

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2016/3252/P	Charles Winston	6 The Hexagon Fitzroy Park Highgate N6 6HR	24/07/2016 14:30:40	INT	<p>Dear Kate Phillips,</p> <p>I am writing to you to object to the planning application referred to above relating to 4 The Hexagon (henceforth called No.4), the property adjoining my own. The reasons for my objections can be gathered into three categories:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The size of the development, particularly the precedent it would set should any other residents of The Hexagon seek to expand their houses to similar degrees. 2. The likely impact of this development on the access to my home at 6 The Hexagon. 3. The significant risk of damage to the infrastructure of The Hexagon during the building process. <p>INTRODUCTION</p> <p>I have lived at 6 The Hexagon for ten years. I hope that it is only human of me to regard the proposal of such a huge redevelopment so close to my home with trepidation. The wall of the new property is only 8 meters from my front door, and the building work will dominate the view of all windows at the front of my home for months. Equally, the builders will be able to see into my home for much of this same period, causing a major reduction in my privacy. The likely noise, mess and dirt is not something I look forward to either.</p> <p>All of that said, in principal I have no specific objection to the design or style of the proposed new house at No.4. The applicants and their architects have made considerable effort to discuss their plans with the existing residents of The Hexagon, and I note that the proposals for the extension of the first floor of the house have been amended a little to reflect concerns I expressed regarding the impact of this extension on the light reaching my home. My original concerns regarding the impact on my privacy from the completed building have also been addressed. Nevertheless, I am objecting to the planning application in its current form for the reasons discussed in this letter.</p> <p>I stress that my objections are to the planning application in its current form. In this letter I discuss amendments that I envisage could be made to the application, or, more likely, conditions I would like to see Camden impose as part of its ruling should approval be given. Should these amendments or conditions be included in your ruling I would regard the reasons for my objections to be removed.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The size of the development <p>It is my view that the current proposals for the development of No.4 would create a building too big for the environment of The Hexagon. The proposal is for a five bedroom house, not the three bedrooms mentioned in your application consultation letter. However my real concern relates to the precedent that would be set were Camden to grant permission to the application in its current form.</p> <p>With regard to my view that the current proposal would in effect lead to the overdevelopment of No.4, I refer to the letter sent to you by Bernard Carnell of 1 The Hexagon. It is not my intention to repeat all of the detail in Mr Carnell's letter with regard to the planning history of The Hexagon, but I believe that the references he makes to Camden Planning's own reasons for rejecting past attempts to increase the size of the houses in The Hexagon materially (summarised below) are pertinent.</p> <p>3 The Hexagon 2002 – (No PEX020111) (includes first floor extension) Refused by Camden and on Appeal. The Inspector's report includes “ Although some of the cohesiveness of the building group in The Hexagon has been lost as a result of the roof alterations and extensions that have</p>

Application No: Consultees Name: Consultees Addr: Received:

Comment: Response:

already taken place on the properties , in my view this cannot justify further harmful development at the appeal site”

4 The Hexagon

1988 – (No PL/8802237)(for roof extension and roof terrace)

Refused by Camden and on Appeal

“ There is a consistent pattern of design in this group of dwellings”

“ The addition would detrimentally affect the outlook from neighbouring houses”

“ The most important objection, however lies in the impact which the use of the proposed terrace would have on the enjoyment of those neighbouring properties. It would enable the users to benefit from immediate views of the gardens to the north west...”

“ it would be so unneighbourly that it would create a clear-cut objection of such demonstrable harm that planning permission should not be granted”

1989 – (for roof extension) Refused by Camden. Allowed on Appeal

6 The Hexagon

1982 – (B9/2/B34172)(includes first floor extension) Refused by Camden on the grounds that

“ the total floor space of the building following the extension would be excessive in relation to the site and the character of the area”

(as referred to in Camden’s Delegated Report of 27.11.2006)

I also agree with the point made by Mr Carnell that the increase in the plot/site size ratio from c22% to c37% at No.4 would set a worrying precedent for overdevelopment of The Hexagon, leading to excessive building ‘density’ in the area. I understand the planning decisions are not strictly precedent based, but if the proposed increase in plot/site ratio were permitted it would certainly weaken any attempts to block further overdevelopment of The Hexagon. For example, were an applicant to appeal a future planning decision to a court I can see that the precedent set by this development (should planning permission be granted) would become worryingly relevant.

Ideally I would prefer Camden to block the current application, suggesting to the applicants they reduce the proposed size of the redeveloped property to something more aligned with its surroundings. Were this not to be the case, (ie: planning permission is granted), it will require a very clear set of rulings from Camden as to why permission has been granted. These clear rulings would need to set out why this decision has been made, counter to all rulings on similar proposals relating to extending properties in The Hexagon in the past – what makes this case different? Given all the rulings against similar property extensions in The Hexagon in the past, a failure to set out clearly, and in public, why this case is different will leave the council open to legal challenge with regard to this decision. In the event the current application is successful, a set of rulings and guidelines with regard to the decision relating to No.4 would give residents of The Hexagon clarity as to whether similar such large developments are likely to be granted permission in the future.

