



The Society examines all Planning Applications relating to Hampstead, and assesses them for their impact on conservation and on the local environment.

**To London Borough of Camden, Development Control Team**

Planning Ref: 2010/2845/P

Address: Fairground Site, Vale of Health NW3

Description: Established Use

Case Officer: Charles Thuaire

Date: 20 July 2010

This is a most important site, in the context of its location on the fringe of Hampstead Heath, and its status as part of Metropolitan Open Land.

Having this in mind, and also its Planning history over the past 10-15 years, we must oppose this application for a Certificate of Lawfulness as a Residential Caravan Site.

We have seen, and strongly support, the objections made by the Vale of Health Society.

Our priorities in relation to the application are:

1. That, whatever decision is made, nothing must be done or implied that weakens the site's MOL designation; any erosion of this in the area of the Vale of Health would be disastrous.
2. That the site's current Sui Generis Use as a Showman's Site is an accurate definition of its actual use, notwithstanding the presence of some residential caravans. This presence seems to us to be a natural derivative, commonplace on similar sites elsewhere.
3. The unacceptable word in the wording of the application is "residential". We are unclear what long-term implications this might have in strict Planning terms, but we do not accept that caravan residency can be regarded as permanent. Any expansion of this wording into a situation where permanent bricks-and-mortar development resulted would be completely unacceptable. Specifically, conditions on the reconstruction of existing residential development in MOL must not be manipulated so as to accept caravan use as qualifying for permanent housing.
4. Acceptance of the existing site use must not be permitted to lead to an intensification of caravan density. The current number of caravans on site-the applicants' site plan suggests that there may be 20, although the Vale of Health Society disputes this, and in any case the number has fluctuated over the years. A maximum number consistent with maintaining standards of site layout (currently

haphazard), public health and hygiene, traffic congestion and vehicle parking, and the legitimate environmental interests of other Vale residents must be established and enforced. Our view is that a considerably lower number than 20 would be reasonable.

5. We agree with the Vale of Health Society's complaint on local consultation . This is such an important application that the widest consultations should have been sought.

Please refuse.