



[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.

Dear Emily

This is the second email; the second email on this matter which I referred to in my email of yesterday. I have the following points.

- a. In relation to the importance of a site visit, by way of further comparison, I am attaching the Applicant's revised drawing (the one that shows *Fence indicative only*) together with a visual impact photo taken live on the

ground. This illustrates the need for a site visit – and you know my view on that. I am also of the very firm view that it is the Applicant who should be producing this material. It is more than reasonable to request that they do so. My client and neighbours continue to have to do the work to bring these points to light when it is the Applicant who should be producing assessments.

- b. In relation to the overall accuracy of the plans, both in the original form and now in the revised form – I refer you to the Development Management Procedure Order (Part 3, and more generally as to the principle of legitimate expectation) whereby the Council is entitled to expect that drawings are accurate. We are now all at the point where given the consistent and persistent failings by the Applicant, the extant Application should be returned as being invalid.
- c. Please confirm that the Council accepts that the previous Recommendation at officer decision level to approve a scheme subject to the Section 106 Agreement was unlawful as it would have been based on incorrect plans and drawings.
- d. The Third Surveyor in the Party Wall matter – you have my point of yesterday and I think its entirely appropriate for the Council to see the material that is being considered and how the Third Surveyor found in favour of my Client. Please see attached.
- e. I query in passing that the revised drawings are peculiar and unusual – in the sense that they have not been signed by the Appointed Architect. That's what I would normally expect in a situation where drawings have been issued for Planning.
- f. In relation to our long running and ongoing concern – a matter which I think is also on the list of the Residents' Committee – on Tree Preservation Orders and the unauthorised lopping and topping of trees. I attach two photographs – one pre lopping and topping and one post-logging. Any consents granted do not relate to the work that led to that tree being removed.
- g. The indicated fence on the plans (a fence which is not part of the Application) and is shown as being on a wall that is not owned by the Applicant, looks to be 2.7m in height, almost 1.2m higher than the current fence. As you know, my consistent view is that this is a deliberate ploy to disguise the massing impact of the proposed development.

With kind regards

Alistair

Alistair Watson
Partner