Application No: **Consultees Name:** **Consultees Addr:** **Received:**

Comment: **Response:**

2. Impact on the access to my home

Covenants within the deeds to the houses in The Hexagon give clear and specific rights of access to those properties, such as my own, where vehicular access requires passing over land owned by other properties. The current proposals for No.4 give rise to two possible situations that would restrict, and possibly even prohibit entirely, vehicular access for me to reach my home:

1. The first relates to the building process itself. While the Construction Management Plan submitted with this application sets out clearly how the builders intend to enable continued vehicular access to No.'s 5 and 6 The Hexagon during the building process, this plan has no legal backing. In practice I have no way of ensuring that these assurances will be adhered to. In the event that planning permission is given, I would request that permission be made conditional on the enforcement of 24/7 access to the properties at 5 and 6 The Hexagon.

2. The second means by which access to my property will be potentially inhibited comes from the proposed parking of vehicles owned by No.4 The Hexagon once the project is finished. I have discussed this with both the architects of the project and with the applicants, and in theory we have agreed to the parking of two cars owned by No.4 in the communal area in front of No.4 in a fashion that should enable continued access to my home.

However, this agreement has no legal backing, while the fact that the proposed house has five bedrooms raises the risk of more than two cars being parked in the communal area, which would very likely prevent me from being able to drive in or out of my home. Vehicular access in and around the Hexagon is tight, and while most of us have garages and/or 'off street' parking out of the way of everyone else, the proposal for No.4 makes no provision for parking on the 'private' land owned by No.4 – it relies on using the communal area. At present this is not an issue, so long as only two cars are parked outside No.4, but this is principally because there are no cars parked outside 5 The Hexagon. Were 5 The Hexagon to be sold and the new owners insisted on parking two cars outside their home as well, there is no way I could get into and out of my home.

I am aware that Roger Pollard has written to you with very firm views on this topic. My views are less strident, but I do share his underlying concern that this project aims to create a very large, five bedroom house but with no provision for parking other than in a communal area that those of us in 5 and 6 The Hexagon need to use to turn vehicles around or to receive deliveries. In particular I believe you need to consider how parking in the Hexagon would develop were 5 The Hexagon to be sold to people who also wish to park two cars outside their home.

It is my view that the applicants need to rethink their plans of parking before permission is granted, probably accepting the need to park at least one car within the area considered 'private' to No.4. All other houses in The Hexagon have accepted this compromise.

3. Risk of damage to the fabric/infrastructure of The Hexagon.

Application No: **Consultees Name:** **Consultees Addr:** **Received:** **Comment:** **Response:**

I am aware of, and have read, the assorted hydrological, arboreal and other reports commissioned by the applicants and also by Fitzroy Park Residents Association.

My concerns with regards to this topic relate to the very likely substantial damage to the fabric of the Hexagon that will be caused by the construction works and the large number of heavy vehicle movements required by a project of this size. Such damage would involve likely break-up of the road surface of the driveway of The Hexagon and also the surface of the communal area between No's 3-6. Other damage to walls and the assorted trees and bushes that line the Hexagon driveway cannot be ruled out.

I accept that such damage is almost unavoidable, but it is thus critical that one of the conditions of any planning permission (were it given for this project or another, later resubmission) should be that permission is only given if the applicants agree to make good any and all damage to The Hexagon and its fabric as a result of their works. This 'make-good' provision should have both a time limit on it (for example, within six months of the project being completed) and it should also be subject to approval by the other residents of The Hexagon (to ensure that no short cuts are taken).

That ends the list of issues I have with this project. As I said at the start of this letter, I have no major objections to this project in principal – despite the inevitable disruption it will cause to my home life for many months. I do not object to the idea of a full demolition and reconstruction and I support the overall design of the house that is being proposed. The applicants and their architects have definitely made efforts to discuss their plans with the existing residents of The Hexagon.

However:

- The proposed new house is too big for this area and I fear it will set a dangerous precedent for other projects in The Hexagon.
- The lack of any parking provision within the private limits of No.4 (ie: that does not use the communal area within The Hexagon) might not be an issue now, but it will become so should No.5 be sold or even if No.4 is sold and a larger family using all five bedrooms moves in.
- I think any planning permission (even of a future resubmission) should be conditional both on (i) a clause that ensures 24/7 access to No.5 and 6 The Hexagon during and after the building works, and (ii) a make-good clause covering the entire fabric and infrastructure of The Hexagon. This make-good clause should include a time limit and should require approval of all Hexagon residents.

