

Dike, Darlene

From: Clack, Michael E [REDACTED]
Sent: 06 March 2015 16:06
To: Planning
Subject: Ref 2015/0441/P

Dear Sir/Madam

I understand that permission has been given for significant excavation work and over 3000 heavy lorry access to 53 Fitzroy Park.

Although this directly impinges on our access to our house on Fitzroy Close, and could block our block our road for many hours a day, we were not given the opportunity to comment on this application

I am very concerned about not only the loss of access (I understand that the lorries will not be able to park off road) but also the likelihood of major damage to the road surface and support. I am also concerned about the water table damage from such an additional extra deep excavation although I understand that this may have been addressed

Can I please ask for a review of the permission, to involve all those directly impacted, at the soonest opportunity

Best regards

Michael Clack
3 Fitzroy Close

This email is confidential and subject to important disclaimers and conditions including on offers for the purchase or sale of securities, accuracy and completeness of information, viruses, confidentiality, legal privilege, and legal entity disclaimers, available at <http://www.jpmorgan.com/pages/disclosures/email>. This message has been prepared by personnel in the Sales and Trading Departments of one or more affiliates of JPMorgan Chase & Co. and is not the product of JPMorgan's Research Department. It is not a research report and is not intended as such. This material is for the general information of our clients and is a "solicitation" only as that term is used within CFTC Rule 1.71 and 23.605 promulgated under the U.S. Commodity Exchange Act.

This email is confidential and subject to important disclaimers and conditions including on offers for the purchase or sale of securities, accuracy and completeness of information, viruses, confidentiality, legal privilege, and legal entity disclaimers, available at <http://www.jpmorgan.com/pages/disclosures/email> <https://urldefense.proofpoint.com/v2/url?u=http-3A__www.jpmorgan.com_pages_disclosures_email&d=AAMGaQ&c=jxhwBfk-KSV6FFlot0PGng&r=jNBBJwWtbLq2Aebw3suv_w&m=PtCKC_sNRV_Hd2q5Uz_w-1dZEvnbQbVqthNP-Rd1ufb4&s=mF5HM_oAK0krdJWUP1gDR9E4zOzJBzruIdGxfR0jk&e=>>.

Dike, Darlene

From: Charles Winston [REDACTED]
Sent: 07 March 2015 07:50
To: Planning
Subject: Re: planning application 2015/0441/P at 53 Fitzroy Park London N6 6JA

Dear Sir/Madame

I wish to register my very strong objection to the currant proposals to redevelop the site at 53 Fitzroy Park. I principal I try not to adopt a "NIMBY-ist" approach to other people's redevelopment proposals, but the scale of the currant proposal and the likely damage to the lower reaches of Fitzroy Park are just grossly excessive. In particular, my issues are:

- Disruption: If I read it correctly the proposal involves something over 3000 heavy truck movements in an around Fitzroy Park, and thus likely 1000s more light van movements. The disruption this will cause in the narrow confines of Fitzroy Park will be beyond that which we (as neighbors) should be expected to cope with.
- Parking: Where will everyone park ? The lower reaches of Fitzroy Park are already frequently blocked by "selfish" parking and this will be exacerbated beyond reason.
- Scale of property and property density: the proposed redevelopment is in my view out of all proportion of the size of the plot and the scale of houses in the area.
- Consistency: When I applied for my own vastly more modest redevelopment project in 2006 I was faced with many restrictions on the size of extension I could build, what glazing and sky-lights I could add and how the footprint on my house my expand by a meager 100-200 sqft. Were you to accept this proposal it would suggest that Camden Planning has ripped up its own rule book in the intervening 9 years. Frankly it would be gross hypocrisy, while it would also set a precedent for other over-sized development applications on the road.

I urge you to reject this application as just the wrong type and scale of proposal for this area. It is suitable for The Bishop's Avenue, not the confined spaces of Fitzroy Park

Kind regards

Charles Winston
6 The Hexagon, Fitzroy Park, N6 6HR

Dike, Darlene

From: Terry Rand [REDACTED]
Sent: 07 March 2015 09:22
To: Planning
Subject: 2015/0441/P

As a registered disabled allotment holder at Fitzroy Park site, I wish to register my formal objection to the proposed development - 2015/0441/P - as it would present me with huge difficulties in attending my plot and producing the crops which are my principal retirement activity.

