

Malcolm Dowers

From: Helen Zammett [h_zammett@yahoo.co.uk]
Sent: 17 January 2010 12:22
To: john.tyne@redbridge.gov.uk; felicity.banks@redbridge.gov.uk;
mahboob.chaudhary@redbridge.gov.uk; ruth.clark@redbridge.gov.uk;
peter.goody@redbridge.gov.uk; geoffrey.hinds@redbridge.gov.uk; Cllr R.Hoskins;
muhammed.javed@redbridge.gov.uk; ashok.kumar@redbridge.gov.uk;
filly.maravala@redbridge.gov.uk; loraine.sladden@redbridge.gov.uk;
michael.stark@redbridge.gov.uk; virendra.tewari@redbridge.gov.uk
Cc: samadams@london.newsquest.co.uk
Subject: Confusion over the objections to the amended Chepstow application

Dear Councillor,

Having just read an article in the on-line Wanstead and Woodford Guardian, which mentions the number of objections to the application going before you on Monday, I read page 16 of the Planning Department's report, under the Representations section.

Not only does it state that the CRA are objecting to this application but it refers to a number of other objections, including objections from 9 Gloucester Road - my home and 20 Gloucester Road - my mother-in-law's home. On close examination, these objections were concerning the original application. As you know, the CRA have written in supporting the amended application - there is no sign of this in the report. Additionally, the Zammett's have not written in objecting to the amended application.

Page 17 reveals that only 2 representations were received concerning the amended application and these withdrew their previous objections to the original plan.

The CRA assumed that having received the usual notification of the amended plan, unless our residents wrote in again and objected, no objection would be registered. This has been our experience on previous planning applications.

Yours faithfully,

Helen Zammett
Chair, CRA