

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2021/5652/P	Mr Graham F R Williams	23/01/2022 08:29:19	OBJ	<p>It has come to attention that the develop is holding some kind of consultation meeting on this matter on the 1 February, no doubt to tick a box. How come this consultation meeting was not offered to directly impacted residents like me in pre-planning?</p> <p>In case, I cannot attend and my non-attendance must not be construed as any kind of approval. I Object strongly because I have seen the effect that unobscured windows will have on my and neighbouring properties...significant lack of privacy when prior to the development we had total privacy. I attest to seeing at first hand work persons moving around in the Workshop only a few metres away at the same level as me with the ability to look directly into my bedroom, a guest bathroom/w/c and an ensuite shower room w/c at the rear of my property.</p> <p>Even in if only partial obscured, which in any case I strongly Object to, the application must be rejected. Clear windows of any kind breach the feel of personal security and safety of residential users on the Mews. This is why, just because you can't see the shark, if you're in the water and worry about sharks, you do not feel safe. If you enter a dark dusty room, you won't stay long because there is a small chance there is a spider or two in the room with you. If you walk alone at night, you prefer to do so if there's decent street lighting.</p> <p>I imagine an argument will run that present or future occupiers in the Workshop won't be at the correct height to see into my property? Really? They will ban the employment of tall people? At no point will anyone stand on a chair or a table? There will be no maintenance of any overhead equipment? If there's a leak nobody will change a ceiling tile? Overhead lighting will never be repaired or maintained? Nobody will put up Christmas decorations?</p> <p>Sharks, spiders and poorly lit streets...please do not approve this application.</p> <p>Further, so that all my comments are properly considered, please see comments made to Camden's planning enforcement case officer:</p> <p>To recap, I made a planning enforcement complaint on the 22 October. You were unable to visit the property as you weren't able to find it/gain access to view the issue. You called me this morning for the first time and I have explained the issue. You will make a another visit to assess the complaint.</p> <p>To confirm times when a visit to the property is convenient, please organise this with REDACTED at REDACTED(copied). REDACTED, I'm sure the Tenants wouldn't mind dealing directly with Olu so he can visit ASAP?</p> <p>I hope unrelated, is that suddenly a planning application (2021/5652/P) was made AFTER my complaint just before Christmas with an extremely short deadline for comments. Luckily a neighbour spotted the application and I have been able to make an Objection by email and post. My comment can now be viewed online. Enya Fogarty is the case officer. I'm sure this application will be the first of many as other matters come to light....</p> <p>I'm certain that the Fortress Grove redevelopment was only granted in the first place on the condition that any new building had to be constrained in the space occupied by the previous building and the privacy of existing property, especially residential, had to be protected. You will see in your archive that the application in various iterations had considerable opposition from residents.</p>

Application No: **Consultees Name:** **Received:** **Comment:** **Response:**

Sadly, what has now been built is what the developer wanted to build as opposed to what was granted i.e. a deliberate tactic of build it, see if we get away it or get retrospective planning because "hey, its built now, they won't make us pull it down". This is not on, and it makes a mockery of Camden's planning controls.

Clearly the non-compliant windows is one matter. But I'm also told the height of the roof exceeds that of the original building too. So they are sighted, I have copied the owner of number 2 Railey Mews, REDACTED and a representative of the Railey Mews and Fortress Road residents association, REDACTED. I'm sure they will forward this email to other interested parties.

This has been a significant development with heavy building works running right the way through lockdown when owner occupiers/tenants have been told to stay at home. We have been through the mill here. I lived in the property and it was extremely challenging. Later, my tenant refused to pay rent and claimed that her mental health was severely impacted. I agreed to her property surrender at significant financial cost to me. I'm sure other residents, particularly those at numbers 1, 2, 4 and 5 will attest to the same. We all made sacrifices to allow this development to generate more jobs in the Borough, so at the very least, please enforce against the developer's non-compliance and get the building adjusted to only what was granted at planning. A logical start would be Enya Forgary suspending application 2021/5652/P until you have been able to carry out full and thorough investigations.

Graham Williams
Owner of 3 Railey Mews
