

Dear Mr Thuaire

Certificate of Lawfulness Application 2014/1059/P
The Garden House, Vale of Health, London NW3 1AN

Please do add my strong objection to the above development to the numerous objections you have already received. I completely support the objection sent by The Vale of Health Society and appeal to you and the Council to recognise the need for special measures in this case and fulfil its obligations to protect local residents rights and welfare.

As you know, this application follows two previously granted Permitted Development (PD) applications for substantial basement excavation and extensions at the property, on neither of which has any work yet been carried out. This application if granted will in no doubt be carried out together with the other PDs. The total development is of significant size and it will therefore, have a very significant impact on the Vale of Health because of its logistical peculiarities.

I strongly endorse the points made by other residents. Specifically:

- This application is part of an extensive redevelopment proposal, a series of permissions for which have been already granted through previous planning and PD applications. As stated in several previous letters, we are extremely concerned that the object of this approach is to gain consent for a redevelopment which would not have been permitted had it been the subject of a single consolidated planning application, particularly given the MOL status.
- This application must not be considered in isolation and needs to be the subject of a Construction Management Plan. It is also of concern that unless there are special provisions for the enforcement of the CMP it will not be worth the paper it is written on.

I appeal to you and the Development Control Committee to reject this application and prevent the negative impact this development will have on our lives and our properties. The Council does have the power and ability to recognise that it is not acceptable to grant a series of permissions for a development that would not have been granted had it been the subject of a single application. It is imperative to recognise that when all these PDs are carried out as a single redevelopment, their impact will be much greater than the sum of the parts.

Regards,

Cristiano Campi
Upfleet
Vale of Health

Hampstead
NW3 1AN

Dear Mr Thuairé

**Certificate of Lawfulness Application 2014/1059/P
The Garden House, Vale of Health, London NW3 1AN**

Please do add my strong objection to the above development to the numerous objections you have already received. I completely support the objection sent by The Vale of Health Society and appeal to you and the Council to recognise the need for special measures in this case and fulfil its obligations to protect local residents rights and welfare.

As you know, this application follows two previously granted Permitted Development (PD) applications for substantial basement excavation and extensions at the property, on neither of which has any work yet been carried out. This application if granted will in no doubt be carried out together with the other PDs. The total development is of significant size and it will therefore, have a very significant impact on the Vale of Health because of its logistical peculiarities.

I strongly endorse the points made by other residents. Specifically:

- This application is part of an extensive redevelopment proposal, a series of permissions for which have been already granted through previous planning and PD applications. As stated in several previous letters, we are extremely concerned that the object of this approach is to gain consent for a redevelopment which would not have been permitted had it been the subject of a single consolidated planning application, particularly given the MOL status.

- This application must not be considered in isolation and needs to be the subject of a Construction Management Plan. It is also of concern that unless there are special provisions for the enforcement of the CMP it will not be worth the paper it is written on.

I appeal to you and the Development Control Committee to reject this application and prevent the negative impact this development will have on our lives and our properties. The Council does have the power and ability to recognise that it is not acceptable to grant a series of permissions for a development that would not have been granted had it been the subject of a single application. It is imperative to recognise that when all these PDs are carried out as a single redevelopment, their impact will be much greater than the sum of the parts.

I cannot overstate the powerlessness I feel in respect to this process. I am wondering how many more such PDs will come and be acceptable before we have a monstrosity of a project next to us and the Council has not acted to protect the basic rights of residents.

With best wishes

Zlatina Loudjeva
Lea Steps
Vale of Health
Hampstead
NW 31AN

Dear Mr Thuairé

**Certificate of Lawfulness Application 2014/1059/P
The Garden House, Vale of Health, London NW3 1AN**

Please do not in any way discount this objection because it is almost a copy of The Vale of Health Society objections. I completely support their objections in every way.

I am writing to register my objections to the above applications for yet further modifications to The Garden House.

This application follows two previously granted Permitted Development (PD) applications for substantial basement excavation and extensions at the property, on neither of which has any work yet been carried out. I understand this to be the fourteenth application for Planning Permission or Permitted Development on this site since 2004.

I completely support Alice Adams' letter of 5 March in relation to this application, and I strongly endorse the points which she has set out therein. Specifically:

· This application is part of an extensive redevelopment proposal, a series of permissions for which have been already been granted through previous planning and PD applications. As stated in several previous letters, we are extremely concerned that the object of this approach is to gain consent for a redevelopment which would not have been permitted had it been the subject of a single consolidated planning application, particularly given the MOL status of the site and its highly sensitive location on the edge of Hampstead Heath. We believe that any such consolidated application would have been rejected out of hand by Camden and, accordingly, we call on the Development Control Committee to reject this latest application for yet another addition to the substantial redevelopment which has already been approved.

· We have on a number of previous occasions also raised our major concerns over the feasibility of carrying out any significant construction on this site, access to which is possible only through a single narrow passageway, and the related concerns about the high probability that construction vehicles will cause severe disruption to traffic through the Vale, with potentially very serious consequences if access to rear part of the Vale is blocked at any stage. While these concerns may not be a material consideration in relation to the present PD application, it remains critically important that Camden take every possible step to ensure that a comprehensive, and fully consulted-on, Construction Management Plan is approved before the commencement of any work on this site, and that this Plan is then fully enforced, including the use of Section 106 agreements where appropriate.

In summary, I strongly support The Vale of Health Society objections and Alice Adams' call for the Development Control Committee to reject this application and to draw a line under a decade of planning battles that have been stressful, expensive and harmful to the community, recognising that it is not acceptable to grant a series of permissions for a development that would not have been granted had it been the subject of a single application.

Yours sincerely

Michael Nourse

Faircroft
Vale of Health

