From: Elaine Chambers [redacted]
Sent: 08 November 2019 18:06
To: 100avenueroadCMP [redacted]
Cc: [redacted] Cassarani, Leo (Councillor) [redacted]
Porritt, Luisa (Councillor) [redacted] Adams, Steve (Councillor)
[redacted]
Subject: Fwd: The proposed Planning Amendment CMP originally approved 22/11/18

FTR. My full unadulterated email. Sincerely, Elaine Chambers, chair, Winchester Rd Residents Assoc (WRRA)

-----Original Message-----
From: Elaine Chambers [redacted]
To: 100avenueroadcmp
CC: barryc [redacted] leo.cassarani [redacted]
luisa.porritt steve.adams
Sent: Mon, 4 Nov 2019 20:33
Subject: Re: The proposed Planning Amendment CMP originally approved 22/11/18

4th Nov. 2019. FAO Mr J. McClue.

Re: The Proposed Planning Amendment CMP approved by the council 22/11/18 under 2017/6638/CMP.
[NB There is considerable doubt as to whether those gathered to make that decision on the 22nd fully understood what was put before them. However, this is not the gist of my correspondence here.]

Dear Mr McClue,

Looking at your correspondence whereby you state that the council, "...will make a technical assessment of whether the proposed amendment CMP would properly regulate construction of the planning permission 2014/1617/P...."

This you claim can be approved on the principle that, "...any CMP relates to technical highway and environmental matters based on specialist professional assessment..." And you go on to claim, "... has no legal requirement/expectation for the council to consult on the content of any form of CMP or to involve elected members in consideration of them."

May I draw your attention to the advances in our understanding (and note this ought to include Camden, see A Harrison) of the effects of pollution on the health of our citizens born, and as yet, unborn, since 2014. Knowledge has moved on considerably.

I respectfully question the ability of earlier environmental assessments to be appropriately up-to-date in order to properly regulate the environmental effects this development will have on the residents surrounding this building site, i.e. vulnerable families, and the visitors, mostly mothers and babies, to this same site. In the light

of the updated statistics concerning this field of environmental health, you would be advised to make some legal re-assessments.

"In the spirit of transparency the council will now take....." (paragraph 3 of your communication) I note with gratitude you will now be seeking the views of the council's Members Briefing panel consisting of three members. Respectfully I hope the selected three will have not shown in previous meetings to have an overt bias in favour of this development.

Again with respect, and in our mutual spirit of transparency and indeed in democracy, and to avoid overt bias, I request to know the names of the three chosen councillors as well as their current understanding of the updated knowledge on pollution,....
... for a permanent record.

Albeit for me to advise the council and its planning department, but it would be in the council's best interest to consider the possible outcome of the Ella Kizzi-Deborah case, the death of a nine year old child, Feb 2013 Lewisham. Bearing in mind that Camden's planning department bizarrely chose to build and house vulnerable families surrounding this site; it would be prudent to consider their health as well as those of the predominant mothers and babies who frequent the site, and to consider your own legal standing on these matters.

Yours sincerely, Elaine Chambers, chair WRRA.