

[REDACTED]

From: Pat Gibson [REDACTED]
Sent: 20 May 2016 18:26
To: Planning
Subject: planning application ref.2016/1482/P

Dear Charles Thuairé, I live at no 3 Highgate Road, a Grade II Georgian house, which overlooks the piano factory. I strongly object to this application on several counts, not the least of which is that this proposed development is far too dense for such a relatively small parcel of land.

Their plan includes a residential block, two storeys high and directly opposite my kitchen, landing and studio/second bedroom windows and only 10.8 metres from my home. Legally, I understand, it should be at least 18 metres away. As it is now proposed, it will seriously affect the amount of light I receive and I shall be right opposite the new residents' windows.

The developers say that they will put translucent glass in these windows, but that can have two functions: either it is milky so I shall be just a shape 10.8 metres away or occupants can see out but I can't see in. Whichever it is, there should not be any windows facing my property at such close proximity. This is an infringement of my privacy.

On the subject of light, I note that the architect has drawn in a shadow from the west, but not from the south on his plans. This is not acceptable. Given that the proposed block behind the Bull and Gate pub is even taller than the one opposite me, this will also affect the amount of light at the back of this terrace in the morning and early afternoon as the earth turns. I shall be living in a gloom through all the seasons whereas currently my home is well lit by natural light at the back. I don't want to have to turn on the (expensive) electric light during the day.

Because this terrace is Georgian and even a passing train can make it tremble at times, I am extremely worried about the digging of foundations for this development. I would therefore urge Camden, if they do approve it, that they make, as part of the permission, a proviso that an independent surveyor must be engaged to report on our homes and at the developers' expense so that we have recourse if any of their building work should damage our homes.

I must also point out that the charming Victorian wall at end of the gardens of this house and number 1 Highgate Road is almost certainly within the curtilage of these properties and is therefore to be considered "listed" as part of the ensemble. I have taken expert advice on this point from English Heritage and Camden's Heritage and Conservation Dept. This means that it must, at all costs, be preserved and not damaged in any way by construction work.

The cobbles in the alleyway between no 1 and The Bull and Gate are also part of their ensemble, as both properties are listed and could not be, in my opinion, covered in tarmac, as proposed. This alleyway is also far too narrow to accommodate lorries and/or a crane. These would cause immense traffic problems on this very busy main road, not only for buses and cars, but also for ambulances and fire brigade tenders.

Lastly, I cite my serious worries about noise from both construction and builders, which will undoubtedly last for some months. I don't have secondary glazing at the back of my property, nor can I afford - as a widowed OAP on a fixed budget - to have it installed. As this huge development is currently proposed, my life will be unbearable.

I realise that the piano factory site cannot be left as it is, but I feel that this development is far too grandiose and that it would be better turned into low-rise and fewer flats and more small workshops for independent artisans than a cramped upmarket housing estate.

Because I am also very concerned by IDM Land Ltd's total disregard of complaints and worries of local residents and their involvement with KR Planning, I fear the situation may get out of hand, given what happened to the Carlton Tavern project.

The application by the previous owners in 2014 was refused as it would result in "an unreasonable sense of enclosure, loss of light, loss of privacy and increased noise nuisance" which would be "detrimental to the amenities of adjoining occupiers". I submit that this is just as true of this current proposal and strongly urge the Planning Committee to refuse the application.

Yours faithfully, Patricia Gibson