

Subject to any comments you have, we will apply for a non-material amendment to the planning permissions granted for the CCTV works at the Pryors (reference 2017/6954/P).

## **5. Works in the interim**

To my knowledge the lead time for a non-material amendment can be up to 5 weeks and could be longer with delays over the Christmas period. There have been a number of recent burglaries to flats in both blocks at the property, most recently last month and our clients primary concern is to have an active deterrent to ensure the safety of residents and property so rather than leave the blocks without the system until the outcome of the application for a non-material amendment.

Therefore, subject to any immediate feedback you can provide, our client will proceed to install the bullet camera and PTZ (dome) camera shown in the attached two data-sheets in the approved locations and quantities as per the planning permission whilst progressing the non-material amendment to remove reference to the example cameras from the datasheets referenced in the permission in parallel.

We would be grateful for any comments you can provide on this.

If you would like to discuss further please call me on the number below, and I will in the meantime commence our application for the amendment to the permission granted.

Look forward to hearing from you.

Kind regards,

### **Will Carter**

Building Surveyor  
Northwood Carter Ltd.  
Chartered Building Surveyors  
Construction & Property Consultants  
Symal House, 423 Edgware Road, London, NW9 0HU  
T: 020 8905 7505 [www.northwoodcarter.com](http://www.northwoodcarter.com)

---

**From:** Will Carter

**Sent:** 06 December 2018 18:24

**To:** Gentet, Matthias <[Matthias.Gentet@camden.gov.uk](mailto:Matthias.Gentet@camden.gov.uk)>

**Cc:** James Carter <[james@northwoodcarter.com](mailto:james@northwoodcarter.com)>; Hatton, Colette <[Colette.Hatton@camden.gov.uk](mailto:Colette.Hatton@camden.gov.uk)>

**Subject:** RE: Final Decision reference: 2017/6954/P - The Pryors, East Heath Road - Extension of Time

Dear Matthias,

I have been trying to reach you the last few days and was hoping to discuss the planning approval for the CCTV works at the Pryors. In brief we currently have contractors on site undertaking the works and some questions about the final decision have arisen, and we feel it best to first discuss over the phone.

Please call us back as soon as possible on the number below, this is a time sensitive matter and would appreciate it.

Kind regards,

**Will Carter**

Building Surveyor  
Northwood Carter Ltd.  
Chartered Building Surveyors  
Construction & Property Consultants  
Symal House, 423 Edgware Road, London, NW9 0HU  
T: 020 8905 7505      [www.northwoodcarter.com](http://www.northwoodcarter.com)

---

**From:** Gentet, Matthias [<mailto:Matthias.Gentet@camden.gov.uk>]

**Sent:** 21 March 2018 08:56

**To:** James Carter <[james@northwoodcarter.com](mailto:james@northwoodcarter.com)>; Hatton, Colette <[Colette.Hatton@camden.gov.uk](mailto:Colette.Hatton@camden.gov.uk)>

**Cc:** Will Carter <[will@northwoodcarter.com](mailto:will@northwoodcarter.com)>

**Subject:** RE: Final Decision reference: 2017/6954/P - The Pryors, East Heath Road - Extension of Time

Dear James Carter

I apologize for the delay in getting back to you. I was trying to get as much done before going on leave but unfortunately didn't manage to get on top of everything.

I would appear that another moderating officer has actually finalised the draft decision as issued generated by me. This was done on 2<sup>nd</sup> March 2018. I was not aware of any other senior officer being involved with this application. The Council prides itself in providing the best possible service to all of our customers, be they applicants, agents, residents. This confusion has clearly caused some inconvenience to you and unnecessary stress, and for this, I am truly sorry.

Nevertheless, the Final Decision has been issued – as attached. I will only request that an extension of time – though belated – be agreed so that it can be added onto your system. As the decision was issued on the 2<sup>nd</sup> March, would you be in agreement to use that date as the extension of time?

Many thanks

Matthias Gentet  
Planning Technician  
Regeneration and Planning  
Supporting Communities  
London Borough of Camden

Telephone: 020 7974 5961  
Fax: 020 7974 1680  
Web: [www.camden.gov.uk](http://www.camden.gov.uk)

2th Floor  
5 Pancras Square  
London N1C 4AG

Please consider the environment before printing this email.

---

**From 1 October 2016 you will not receive a letter from us if your neighbour submits a planning application. You can still find out about planning applications:**

- on new improved posters on lamp posts
- by signing up to planning e-alerts
- in the planning section of the Camden Account
- through adverts in the Camden New Journal and Ham & High

---

**You can [sign up](#) to our new and improved planning e-alerts to let you know about new planning applications, decisions and appeals.**

This e-mail may contain information which is confidential, legally privileged and/or copyright protected. This e-mail is intended for the addressee only. If you receive this in error, please contact the sender and delete the material from your computer.