Terry Rand

Dike, Darlene

From: Nitsa Sattentau [REDACTED]
Sent: 07 March 2015 15:52
To: Planning
Subject: application number 2015/0441/P

We believe that this application should be rejected totally. It will cause damage to the roads leading to it by the 3000 heavy vehicles to visit the site over three years which will inevitably frequently block the road. The resulting pollution will be intolerable for nearby dwellings not to speak of the noise. The creation of such a deep basement will affect ground water and the stability of neighbouring buildings. This area seems to be subjected to a constant barrage of redevelopment. Can't we be left in peace for a while? What used to be a pleasant semi-rural lane has become has a congested thoroughfare as a result of overdevelopment. What is wrong with the present building that it must be demolished with huge waste of materials? Yours,
Neville Sattentau, allotment holder, Fitzroy Park.

Dike, Darlene

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: 07 March 2015 18:29
To: Planning
Subject: 2015/0441/P

Dear Sirs,

I live at 49 Fitzroy Park, 2 doors down from number 53, and I am writing to object in the strongest possible terms to the proposed development.

My primary objections are twofold and are intimately related.

First, I regard the size of the proposed development at 9000 square feet, representing a 30% increase on the development size approved in 2012 and a 300% increase on the size of the existing dwelling, to be excessive and unreasonable, particularly given the fact that the property is located in a conservation area on the fringes of the heath.

This leads on to my second objection, which relates to the construction management plan. The size of the proposed development means that over 3000 HGV movements are predicted, with consequent damage to the road and inevitable regular and protracted road closures over a 2 year period. The planning process is about weighing up the rights of the individual developer against the rights of the community and approving a plan of that nature would involve getting that balance hopelessly wrong. Why should everyone living in the road be so seriously inconvenienced for such a long period in order to satisfy the self-aggrandisement of a single individual? It would involve an unreasonable and excessive loss of amenity.

I have other objections to the proposal - for example, Fitzroy Park is unlit in order to retain its "village" feel and yet the development proposes the installation of a concrete lift well with back lighting that will give rise to significant light pollution to the entire street.

However, the objections mentioned above are my main ones.

Yours faithfully,
Anthony Beare
Sent from my BlackBerry® wireless device

Dike, Darlene

From: Jane Shallice [REDACTED]
Sent: 07 March 2015 18:30
To: Planning
Subject: 2015/0441/P

I would like to object to the planning application for 53 Fitzroy Park in particular the CMP which shows that they would be estimating a huge number of lorry movements along Merton Lane and into Fitzroy Park. I swim at the Kenwood Ladies Pond, and am Chair of the Kenwood Ladies Pond Association. AS an association we are alarmed at the numbers of HGVs which will be moving in and out of Fitzroy park at a most awkward corner which often has had the mutilation of the necessary traffic island by such vehicles. The numbers of vehicles proposed means that there will be a constant movement of HGVs for a period of two years which will have a huge impact on the large numbers of pedestrians and cyclists who use Millfield Lane. It is not in the interests of the many people who use the Merton Lane entrance onto the Heath to have to do battle with such a huge amount of construction traffic.

Jane Shallice,

17 Haslemere Road London N89QP.

Dike, Darlene

From: Anne Elton [REDACTED]
Sent: 08 March 2015 11:50
To: Planning
Subject: Fw: ref; 2915/0441/P

I am writing to object to the the traffic use projected in this application. I use Fitzroy Park almost daily as I have an allotment there and i also go to the Ladies Pond frequently.

It would appear that the road may be blocked for significant periods of time over a very long period, even up to two years by HGVs which cannot be contained in the actual boundary of no 53 as there is such a short frontage. This will cause major problems to any motor traffic on the road – including blocking access for any emergency vehicle. It is difficult to imagine that the road itself will not be damaged by their heavy footfall. Also the entry to Fitzroy Park from Millfield Lane is at a difficult junction where the traffic island is already regularly damaged by vehicles, much smaller than HGVs. This junction is heavily used by walkers (and their dogs) going to the Heath, to the Ladies Pond and on to Fitzroy Park itself. such a huge amount of traffic will not only seriously inconvenience them but may actually constitute a significant risk.

