

53 Fitzroy Park, N6

Statement of Community Involvement

Prepared on behalf of Smarter Building & Construction Ltd

HardHat.

January 2015

1. Introduction

HardHat was appointed in July 2014 to undertake consultation with neighbours in relation to a proposed replacement dwelling at 53 Fitzroy Park, London N6.

The requirement was to establish contact, arrange meetings, explain the proposals, receive feedback and discuss potential modifications to address the comments raised.

This document summarises the pre-application contact which has taken place over a five month period.

2. Methodology & Approach

The proposal is for a replacement dwelling in a private road close to Hampstead Heath. The site is located in the Highgate Village Conservation Area although the current dwelling is not considered to make any contribution to the conservation area.

The site has a long running recent planning history related to the previous consent for a replacement building which achieved consent but was the subject of a high court challenge. The comments made by local consultees in respect of the previous extant permission were reviewed at the outset to inform the process of design and consultation.

Camden Council's adopted Statement of Community Involvement (2011) provides the following guidance to those making a planning application:

"We strongly encourage pre-application advice and pre-application consultation for major, or potentially controversial, proposals. Pre-application consultation provides an opportunity for local communities and stakeholders to raise any issues directly with the applicant and influence their proposals."

HardHat established contact with the immediate surrounding neighbours and the Chair and Treasurer of the Fitzroy Park Residents Association. A dialogue took place by email and face-to-face meetings over the course of a five month period and ran in parallel with a series of

meetings with planning, design and conservation officers at Camden Council.

Given that the wider issues of concern raised by statutory and non-statutory consultees were considered as part of the previous application and consent, the focus has been on local engagement with the immediate neighbours to seek to address concerns about the height, bulk and massing of the proposed replacement private family dwelling.

3. Activity

3.1 Supply of Computer Generated Views

Initial contact was made with the neighbouring properties which overlooked the site in order to visit to take a photograph looking into the site. The properties in question were 1 Fitzroy Close, Sunbury, Ashridge and 53 Fitzroy Park.

Photographs were taken in August 2014 and computer generated views of the proposals were shared in September. These views were modified in light of neighbour feedback and now form part of the planning application material.

3.2 Meetings with Neighbours

A series of meetings has taken place between September and December to discuss the proposals and possible amendments.

3.2.1 Meeting with 1 Fitzroy Close & Ashridge

The first meeting with the neighbours from 1 Fitzroy Close and Ashridge took place on 18 September 2014. The owner of Sunbury was due to attend but missed the meeting owing to business commitments.

The meeting discussed the height, bulk and proximity of the building. The development team explained the client's requirement for a house with the majority of the bedroom accommodation located on the first floor.

It was agreed that the development team would explore the possibility of reorienting the building to move it further away from the road. This would be achieved by both increasing the separation from the road and pivoting the building so that it moved into the plot. This also allowed for the introduction of significant additional planting to provide screening between the proposed house and the road.

The residents asked for the Computer Generated Views to be revised to reduce the presence of any additional foliage. The development team visited the first floor windows at 1 Fitzroy Close to look at the relationship and view over the land at 53 Fitzroy Park.

3.2.2 Meeting with Fitzroy Park Residents Association

The development team met with the Chair and Treasurer of the Fitzroy Park Residents Association (FPRA) on 19 September 2014.

The Chair of the FPRA said that the proposal would have an impact on the fabric of the road and an impact on road users during construction. This meeting discussed the construction method and basement proposals.

The FPRA Chair was pleased that the latest proposal required less earthworks relocation than proposed under the extant consent. The Chair asked for funding so that Alan Baxter Associates could review the basement proposals as they had done with the previous proposals but the development team explained that was likely that the council would be commissioning an independent review in any case.

The FPRA Chair expressed concern about the age of some of the trees bordering the road and suggested these should be removed and replaced as part of the works rather than being left to fail. The development team expressed doubt that the Council would favour such proactive management of the mature trees and that this would be counterproductive given the parallel concerns raised by others over levels of screening.

3.2.3 Meeting with 1 Fitzroy Close & Sunbury

Following revisions made in response to the meeting held on 18 September a further meeting was held with the neighbours opposite the site on 18 November 2014. This time the meeting was with the owner of 1 Fitzroy Close and Sunbury. The owner of Ashridge was unavailable owing to business commitments.

The revised proposals were presented and discussed, showing the reorientation of the building away from the road, a reduction in height, revised fenestration onto Fitzroy Park and the introduction of new evergreen planting.

The neighbours were keen to see the building sunk as far as possible into the ground to minimise the height and had concerns about the materials and finish of the lift shaft on the side of the building.

The neighbours requested the opportunity to meet the new owner in person and although dates were offered the meeting did not take place before the end of 2014.

3.2.4 Meeting with 51 Fitzroy Park

A meeting with the owner of 51 Fitzroy Park was held on 27 November 2014. The principle concern of the owner was the proximity of the proposal to the shared boundary.

As a result of the discussion, it was agreed to modify the position of the side wall so that the northern flank would be no closer to the shared boundary than the limit of the existing approved planning application.

This amendment was shared with the neighbour but did not resolve the substantive objection to the proposals.

3.3 Follow up with other nearby residents

In addition to meetings with the directly affected neighbours with views into the site, the other adjacent property owners also received a letter

and summary information ahead of the submission of the planning application.

Follow up visits to these neighbours took place on 9 December 2014 to ask if a meeting was required but no requests to meet were received.

4. Summary of Concerns and Responses

<i>Concern</i>	<i>Response</i>
View from 1 Fitzroy Close and other neighbours	Reorientation of the building to push it back from the road. Increased boundary treatment facing Fitzroy Park with additional evergreen planting Provide a trellis above close board fence to match boundary treatment at 1 Fitzroy Close opposite.
Concern about the lift shaft screening	Revision to fenestration
Concern about height facing road and overall footprint	Reduction in overall height of parapet.
Redo the summer CGIs to remove additional foliage and check accuracy.	CGIs subsequently revised. Winter views commissioned
Proximity to boundary with 51 Fitzroy Park	Moved flank wall back to closest point of the consented proposal.
Deeds may contain a restrictive covenant	Deeds checked and no

related to building close to boundaries	restrictive covenant for garden land.
Meet the costs for FPRA to review the basement structural engineering report	A second independent review of the basement proposal not required when the council already require an independent review paid for by the applicant.
Consider replacing trees which are old and diseased as part of the application	Camden Council are unlikely to consent to proactive management of protected trees in this way.
Request to meet the new owner	Meeting dates offered in December 2014 & January 2015.
Sink the building lower to reduce height	It is not practical to make the basement any deeper due to levels within the site and engineering constraints.

5. Conclusions and Next Steps

All the neighbours have had the opportunity to comment on the proposals. A sustained dialogue has taken place with the closest neighbours to discuss their concerns and explore modifications to the plans.

As a result of the dialogue a series of amendments have been made. The consequence has been to move the building away from all of the neighbours, to reduce the height, amend the fenestration and detailed design and to introduce significant additional evergreen screening.

The applicant has fully complied with the expectations to inform and consult with neighbours before submitting the planning application, and have made every effort to address the matters raised in an open and productive manner.