

---

**From:** Neil Barwick [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** 05 August 2022 15:35  
**To:** Patrick Marfleet  
**Cc:** Planning Planning  
**Subject:** Planning Objection to Ref 2022/2301/P

[REDACTED]

Applicant:  
89-91 West End Lane  
Francis Gardner Apartments  
Ref 2022/2301/P

Dear Sir/Madam

As the freeholder of Flat 4, 93 West End Lane, and the immediate next door neighbour to the proposed development (and a member of NW6 Residents Group), I OBJECT TO APPLICATION 2022/2301/P for the following reason:-

The developers should not be allowed to game the planning system and hedge their bets. It is unfair, unreasonable and unjustifiable to seek new consent AND to retain the old consent, when the two are at complete odds.

They can't use arguments to get this new application approved when it is contradictory to their original case, and then be allowed to keep both conflicting options on the table.

The applicants were granted consent under Ref 2020/0928/P in Dec 2020 to totally demolish and rebuild the site. Objections at the time, including my own, highlighted the many flaws in that proposal, not least that it was economic and environmental vandalism. We suggested a refurbishment as a much better alternative. It now seems in hindsight both the developers and LBC agree.

The applicants now seek to gain new consent to retrofit and refurbish the building instead, on the grounds of cost and sustainability, but want to also "retain future flexibility to implement either consent".

It seems completely disingenuous to make a new application which freely concedes that their original plan was economically and environmentally misjudged, but to also seek to retain that original consent alongside a new plan that starkly lays bare their previous application's failings.

A core premise of their original justification was based on it being "impossible" to retrofit and refurbish the building. Strangely this is now, by the applicant's own admission, very possible. Consequently, the old consent, which was clearly and self-evidently based on inaccurate and misleading information, should now be considered defunct by LBC.

If consent is granted for the new "alternative" refurbishment proposal, I respectfully urge the planning officer and committee to conclude that this must supersede and negate the original consent granted in Dec 2020. The original consent must be struck off the planning register in favour of the new consent. The applicants should not be allowed to conveniently use selective arguments to serve their own purposes, so they can have their cake and eat it at the expense of the local community.

Regards  
Neil Barwick

Get [Outlook for Android](#)