

SALLY HAY  
5 FITZROY CLOSE, HIGHGATE, LONDON N6 6JT



Mr Raymond Yeung  
Planning Officer  
London Borough of Camden  
5 Pancras Square  
London N1C 4AG

12th July 2016

Dear Mr Yeung

Re Planning Application 2016/2992/P

I am writing to object to the proposed development of the above site. I live in the house directly opposite the property and am, therefore, one of its closest neighbours.

The proposal envisages a substantial increase in the density of the development of the site in contrast with the building to land ratio of the other houses in the area. Almost all of the footfall of the property is already built upon and this proposal would mean that there was virtually no outside area remaining. This is not in keeping with the character of the surrounding environment and would constitute a substantial loss of amenity and would mean that the house was out of character with its environment.

The property has been under almost continual development since it was acquired by the applicants and the associated noise, dust and congestion caused has had a severe negative impact on those who live nearby. The property has been shrouded in a vast four storey scaffolding cover for many months, and many months in excess of what was originally promised. The scale of the scaffolding being hugely out of proportion to the works for which it was allegedly erected, although probably not out of proportion with the works covered by the current application. No attempts have been made to minimise the impact of the building works on those living in or around the property and severe and unnecessary inconvenience has therefore been caused. Initially we were told that the excessive size of the scaffolding was an error by the scaffolders but many months have passed and no attempt has been made to reduce the size of the structure.

---

Our house and garden would be overlooked by the development. The addition of balconies at the front of the property would remove the privacy that our house and garden enjoy completely.

The house as it currently stands is broadly similar in shape and size with the neighbouring properties, the proposal would leave it towering above the houses around it, making it stick out like a sore thumb. Looking at the four storey scaffolding currently in place amply demonstrates the anomaly the proposed size represents. I urge you to come and look at the current situation so that you can see the true scale of what is proposed and how it is wholly disproportionate to its proposed environment.

The applicants sought the cooperation of my husband and I with their last development of the property (the second development) on the basis that they needed another bedroom for their family size and we offered no objection despite our reservations generated by the shambolic management of their first development of the property. The current application (the third development by the applicants) must be in excess of their housing needs since those were said to be going to be satisfied by their last endeavour. This second development is still not completed and has been, like the first development, disruptive dirty noisy and well in excess of the proposed timescale. We have no confidence that the third development would be the last and are quite certain that it would be managed in similarly disruptive manner.

Were the application granted the amount of green space around the house would be drastically reduced which, again, is in contrast the generally green and leafy nature of this unique area of London.

The site has already received the delivery of several lorry loads of large steels, intended for the proposed works, each time there has been disruption of movement for other residents and visitors to the area and no sensible arrangements have been made to avoid such disruption. Tradesmen delivering to this address have been told they could not bring vehicles onto Fitzroy Close because No 2 were expecting the delivery of more huge steels and there would be no room to accommodate any other vehicles. If the development were permitted it is inevitable that this loss of amenity and inconvenience will be replicated for many months and potentially years to come. When this is viewed in the context of the disruption to traffic that will be generated by the development at 53 Fitzroy Park for which permission has now been granted it is quite clear that free movement in the area would inevitably be compromised were both developments to take place at the same time.

We are available to offer you an opportunity to view the site from this perspective if that would be of assistance and urge you to do so [prior to making any decision.

Yours Sincerely

Sally Hay