

[REDACTED]

From: Steven Fisher [REDACTED]
Sent: 13 September 2023 12:01
To: Planning Planning
Subject: Planning applications 2023/1630/P & 2023/3290/L (Heath House)

I wish to raise some concerns regarding the planning applications, 2023/1630/P & 2023/3290/L, both in relation to Heath House (NW3 7ET).

The applications purport to be "almost entirely procedural and seek to unify the previous planning consents." If this statement is to be taken at face value, then it is puzzling. If the planning consents already exist, why go to the trouble of "unifying" them? I can think of only one plausible explanation: the original consents were accompanied with a time limit to commence work on the approved plans. Presumably a new approval is expected to be accompanied by a new time limit, allowing the developer to delay substantive building works even longer.

The original planning approvals now date back several years. Since that time, no actual work has taken place, but the entire building has been permanently shrouded in ugly scaffolding. In addition, for the last couple of years, a static caravan has been set up in the forecourt, and used as a residence. Do these actions require their own planning permissions? Should the Council be initiating enforcement actions?

Heath House is a listed building in a prominent and sensitive location, directly behind the Hampstead War Memorial. The current permanently-scaffolded state, and use as a caravan site, is disrespectful to the War Memorial setting, and wholly inappropriate.

I'm therefore asking that the Council should utilise the planning and enforcement levers available to it, in order to remedy the current unsatisfactory situation. Specifically:

- ∞ If these latest applications are to be approved, such approval should not be accompanied by a multi-year extension to the deadline for commencing works, which would only be expected to facilitate further delay. The developer has already had many years during which to begin substantive building work, with planning approvals already in place. The developer should understand that if it does not use the planning approval in place, then it will lose it.
- ∞ If substantive building work does not begin imminently, then the Council should take steps for the unsightly scaffolding to be removed. The existing structure, even in its dilapidated state, would be a far preferable and more respectful backdrop to the War Memorial than the current scaffolding.
- ∞ If any of the current arrangements noted above are in breach of existing planning rules, then appropriate enforcement actions should be initiated.

Kind regards
Steven Fisher
[REDACTED]