

Bernard Carnell

1 The Hexagon
Fitzroy Park
Highgate
London N6 6HR



3rd March 2015

Development Management Team
London Borough of Camden ,
Town Hall
Judd Street
London WC1H 9JE

By email to planning@camden.gov.uk

Dear Sirs

53 Fitzroy Park , London N6 6JA
Planning Application 2015/0441/P

My wife and I have lived in Fitzroy Park since 1992.

I write to record our **objections** to both the above numbered applications

Scale of construction , including basement

The Applicant proposes the demolition of the current house and construction of a property , including a significant basement, that would increase the current building by an approximate factor of three..

We consider this to be of such a scale as to cause catastrophic damage to the area , and without any concern to the effect on neighbouring properties.

Impact on local hydrology

We submit that

- ground water flows would be detrimentally affected by the basement construction
- the high level "perched" water table supplies the pond grounds of 55 Fitzroy Park (and the Bird Sanctuary Pond). Also there is a deep level ground water flow at 8/9m below that feeds the Highgate chain of ponds downstream.

- there is significant risk of devastating and lasting damage to the ecology of the ponds , as well as flooding and damage to neighbouring properties and to the road

Risk of subsidence of the road in Fitzroy Park

Equally of concern is that the road and services, together with properties upstream of the site, are in serious risk of subsidence should construction of the basement be permitted .

Arborial impact

We understand that the proposal would also require a significant number of trees on site to be felled . We submit that the Applicant should not be permitted to disregard or ignore the arborial impact not only to trees on site but also on neighbouring properties and the risk , if not likelihood , that many of the trees and gardens of neighbouring properties will be affected by changes in ground water flow and the direct consequences of the construction process and post-construction impact.

The special nature of Fitzroy Park and it's proximity to Open Spaces/ Hampstead Heath

Those who have the good fortune to own properties in Fitzroy Park also have responsibilities . No 53 is within the Highgate Conservation Area and close to Hampstead Heath. This is a very special area enjoyed not only by those privileged to be able to live here but also by the many who walk along Fitzroy Park to access and walk on the Heath , to enjoy the nature ponds , to swim , etc

Those who own , construct or extend properties in Fitzroy Park should understand and respect the significance of the area and maintain the balance between a building and its plot , between construction and nature. It seems to me that the Applicant has less regard for the area than his desire to construct to maximum capacity .

We submit that, were planning permission to be granted, the effect would be to seriously damage the openness of this part of the Highgate Conservation Area and permanently devalue the character of this unique area.

Yours faithfully,



Bernard and Liz Carnell



[REDACTED] Sunbury, Fitzroy Park, London N6 6HX [REDACTED]

Gideon Whittingham Esq
Development Control Planning Services
London Borough of Camden
Town Hall
Judd Street
London WC1H 8ND

23 February 2015

Dear Mr Whittingham

APPLICATION REFERENCE 2015/0441/P
53 FITZROY PARK, N6 6JA

I am writing to object against the planning application noted above. I live immediately opposite 53 Fitzroy Park and, together with 51 Fitzroy Park, Ashridge and 1 Fitzroy Close, am one of the most effected households.

The reasons for my objections are various and are set out below.

1 Scale of the proposed development

Camden must be aware that there were serious objections to the previous planning application which was approved by Camden. That approved scheme at 660 metres was massively larger than the existing building although the actual increase in size was masked by the developers exaggerating the size of the existing building (the previous applicants claimed an existing area of 428 metres while in this application it is a more realistic 325). The current proposal is for 845 metres – a nearly trebling from the existing building to some 10,000 square feet.

The proposals entail a much increased first floor both in height and width which will be clearly visible from the road and will be immediately in view of and imposing on my house and those of my neighbours. Instead of looking out on to green space, I would be looking at a massive new building – on Private Open Land which, I believe, is supposed to be protected from such development ("Fitzroy Open Space"). The height of the proposed structure is around 1 metre higher than the existing property and the already approved scheme – a massive increase when looked at from my home – and the plans envisage air conditioning units and heat exchange pumps on the roof which (to prevent noise) will require "additional solid screening within line of sight". The line of sight is directly in front of my bedroom windows. There is simply no way that the outlook "has been improved compared to the existing situation".

