
From: Billy Byatt [REDACTED]
Sent: 07 December 2021 17:37
To: Jonathan McClue; jim watts; [REDACTED]
Subject: Re: 2020/5660/P + 2020/5661/P Elm Terrace Dormer - Strong Objection to all works - South End Close Residents Association

[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.

Thanks Jonathan, I appreciate all the protection you are looking to include. Sadly, I recall how contractors frequently flout planning application constraints and I would ask for a few minor alterations in line with your new text as follows;

....will avoid obstruction,

o become....

"...will not obstruct or otherwise restrict access to residents of South End Close (SEC) due to the proximity of the proposed works to the main private pedestrian & vehicle access way of SEC, prevent using this same SEC from use as; an access point, building site extension, [materials] storage area, removal access way for waste, and worker/contractor access way to the construction site of the development..."

Apologies for 'closing' the access descriptions but I could see how they might use this language to demonstrate how they might minimize impact while still taking full access.

As always we remain happy to discuss any build arrangements with the owner/developer to come to an agreeable resolution which protects the residents of SEC but facilitates an easy build. Sadly, such offers have never (no, never!) been taken up by our neighbours. I wish it were otherwise.

Thanks again for your diligence and support.

Billy Byatt
SEC Coordinator
[REDACTED]

Get [Outlook for Android](#)

From: Jonathan McClue <[REDACTED]>
Sent: Monday, December 6, 2021 4:51:51 PM
To: 'Billy Byatt' <[REDACTED]>; jim watts <[REDACTED]>
Subject: RE: 2020/5660/P + 2020/5661/P Elm Terrace Dormer - Strong Objection to all works - South End Close Residents Association

Dear Jonathan

I am emailing you about the above two applications. The previous case officer - Joshua Ogunleye – has left the Council.

2020/5660/P is for alterations to the rear projection to form a flat roof. This proposal is unacceptable in principle and would be refused on design/conservation grounds and residential amenity (overlooking/loss of privacy). Given the age of the application – over 44 weeks – and that it is unacceptable, I am attempting to withdraw it.

For the rear dormer proposal under 2020/5661/P, Joshua has written this one up for approval but there is an objection from you below. Now that any works are likely to be limited to a rear dormer, I hope you are not too concerned. Looking at the details of your objection I'm not sure it relates to a material planning consideration, as it is about construction access on private land. It could be argued this is a civil matter. Notwithstanding this Joshua got the applicant to agree to a condition for a Construction Method Statement. Please see draft wording below:

Prior to commencement of construction works, a Construction Method Statement shall be submitted to and approved by the local planning authority in writing. The statement shall give details of how the build will avoid obstruction, or otherwise restrict access to residents of South End Close (SEC) due to the proximity of the proposed works to the main pedestrian access way of SEC, details of access point, building site, [materials] storage, removal of waste, and worker/contractor access to the construction of the development.

The details and measures contained in the approved Construction Method Statement must be fully implemented to the Council's satisfaction.

Reason: To safeguard the amenity of adjoining premises, protect private land within South End Close estate and the area generally in accordance with the requirements of policies A1, T1, T2 and CC4 of the London Borough of Camden Local Plan 2017

On this basis we are going to approve the application under delegated authority and I believe the above condition would satisfy your concerns. Please let me know whether you have any comments on this approach and the above wording of the condition.

Kind regards

Jonathan McClue
Deputy Team Leader
Regeneration and Planning
Pronouns: He/Him/His

From: Billy Byatt <[REDACTED]>
Sent: 04 August 2021 15:32
To: Joshua Ogunleye <[REDACTED]>; John Sheehy <[REDACTED]>; jim watts <[REDACTED]>
Subject: 2020/5660/P + 2020/5661/P Elm Terrace Dormer - Strong Objection to all works - South End Close Residents Association

[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.

Hi Joshua,

I am writing on behalf of the South End Close Residents Association. We have a practice of responding to applications which impact our residents in relation to applications in our immediate area. Too often applicants outside our estate have used SEC as a access point, building site, storage depot, rubbish tip, truck and equipment parking area for their construction projects. This means significant parts of our estate are taken over by building materials and spoil which can be hazardous to our elderly, disabled or young families. A single resident's application on Constantine Road or Elm Terrace can involve months of despoiling of the estate with unauthorised access and dumping throughout removing such areas from our own use.

The application at Elm Terrace is a classic case of this. This applicant has a history both of non-consultation with SEC but also in breaking planning permission and adding illegal entrances to all their construction projects (2 of which are still in place on SEC). We would therefore oppose this application most strongly, to the point whereby we are willing to speak against it at a formal planning meeting. We have not been contacted by the applicant to discuss any method for minimising impact but fully expect SEC at its most vulnerable point – the pedestrian access gate beside

this property to become an obstacle course for residents and potentially to be taken out of use for long periods breaching health and safety standards.

We are happy to discuss our objections in more detail but oppose and object most strongly to this application(s).

Kind Regards

Jonathan Byatt



SECRA Coordinator

Sent from [Mail](#) for Windows 10

This e-mail may contain information which is confidential, legally privileged and/or copyright protected. This e-mail is intended for the addressee only. If you receive this in error, please contact the sender and delete the material from your computer. See our new Privacy Notice [here](#) which tells you how we store and process the data we hold about you and residents.