

20 April reply said: "The matter you have raised will be investigated and you will be contacted on the outcome in due course."

On 31 May I informed Enforcement by phone that a second prominent dormer was now being installed in the forward-facing side of the roof. The Enforcement Officer now said a planning application had been submitted on 8 December 2016 for one front dormer and two rear, and this was still in the hands of the planning department. She had warned the builder on 5 May that by pre-empting the decision, they were working at their own risk. (It appeared she had not known, in her 20 April letter, of this planning application.) She checked the file and gave me the addresses of some of the properties that had been consulted; mine was not among them - although my property was closer, it seemed, to the application site than some that had been consulted.

I then phoned [REDACTED] the planning officer concerned. He said an additional planning application had been approved (by officers) on 16 August 2016 and the present application (one front & two rear dormers) was received 8 December and validated 31 January. He presumed I had not been included in either of these consultations on the grounds that my property must have been "out of the perimeter". Neither he nor the Enforcement Officer knew that a second forward-facing dormer was now being installed by the builder. He was not able to provide me with a list of consultation addresses.

On Friday 2 June 2017 I visited Barnet House and asked (over the phone in Planning Reception) for a list of consultation addresses for the above two applications (16/3971/FUL and 16/7784/FUL) in order to establish why my address had been omitted from both of these consultations (and the omission also of myself, as an interested person; see letter above, July 2014). I was told by Mr. [REDACTED] that it was very likely these address lists (omitting names) would be sent to me within a few days by the planning department. They have not yet arrived, despite a further telephone enquiry from myself.

CONCLUSION: Proper consultation on planning applications is an essential element in accountability. What procedures are in place to ensure (a) that consultation addresses are readily available for checking, and (b) that these addresses include persons previously informed that they would be notified of any new applications for a particular address on which they had previously commented? The above (b) has been standard practice in the past.

This is another issue where there is a potential conflict of interest in relation to the **Client** (Barnet plus **Contractor Re Ltd**) and the other **Contractor** (the developer at [REDACTED]).

What procedures are in place to ensure a clear dividing line between these two Contractors?

Who, if anyone on the Council's staff, is in a position to check whether a particular developer is one of Contractor Re Ltd.'s (or Capita's) "Private Sector Clients" in receipt of their "planning support"? Who, in other words, on the Council's staff, is in a position to ensure proper, unbiased and un-influenced accountability in the Barnet/Re Ltd. consultation process?

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

Monday 19 June 2017.

SAE enclosed for acknowledgement.

TO: Mr. Michael Van Yeboah, Performance & Projects Consultant, Commissioning Group, Performance Team, L.B. Barnet, Building 2, North London Business Park, N11 1NP.