

Dike, Darlene

From: Bernard Carnell [REDACTED]
Sent: 08 September 2016 17:02
To: Phillips, Kate; Planning
Subject: 4 The Hexagon, N6 6HR - 2016/3252/P

Dear Kate Phillips

I have seen the documents recently provided by Camden in response to the FOI application made by FPRA, including the letter dated 21 October 2015 from SOUP Architects and the Pre-Application Advice email dated 21 December 2015.

I refer to my letter (objecting to the application) dated 28th July 2016 and which, in part, referred to issues of general concern on behalf of the owners of 2,3,5 and 6 The Hexagon in addition to those of specific concern for 1 The Hexagon. In that letter I also referred (at page 5) to the possibility of commenting on the pre-planning consultation notes once available.

What follows is therefore once again written on behalf of my neighbours as well as for myself.

I do not intend repeating what I submitted in my letter of 28th July . There are however 2 specific issues concerning which more information has become known since that letter. These are :

- The legal position in relation to parking outside 4 The Hexagon and the use , by heavy construction vehicles, of The Hexagon access lane over land belonging to Nos 2 and 3 The Hexagon
- The architectural significance of 4 The Hexagon , and in relation to all 6 houses forming The Hexagon

Parking

The Hexagon access lane

SOUP's letter of 21.10.2015 specifically proposes "*Off-street parking*" and the pre-app advice at page 6 states "*the proposal seeks to retain 2 parking spaces*"

Etta Pollard's letter of 8 August 2016 refers you to the identical restrictive covenants and obligations within the registered titles of 2,3,4,5 and 6 The Hexagon and that the owner of 4 The Hexagon has no legal right to park any car – let alone 2 cars – where the applicants propose. She also provided a copy of the 1959 planning consent containing the condition relating to garaging and the stated reason by the LCC for that condition : not simply in relation to 4 The Hexagon but in relation to, and for the benefit of, all the houses.

Letters to you from 2 and 3 The Hexagon refer you to the view that their prior consent would be needed for construction vehicles of the size required to pass along the long stretch of The Hexagon that they own.

I/we therefore ask and recommend that

- Camden takes legal advice or in any event consider the implications and potential legal liability arising were it to propose giving consent purporting not only to allow the applicants to do what they have no legal right to do but also to reduce or remove rights belonging to the owners of neighbouring properties.

and

- were Camden to consider granting permission then Conditions be imposed - and included within any section 106 agreement - both in relation to parking and to use of The Hexagon access lane that the applicants will need to demonstrate that they are entitled to the legal rights to do what they propose and that such Conditions would need to be discharged before any work (demolition or otherwise) commences.

Significance of 4 The Hexagon

(as part of the 6 houses forming The Hexagon)

Page 3 of the pre-app advice states , in relation to 4 The Hexagon , that "*it is not considered to make a positive contribution to the character or appearance of the conservation area*".

Since my letter of 28th July you have received and have the benefit of professional advice from the respected and entirely independent The 20th Century Society. I/we submit that their contribution is therefore extremely significant (separate from but in addition to the representations lodged by The Highgate Society and by Dr Blackshaw)

Yours sincerely

Bernard Carnell
1 The Hexagon
Fitzroy Park
Highgate London N6 6HR