From: English, Rachel
Sent: 02 June 2020 13:30

To: Planning

Subject: FW: planning application 2019/5141/P

Please log

Rachel English Senior Planner

Telephone: 020 7974 2726



The majority of Council staff are now working at home through remote, secure access to our systems.

Where possible please now communicate with us by telephone or email. We have limited staff in our offices to deal with post, but as most staff are homeworking due to the current situation with COVID-19, electronic communications will mean we can respond quickly.

From: hilary King <

Sent: 31 May 2020 12:33

To: English, Rachel < Rachel.English@camden.gov.uk >

Subject: planning application 2019/5141/P

[EXTERNAL EMAIL] Beware – This email originated outside Camden Council and may be malicious Please take extra care with any links, attachments, requests to take action or for you to verify your password etc. Please note there have been reports of emails purporting to be about Covid 19 being used as cover for scams so extra vigilance is required.

Rachel, the revised plan for a semi-basement side extension to no. 33 Willow Cottages does nothing to change the central contention here which remains whether such an extension to a grade 2 listed building is permissible under Camden's revised planning guidelines. Policy D2 Heritage clearly states "the council will resist proposals foralterations and extensions to a listed property where this would cause harm to the architectural and historic interest of the building " and " will resist development that would cause harm to the significance of the listed building and its effect on its setting ". The revised plan, like its predecessor, does both these things.

However further issues have arisen since the Heath and Hampstead's Dr. Vicki Harding took a closer look at the RSK's BIA. and forwarded her report to you. Groundwater issues have not been properly addressed and most worrying of all, through two

separate misplacements of no. 33 on Arup maps, RSK have concluded that the risk of slippage during construction work is minimal whereas when accurately positioned, no 33 and it's 8 companion cottages sit within the High to Very High risk zone. While I do not doubt that these are genuine errors, they seriously undermine confidence in the accuracy, reliability and professionalism of the BIA document and add further weight to the argument that this application should be rejected.



