

Dear Rob

I am writing with respect to planning application 2015/1381/P (the **Proposed Development**).

By way of background, I own the second floor unit at 62 Haverstock Hill and am a director of the Right to Manage company for 62 Haverstock Hill. As you may be aware (through Joyce Amoateng) there has been a long standing dialogue with the Council (and latterly with the owner of 201 Prince of Wales Road (the **Applicant**)) with respect to the dangerous and dilapidated state of 201 Prince of Wales Road (the **Property**). The Property has been derelict for many years and was inhabited on and off by squatters for extended periods (despite numerous evictions). As you can imagine, the squatters were a considerable nuisance and caused significant damage to the Property and my immediately adjoining property.

On the basis of the foregoing, I welcome that meaningful steps finally appear to being taken to demolish the Property and build something afresh. However, as an immediate neighbour of the Proposed Development I have a number of concern that I set out below in summary form.

On the basis of the matters set out in this email **I object to the Proposed Development**.

1. Loss of light

From the plans it appears that the Proposed Development will be built right up to a series of 4 windows bringing natural daylight and sunlight into my kitchen and living room as well as providing views directly up Haverstock Hill. As we previously discussed, the conclusion of the Daylight & Sunlight Report is materially incorrect as it states at para 7.0 (Surrounding Properties, 62 Haverstock Hill) *"Of the 4 windows that experience alterations beyond the BRE Guidelines and experience reductions between 32-53% VSC. These windows are all located in the rear of the property."* My objection to this conclusion is founded on the following:

- No data is provided in the GIA report with respect to my windows which are materially impacted by the Proposed Development. On the plans these windows are classified as "102/W4" (see drawing number 5865-13 in Appendix 2) but no dataset is included within the body of the report or Appendix 3.
- The windows impacted by the Proposed Development are not *"at the rear of the property"*. These windows are the only windows located with views up Haverstock Hill and are the only windows in my property which take advantage (and enjoy the pleasing aspect) of our corner position (Prince of Wales/Haverstock Hill).

I am obviously deeply concerned that the Council will be relying on materially inaccurate and incomplete data in considering the Proposed Development.

2. Lack of clarity in plans

In addition to the foregoing, the current plans do not appear to take into account that I need, and have always benefitted from access to the windows for external cleaning and gutter access. As presented, it appears that the Proposed Development will be built directly up to my windows with the worrying result of effectively "bricking up" my windows. The loss of access, amenity, and potential loss of value as a result of this is material and self-evident and requires the Council's attention. It is noteworthy that this concern was raised on numerous occasions directly with the Application in relation to previous applications and it is disappointing that this basic issue has not been addressed in the Proposed Development.

3. Large external balcony

A major issue we had with the squatters was loss of privacy as they frequently held large parties on the roof which allowed them direct line of sight from very close proximity into my kitchen and living room. That is clearly undesirable and from the plans submitted it appears that this issue has not been resolved by the Proposed Development. Again, this raises concerns as to material loss of amenity

and concurrent loss of value to my property.

4. Impact of Proposed Development

From the architects drawings provided it is not clear how the building will actually look once built. Accordingly, its amenity and interaction with the neighbouring properties cannot be effectively determined as is required by Council policy. In particular, I would like to understand what materials, colour scheme, render etc. will be applied to ensure it blends in to the locale.

5. Structural Issues

As we discussed, the managing agents of Haverstock Hill (RedBrick Management Limited) advised the Council and the Applicant that the perilous state of the Property had caused major structural damage to 62 Haverstock Hill, as it was effectively pulling the two properties apart leading to visible gapping between the two buildings. Please refer to the attached pictures. It is a matter of urgent necessity that, regardless of the Council's decision on the Proposed Development, this is remediated at the Applicant's cost.

It is material to note that the Site Investigation and Basement Impact Assessment Report presented by the Applicant in support of the Proposed Development makes no reference to this major issue, despite the Applicant being expressly aware of this. This is a significant and potentially misleading omission which the Council must consider in its decision making process and the requisite independent review of the Site Investigation and Basement Impact Assessment Report.

6. Loss of Value

Local estate agents have advised that the Proposed Development may lead to a loss in value to my property. In particular as it is currently tenanted there will likely be a material loss of value for the duration of the construction works (of unspecified duration) and an ongoing loss of rental and capital value due to the material loss of amenity described above.

Objection to the Proposed Development

On the basis of the foregoing, I strongly encourage the Council to reject the Proposed Development. The fact that the Applicant has finally taken some meaningful steps to remediate the unacceptable state of his Property (only following initiation of the compulsory acquisition process by the Council) is not of itself a justification for approval. As stated above, there are material outstanding issues each of which the Applicant is expressly aware of or ought reasonably to have been aware of which necessitate a more sophisticated approach to development of this high impact site. I believe such a solution is achievable with proper consultation by the Applicant with all stakeholders.

Yours sincerely

Iain Hardie

cc:

Mr & Dr Gibson (owners of top floor, 62 Haverstock Hill)

Lucie Williams (Hons MIRPM AssocRICS - Director of Property Management, RedBrick Management Limited)

Joyce Amoateng (Empty Property Manager, Camden Council)

1 Bligh Street, Sydney, NSW 2000

This e-mail may be confidential and/or privileged. Only the intended recipient may access or use it. If you are not the intended recipient, please notify us promptly and delete this e-mail and its attachments from your system. The views expressed by the sender are not necessarily those of Oil Search Limited unless otherwise specifically stated. We use virus scanning software but exclude all liability for viruses or similar in any attachment.

Think of our environment before you print this e-mail