Anne Elton
63 Parliament Hill
NW3 2TB

reference number 2015/0441/P.

Apex Lodge, 59, Fitzroy Park

London N6 6JA

Sir

08/03/15

I would like to register my objections to the proposed redevelopment of 53, Fitzroy Park.

With reference to the **Building Plan** itself I think 1. The site will be overdeveloped

2. The depth of the basement and foundation excavations (about 25m) is excessive.

3. The basement excavations are too close to the edge of Fitzroy Park and will result in some collapse of the edge of the road. The maintenance of the road is the financial responsibility of the residents of Fitzroy Park, administered through the Fitzroy Park Residents' Association. Any collapse of the road will result in major expense to residents and could also result in damage to the major services under the road.

With reference to the **Construction Management Plan** I think

1. With more than 3000 heavy goods vehicles envisaged visiting the site (probably an underestimate) over the course of a two year period, normal resident and domestic traffic along the south end of Fitzroy Park, will be severely compromised. This is the open end of Fitzroy Park – the north end having a barrier – and therefore is more commonly used by residents, visitors and deliveries.

2. The surface of the south end of Fitzroy Park will be significantly damaged incurring further expense for residents.

3. There is no provision on the site for these vehicles to pull off the road resulting in complete blockage of the road for significant periods of time causing obstruction to the flow of traffic.

4. There is no provision for the vehicles to turn on site which will result in them having to reverse for a considerable length along the south end of Fitzroy Park. This will result in excessive noise from the beeping, potential hazard to pedestrians and cyclists and to adjacent properties. The last redevelopment on Fitzroy Park resulted in damage to our boundary fence from the traffic of heavy goods vehicles.

5. There is no provision for a holding bay. The area immediately adjacent to our garden on double yellow lines on Millfield Lane in previous redevelopments has been used as such (unofficially) and results in increased pollution and noise.

The CMP as it stands is not fit for purpose and should be rejected.

Yours sincerely

Professor Christine Hall

Dike, Darlene

From: Peter Brighton [REDACTED]
Sent: 08 March 2015 15:44
To: Planning
Subject: Application 2015/0441/P

Dear Sir/Madam

We are members of the North London Bowling Club, situated off Fitzroy Park, Highgate. We are writing to strongly object to the proposed development of 53 Fitzroy Park. We are extremely concerned about the impact this development will have on access to the bowling club for an estimated two year period. Fitzroy Park is extremely narrow, and we have been informed that there will be over 3,000 HGV journeys to and from the site, which will obviously block the road for hours on end causing major disruption to other vehicles, cyclists, joggers and pedestrians. We are also concerned that the unique and peaceful character of the area is being eroded to its detriment.

Yours faithfully
Peter Brighton & Lisa Hamby
North London Bowling Club

Dike, Darlene

From: Sue Thomas [REDACTED]
Sent: 08 March 2015 18:20
To: Planning
Subject: 53 FITZROY PARK N6 - Planning Application No: 2015/0441/P

Dear Sirs,

As a resident of Fitzroy Park (No. 8 Fitzroy Park) I was dismayed to read the extent of the planning application for the redevelopment of the site at 53 Fitzroy Park.

This will cause long-term disruption of the use of the road by the residents because of the scale of the basement level applied for - both spoil removal and subsequent construction required - with safety issues for both vehicular and pedestrian traffic. The road is narrow and has no pavements.

As a private road Fitzroy Park has not been built with the same load-bearing capacity as a local authority-built and maintained highway. The works are very likely to cause damage to both the surface and underlying water, sewerage and gas pipelines of the existing properties.

Whilst accepting that residents should be able to develop their homes within planning guidelines, it does not seem unreasonable to expect that these same guidelines should consider the effect such developments may have on the existing amenities of the area. The size of the house being applied for seems incongruously large for the site, and the execution of the building process is likely to have a long-term detrimental effect on the road and safety implications for both the existing residents and daily pedestrian users of the road.

Yours faithfully

Sue Thomas

8 Fitzroy Park
London N6 6HP
[REDACTED]