The scale of the proposed building is simply too large for the site and will be detrimental to the rural environment that is Fitzroy Park, immediately adjoining Hampstead Heath. The proposal is for a property on four and a bit floors (euphemistically described as "three storey including basement").

I dispute that any consultation with this resident has resulted in any significant revisions to the applicant's plans. The residents are not supportive of these plans.

The size of the proposed basement is also extremely large and deep whilst obviously not visible from the road. My comments on the basement proposals are noted later in this letter.

The proposed house is far too large for the location and the plot. Camden should not be misled by the unverified plot ratios quoted in the documents. In fact, they should all be invalidated so that they are not used in future. There is just no way that the scale of the proposed building is "in scale with its neighbours". It is interesting that there is no comparison of building mass to plot size.

2 Misleading photos

The application includes numerous photographs of (a) the existing position and (b) the proposed outlook and impact on Fitzroy Park. The majority of these are misrepresentative and misleading.

For instance, I gave the applicants access to take pictures from my ground and first floors but none of the pictures have been included as "before or after". Why? Because they would show the truly destructive impact on my home. They simply show a picture from outside my front door with no new building opposite. For the most part, what is now open space or roof would be a heightened building. Acceptance of such erroneous photos would be negligent.

The views from Ashridge and 1 Fitzroy Close suggest that there would be no visual impact. This is utterly absurd as well.

Only on page 27 of the Design & Access statement are there remotely honest pictures of the impact – but without the comparative now. A massive and intrusive structure which somehow is not reflected in the other pictures from the road.

The photos of the views from the road are similarly misleading. They suggest that there would be almost no impact when the truth is it would be massive. The impact on Fitzroy Park would be horrific. How can they expect a house three times the size to look less obtrusive? Why are there no photos showing the view from Fitzroy Park from the other direction, coming down the road when the new building will be prominent?

3 The impact of the basement on the road and neighbouring properties

You will be aware that Fitzroy Park is a private road and is maintained by the residents through the FPRA.

The road is on a gentle incline and there is a significant drop between the road and the garden of 53.

The proposed basements will entail excavation that will go down some 8.5 metres (27 feet) below the level of the road. This depth is quite extraordinary and is liable to

endanger the safety and stability of the road – even absent the serious water flows that go beneath the premises.

The previous applicants engineers identified high pressure water flows at above this depth but their findings have not been incorporated into the building model. Also, the proposals for the retaining wall appear to be inadequate.

There is a very significant risk that the road, its services and even houses such as mine may subside or collapse into the massive hole that the excavations require. This is simply not acceptable and I hold Camden, the developer and their advisers liable for any damage to my property.

4 The impact of the basement on the local hydrology

It is accepted by all that the Highgate ponds are fed from the water that comes down the hill from Fitzroy Park. One just has to walk across Millfield Lane to see this. In addition, it is believed that the pond in the garden of 55 Fitzroy Park is fed from the garden of 53 (although the applicant denies this).

I will leave it to FPRA to demonstrate the issues but would note that the Basement Impact Assessment relies on several old and discredited reports. The BIA states that the proposed development is not within 100 metres of a spring or well but that is not true since there is a spring in my garden which is closer than 100 metres away. Similarly, the BIA says that it would not result in the proportion of land hard surfaced or paved being increased. Just look at the drawings.

It is of note that construction of The Wallace House created severe pollution to the Ladies pond and the construction works at Fitzroy Farm – even before the basement had been built – caused problems with the local hydrology.

If the proposed basement is built, the local hydrology, the Highgate ponds and the pond in 55 will inevitably be damaged.

5 Overlooking

Although there have been some attempts to reduce the number of windows looking from the first floor directly into my bedrooms, there remain several windows which can see into my house.

In addition, the lift shaft will be visible from the outside of the house and will, I believe, have lights that will be visible from outside ("A perforated lift shaft"). This is wholly against the character of Fitzroy Park – and at the nearest point to the road.

6 The mass destruction of trees

At present, the environment in Fitzroy Park is dependent on the existence of many mature trees which border the road.

The applicant has already removed a large number of trees from the site and plans the removal of further trees.

The canopy provided by the trees will basically vanish and leave Fitzroy Park denuded along a significant frontage. The loss of so many trees is entirely unacceptable.

