



**[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

Following on from your email that told me of the new plans – thank you again – my Client and I have considered matters. This first email deals with technical matters that relate to the revised drawings, following advice from my Client's architects. I am also attaching our comparative drawings to assist in this exercise and I shall be happy to speak to these on a call.

A second email will follow with a longer list of points.

The concerns from my Client's architects can be summarised in the following three points that lead then to a logical conclusion, set out at point four.

1. The Drawings from the Application 2020/1502/P; Revised Existing Elevations and floor plans; Existing Ground Floor Plan 003, Existing, Existing NW Elevation 006 still show inaccurate boundary wall locations between 23 Redington Road and 1 Chesterford Gardens. There are clear discrepancies between the actual boundary wall on the ground, and what is shown in the existing and proposed documents of the Application 2020/1502/P.

2. The level differences are still not addressed in Application 2020/1502/P Revised proposal; Plans and elevations AP01. The statements '*the fence height is indicative*' and '*Precise survey information unavailable for South East elevation levels and details*' are very concerning. The Council has waited and we have waited some considerable time for these drawings and they still do not provide accurate information that allows the Council to assess the application and impacts, and because the level difference and the fence have not been measured accurately - which I believe is being done on purpose - the view as shown on the plans of the proposed development from the buildings and gardens of nos. 21, 23, and 25 Redington Road is completely misleading.

3. As the Council is aware, a Party Wall matter and Award is not directly a planning matter. However, in this current scenario, it is fundamental that the Council understands that the 3<sup>rd</sup> Surveyor in the recent Party Wall decision concluded that the Applicant was wrong in seeking to assert that the boundary wall was a Party Wall that could be used to support and construct the proposed development. The 3<sup>rd</sup> surveyor found in favour of my Client.

4. The Applicant's assertion, having been proved wrong, means that the proposed scheme needs to be pulled back further into the Applicant's site. The redline plan is incorrect. The extant Application needs to be withdrawn and the Applicant can consider whether another Application should be submitted.

With kind regards

Alistair

**Alistair Watson**  
Partner

D +44 20 7300 4240

