

[REDACTED]

---

**From:** Paul Braithwaite [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** 15 June 2019 20:45  
**To:** Planning  
**Subject:** Fw: Objection to planning application 2019/0727 (this wouldn't file online)  
**Attachments:** IMG\_6863.jpg

----- Forwarded Message -----

**From:** Paul Braithwaite [REDACTED]  
**To:** [REDACTED]  
**Cc:** Bethany Cullen Planning [REDACTED]; paul Braithwaite [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** Saturday, June 15, 2019, 8:12 PM  
**Subject:** Objection to planning application 2019/0727

By post and email to Matthew Dempsey, Planning

Objection to Planning application 2019/0727  
14A, Patshull Rd, NW5 2LB

15th June, 2019

Whilst I do not object to the design of the proposed new buildings at ground floor rear of 14A Patshull Road, central to this application, I seek a restriction placed on its Construction Management if it is granted approval.

The Ground Floor Plan submitted (Drawing 482:04 by I D Cuthbert, <http://camdocs.camden.gov.uk/HPRMWebDrawer/Record/7564780/file/document?inline>) is not complete in an important respect:

The plan omits the outside door and narrow side passageway on the east side of the house. This is the other side of the wall between my own property (42 Bartholomew Villas) and 14 Patshull Road. This passage has a slate tiled sloping roof to the dividing wall – see attached important photo.

My concern is that the builder's obvious preferred route for all demolition materials to leave and concrete, bricks, steel, timber, roofing, glazing etc to be delivered would be along this passage – which is less than one metre wide and, I'd guesstimate, only two metres high internally at the centre. Obviously I am concerned for the party wall.

Given that the applicant/owner did not notify or discuss his proposal with me or any neighbour, I wrote to the owner (Raj Persad) to articulate this concern.

On 31st May Mr Persad emailed me back with the following text;  
“....as no alterations were submitted in the planning which involved the passageway this aspect does not feature in any alteration application. I would, however, value your opinion as to whether removing the covering would be acceptable to you or not”

My answer to this question is that I DO OBJECT to removing the covering to the side passage, not least because it adds some support to the party wall.

I therefore request that if the application be approved it be subject to a condition that the slate roof and covering remains untouched as is. Indeed I note that the plan of the exiting East Side Elevation (at 482:54) the reference acknowledges the "Covered Passage".

My suggestion for Construction practice is that all demolition and construction materials should pass through the house and its main front door. Thank you.

Regards,

Paul Braithwaite

A solid black rectangular box used to redact the signature of Paul Braithwaite.