7 Construction Traffic Management Plan (CTMP)

The CTMP envisages the provision of some form of bond to cover damage caused during the works. However, the plan is wholly inadequate, poorly written and plain wrong and contradictory.

The existing road surface is new and will be destroyed by the heavy vehicles accessing the site.

The CTMP does not account for many vehicle movements nor the need to bring in heavy equipment. As a best estimate, it understates the number of vehicle movements by thousands. Their figures are not credible. For a development of this size, the suggested vehicle movements per day are totally unrealistic and the use of the existing drive for collecting demolition spoil – let alone turning – is simply not feasible. This is even evident from the swept path analysis. It will not even be feasible for a vehicle to discharge its load without at best partially blocking the road. The proposed loading platform will kill the adjacent tree.

You should also note that the swept path drawings in the Knight Build report – which will inevitably have been designed to show that vehicles can turn – actually show that large vehicles will have to either access my drive or hit my pillars or the gates that I intend installing. This cannot be acceptable. In fact, the current building is unbuildable without huge disruption to other residents and trespass on their land.

Also, the turning from Fitzroy Park into Merton Lane does not allow large vehicles to turn. During the recent developments at Fitzroy Farm, 51 Fitzroy Park and others, there has been considerable damage to the infrastructure – which will be even worse with the excavations from this proposal.

Knight Build, completely erroneously, say that “there are no parking restrictions” along Fitzroy Park. This shows a total lack of knowledge or research. There are signs throughout Fitzroy Park that explain that parking is not allowed. If they can get this so wrong, then one cannot trust the more detailed assessments they claim to have made. Only residents or their guests are allowed to park in the road and if they were to do so, large vehicles would not be able to pass.

For the other recent developments in Fitzroy Park, all vehicles entering or leaving the site have been controlled by someone on foot walking in front of the vehicle. This is fundamental but not always controlled or implemented.

I also question the realism of the proposal to retain so much spoil on site and the CMP fails to allow for the delivery of materials that would be required to achieve this.

8 Other matters

Please would you incorporate into this objection the contents of my letter of objections to you on the previous applications, dated 28 February 2010 and 23 May 2011.

The applicants note that they have consulted with residents but the reality is that most objections have been ignored or glossed over. We have been consulted but very little has been changed as a result of our objections; "a series of amendments have been made" but they are all minor. In the Nathaniel Litchfield document, it is implied that the CTMP has been approved by FPRA and residents by linking it to the approved scheme – but the CMP for that scheme faced massive opposition. In fact, the Nathaniel Litchfield document contradicts the CTMP by saying that there would be a wheel wash facility.

I would also note that the neighbours shown on your website do not include 1 Fitzroy Close or Ashridge or my own property, Sunbury. They should be, particularly as they, together with 51, are the properties most referred to in all the documentation.

Please would you notify me if this application is not to be put to the full committee for approval together with the date of any committee meetings to consider the proposals.

Yours sincerely

A black rectangular box redacting the signature of SD Barber.

SD Barber

Suzanne Barber

Sunbury, Fitzroy Park, London N6 6HX

Gideon Whittingham Esq
Development Control Planning Services
London Borough of Camden
Town Hall
Judd Street
London WC1H 8ND

3 March 2015

Dear Mr Whittingham

APPLICATION REFERENCE 2015/0441/P
53 FITZROY PARK, N6 6JA

I am writing to object to the above mentioned application on the grounds that:

- 1 It is massively too large for the plot and the area. The proposed new house is some three times the size of the existing one and numerous inaccurate and discredited statistics have been used to justify it.
- 2 It will severely damage the rural environment of Fitzroy Park.
- 3 The photographs used in the application are misleading.
- 4 The impact of the basement will most likely cause damage to other properties and the road.
- 5 The depth of the basement will damage the local hydrology.
- 6 The building will look straight into my house and the lift shaft will look absurd in this rural environment.
- 7 Yet more trees will be removed.
- 8 The Construction Traffic Management Plan (CTMP) is woeful, inaccurate and wrong. It misstates the amount of site traffic; it assumes that vehicles will be able to turn (which they won't) and any large vehicle will end up trespassing on my property.
- 9 The views of residents have been largely ignored on the basis that "the owner wants a 10,000 square foot house and we will deliver it".
- 10 The building is out of character with Fitzroy Park.

The application should be rejected.

Yours sincerely

Suzanne Barber