

[REDACTED]

I am writing to object to the above planning application. The application has been supposedly classified as "residential minor alterations", but as set out below this classification is quite inaccurate. In fact, the application has substantial adverse implications.

- The proposals represent a clear backtracking on commitments made by the applicant in its original application, in various promised s106 commitments, and in its submissions to the appeal inspector - specifically a commitment to reduce the number of parking spaces to 7, as well as detailed commitments in relation to the car park landscaping. There is no obvious reason to believe that the appeals inspector would have upheld an appeal in the absence of these commitments. Indeed, these commitments were even presented by the applicant as specific arguments in support of its case (e.g. paragraph 5.54 of the applicant's Statement of Case to the appeals inspector re 2020/1828/P). These commitments were offered voluntarily by the applicant, and the applicant should be held to all such commitments made. Otherwise, we will end up with a salami-slice erosion of the basis on which the appeal was (narrowly) upheld.

- The installation of these lift mechanisms will necessarily be unsightly. Notwithstanding that the design concept is supposedly intended to include matching paving on the top surface of the elevator, a closer investigation reveals that this is not the case. I note that the applicant previously made, then withdrew, a similar planning application for the same car stackers. That earlier application included a link to the manufacturers' website (interestingly omitted from this new application), which indicated that matters are not so simple. For safety reasons, UK law requires that all edges of this new surface will require bright luminous yellow hazard warning stripes. This represents a material step backwards from the aesthetic vision presented to the appeal inspector. Whilst such hazard markings are perfectly sensible from a safety perspective, they will be visually hideous, and will only be required because the applicant now wishes to backtrack from his previous commitments re parking.

- It is of some concern that the application, as currently presented, seems to hide this important information. The application does include photographs of the car stackers, but close inspection reveals that the cars shown have non-UK numberplates. It is evident that this supposed visualisation does not reflect the visual implications of the relevant UK regulations. As such, the application is worryingly misleading.

- It is also inevitable that the elevator will always be in the 'down' setting. The platform will inevitably spend time in its 'up' setting, perhaps for extended periods. The possibility of cars appearing to float higher up the car park wall - or above the North End Way / Heath Brow pavement level - is surely as far from Raymond Erith's vision as one could possibly get. And yet this is exactly what is envisaged by this application.

- The installation would require significant underground excavations not envisaged in the original application. It is important to note that while the 2 new houses abut a relatively new extension at the rear of Jack Straws Castle, these excavations are adjacent to the most historic part of the listed building. And yet the application includes no information as to the impact of these additional excavations on the historic structure. This is a disturbing omission.

- Another disturbing detail is only evident from careful inspection of the plans. The two car stackers on the eastern side of the car park are wider than a regular parking space. Thus, the third space along this row has been substantially narrowed within the proposed plan, effectively losing 33% of its total width and rendering the parking space unviable. I'm not sure if it would even be possible to fit a car into such a narrow space. It certainly won't be possible to park there and safely open the car doors. I believe this counts as a significant loss of amenity!

I urge the Council to reject this retrograde and unnecessary proposal.

Many thanks for considering these comments.

Comments made by Steven Fisher of 8 Jack Straws Castle, North End Way, London, NW3 7ES



Comment Type is Objection