I realise that as I am finishing this letter it reads as though I am trying to tell you how to do your job ! I recognise I am an amateur, and I trust that the professionals in your team and on the Council will weigh all the facts carefully. However, such a large construction project so close to my home inevitably causes uncertainty, disruption and thus a lot of emotion. I hope you will forgive me if my emotions have at times been too evident in this letter.

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2016/3252/P	Charles Winston	6 The Hexagon Fitzroy Park Highgate N6 6HR	24/07/2016 16:55:55	AMEND	<p>I have found cause to amend very slightly my submission of earlier today. Please disregard my first comment on this proposal - the comment below is my full and final submission.</p> <p>I have lived at 6 The Hexagon for ten years. I hope that it is only human of me to regard the proposal of such a huge redevelopment so close to my home with trepidation. The wall of the new property is only 8 meters from my front door, and the building work will dominate the view of all windows at the front of my home for months. Equally, the builders will be able to see into my home for much of this same period, causing a major reduction in my privacy. The likely noise, mess and dirt is not something I look forward to either.</p> <p>All of that said, in principal I have no specific objection to the design or style of the proposed new house at No.4. The applicants and their architects have made considerable effort to discuss their plans with the existing residents of The Hexagon, and I note that the proposals for the extension of the first floor of the house have been amended a little to reflect concerns I expressed regarding the impact of this extension on the light reaching my home. My original concerns regarding the impact on my privacy from the completed building have also been addressed. Nevertheless, I am objecting to the planning application in its current form for the reasons discussed in this letter.</p> <p>I stress that my objections are to the planning application in its current form. In this letter I discuss amendments that I envisage could be made to the application, or, more likely, conditions I would like to see Camden impose as part of its ruling should approval be given. Should these amendments or conditions be included in your ruling I would regard the reasons for my objections to be removed.</p> <p>1. The size of the development</p> <p>It is my view that the current proposals for the development of No.4 would create a building too big for the environment of The Hexagon. The proposal is for a five bedroom house, not the three bedrooms mentioned in your application consultation letter. However my real concern relates to the precedent that would be set were Camden to grant permission to the application in its current form.</p> <p>With regard to my view that the current proposal would in effect lead to the overdevelopment of No.4, I am aware of the general nature of the letter that Bernard Carnell of 1 The Hexagon will be sending to you. It is not my intention to repeat all of the detail in Mr Carnell's letter with regard to the planning history of The Hexagon, but I believe that the references he makes to Camden Planning's own reasons for rejecting past attempts to increase the size of the houses in The Hexagon materially (summarised below) are pertinent.</p> <p>3 The Hexagon 2002 – (No PEX020111) (includes first floor extension) Refused by Camden and on Appeal. The Inspector's report includes “ Although some of the cohesiveness of the building group in The Hexagon has been lost as a result of the roof alterations and extensions that have already taken place on the properties , in my view this cannot justify further harmful development at the appeal site”</p> <p>4 The Hexagon 1988 – (No PL/8802237)(for roof extension and roof terrace)</p>

Application No: Consultees Name: Consultees Addr: Received:

Comment: Response:

Refused by Camden and on Appeal

“ There is a consistent pattern of design in this group of dwellings”

“ The addition would detrimentally affect the outlook from neighbouring houses”

“ The most important objection, however lies in the impact which the use of the proposed terrace would have on the enjoyment of those neighbouring properties. It would enable the users to benefit from immediate views of the gardens to the north west...”

“ it would be so unneighbourly that it would create a clear-cut objection of such demonstrable harm that planning permission should not be granted”

1989 – (for roof extension) Refused by Camden. Allowed on Appeal

6 The Hexagon

1982 – (B9/2/B34172)(includes first floor extension) Refused by Camden on the grounds that

“ the total floor space of the building following the extension would be excessive in relation to the site and the character of the area”

(as referred to in Camden’s Delegated Report of 27.11.2006)

I also agree with the point made by Mr Carnell that the increase in the plot/site size ratio from c22% to c37% at No.4 would set a worrying precedent for overdevelopment of The Hexagon, leading to excessive building ‘density’ in the area. I understand the planning decisions are not strictly precedent based, but if the proposed increase in plot/site ratio were permitted it would certainly weaken any attempts to block further overdevelopment of The Hexagon. For example, were an applicant to appeal a future planning decision to a court I can see that the precedent set by this development (should planning permission be granted) would become worryingly relevant.

Ideally I would prefer Camden to block the current application, suggesting to the applicants they reduce the proposed size of the redeveloped property to something more aligned with its surroundings. Were this not to be the case, (ie: planning permission is granted), it will require a very clear set of rulings from Camden as to why permission has been granted. These clear rulings would need to set out why this decision has been made, counter to all rulings on similar proposals relating to extending properties in The Hexagon in the past – what makes this case different? Given all the rulings against similar property extensions in The Hexagon in the past, a failure to set out clearly, and in public, why this case is different will leave the council open to legal challenge with regard to this decision. In the event the current application is successful, a set of rulings and guidelines with regard to the decision relating to No.4 would give residents of The Hexagon clarity as to whether similar such large developments are likely to be granted permission in the future.

2. Impact on the access to my home

Covenants within the deeds to the houses in The Hexagon give clear and specific rights of access to those properties, such as my own, where vehicular access requires passing over land owned by other properties. The current proposals for No.4 give rise to two possible situations that would restrict, and

Application No: **Consultees Name:** **Consultees Addr:** **Received:**

Comment: **Response:**

possibly even prohibit entirely, vehicular access for me to reach my home:

1. The first relates to the building process itself. While the Construction Management Plan submitted with this application sets out clearly how the builders intend to enable continued vehicular access to No.'s 5 and 6 The Hexagon during the building process, this plan has no legal backing. In practice I have no way of ensuring that these assurances will be adhered to. In the event that planning permission is given, I would request that permission be made conditional on the enforcement of 24/7 access to the properties at 5 and 6 The Hexagon.

2. The second means by which access to my property will be potentially inhibited comes from the proposed parking of vehicles owned by No.4 The Hexagon once the project is finished. I have discussed this with both the architects of the project and with the applicants, and in theory we have agreed to the parking of two cars owned by No.4 in the communal area in front of No.4 in a fashion that should enable continued access to my home.

However, this agreement has no legal backing, while the fact that the proposed house has five bedrooms raises the risk of more than two cars being parked in the communal area, which would very likely prevent me from being able to drive in or out of my home. Vehicular access in and around the Hexagon is tight, and while most of us have garages and/or 'off street' parking out of the way of everyone else, the proposal for No.4 makes no provision for parking on the 'private' land owned by No.4 – it relies on using the communal area. At present this is not an issue, so long as only two cars are parked outside No.4, but this is principally because there are no cars parked outside 5 The Hexagon. Were 5 The Hexagon to be sold and the new owners insisted on parking two cars outside their home as well, there is no way I could get into and out of my home.

I am aware that Roger Pollard has written to you with very firm views on this topic. My views are less strident, but I do share his underlying concern that this project aims to create a very large, five bedroom house but with no provision for parking other than in a communal area that those of us in 5 and 6 The Hexagon need to use to turn vehicles around or to receive deliveries. In particular I believe you need to consider how parking in the Hexagon would develop were 5 The Hexagon to be sold to people who also wish to park two cars outside their home.

It is my view that the applicants need to rethink their plans of parking before permission is granted, probably accepting the need to park at least one car within the area considered 'private' to No.4. All other houses in The Hexagon have accepted this compromise.

3. Risk of damage to the fabric/infrastructure of The Hexagon.

I am aware of, and have read, the assorted hydrological, arboreal and other reports commissioned by the applicants and also by Fitzroy Park Residents Association.

My concerns with regards to this topic relate to the very likely substantial damage to the fabric of the Hexagon that will be caused by the construction works and the large number of heavy vehicle

Application No: **Consultees Name:** **Consultees Addr:** **Received:****Comment:** **Response:**

movements required by a project of this size. Such damage would involve likely break-up of the road surface of the driveway of The Hexagon and also the surface of the communal area between No's 3-6. Other damage to walls and the assorted trees and bushes that line the Hexagon driveway cannot be ruled out.

I accept that such damage is almost unavoidable, but it is thus critical that one of the conditions of any planning permission (were it given for this project or another, later resubmission) should be that permission is only given if the applicants agree to make good any and all damage to The Hexagon and its fabric as a result of their works. This 'make-good' provision should have both a time limit on it (for example, within six months of the project being completed) and it should also be subject to approval by the other residents of The Hexagon (to ensure that no short cuts are taken).

That ends the list of issues I have with this project. As I said at the start of this letter, I have no major objections to this project in principal – despite the inevitable disruption it will cause to my home life for many months. I do not object to the idea of a full demolition and reconstruction and I support the overall design of the house that is being proposed. The applicants and their architects have definitely made efforts to discuss their plans with the existing residents of The Hexagon.

However:

- The proposed new house is too big for this area and I fear it will set a dangerous precedent for other projects in The Hexagon.
 - The lack of any parking provision within the private limits of No.4 (ie: that does not use the communal area within The Hexagon) might not be an issue now, but it will become so should No.5 be sold or even if No.4 is sold and a larger family using all five bedrooms moves in.
 - I think any planning permission (even of a future resubmission) should be conditional both on (i) a clause that ensures 24/7 access to No.5 and 6 The Hexagon during and after the building works, and (ii) a make-good clause covering the entire fabric and infrastructure of The Hexagon. This make-good clause should include a time limit and should require approval of all Hexagon residents.
-