

London 198 Blackstock Road,
London.
N5 1EN

Tel +44(0)20 7354 1729
Fax +44(0)20 7354 1730
studio@souparchitects.com

www.souparchitects.com

Guernsey The Loft, Upper Mansell Street,
St. Peter Port, Guernsey. C.I.
GY1 1LY

Tel +44(0)7781 147 667
studio@souparchitects.com

SOUP

161018_292_3.1.5

Planning Team
London Borough of Camden
2nd Floor, 5 Pancras Square
c/o Town Hall, Judd Street
London
WC1H 9JE

18th October 2016

Dear Kate Phillips,

PROPOSAL: Redevelopment of existing residential property

LOCATION: No.4 The Hexagon, Fitzroy Park, London, N6 6HR,

REF: 2016/3252/P – 4 The Hexagon

Further to our recent meeting and the information received from subsequent consultants, neighbouring owners and Camden Planning Department, please find attached and outlined below our responses to many of these matters. Rather than outlining our responses individually to the planning department, consultants and neighbouring owners we have separated it into general individual headings and topics.

1. Contextual data.

- a. Further to the concerns regarding the overall building / plot size, please find attached SOUP drawing no. 292_114_PL00 indicating the Building / Plot ratios for all six properties on The Hexagon. This indicates ratios varying from 20.5% to 41.5%. We have also omitted the area of the access driveway from each subsequent property / plot.
- b. As outlined by neighbouring owners and the Highgate Society we have included the Building / Plot ratio for the proposed development at no.4 including the lower ground floor footprint. This does not include the courtyard spaces as these are external.
- c. Attached drawing no.292_114_PL00 includes approximate outlines of the original 1960's development in order to establish the general overall property density increase for The Hexagon over the last 56 years.
- d. Please find attached SOUP drawing no.292_112_PL01 indicating the existing boundaries and ownerships. This is also covered in the later section 'Access Rights, ownership and Parking arrangements' covering the rights of access and areas of use of The Hexagon occupants.
- e. We would like to note that the challenged statement in SOUP Design and Access Statement of '*The existing house is not noted as a positive building*'. This statement is taken from Camden's 'Highgate Conservation Area Appraisal & Management Strategy – Adopted 4th October 2007'.
- f. The justification of the overall hard landscaping has also been questioned. We believe our proposals are no greater than the current areas of hard landscaping to surrounding buildings and we have undertaken extensive design exercises to alleviate any possible complications.

2. Privacy and Screening.

- a. As indicated on SOUP drawing no. 292_110_PL02 and 292_111_PL02 our clients would be satisfied if the outlined proposed mature planted screening to the West boundary with no.3 was conditioned to provide adequate privacy to no's 1,2 and 3. We would also accept a condition for any planted privacy screening to the North section of this boundary with no.3.
- b. The objection raised by the owners of no.3 in relation to the removal of the Black Mulberry Tree [T5] is correct and this tree does originate in their garden. At present T5 overhangs the boundary by approximately 5 metres and is currently supported by large steel braces in the garden of no.3. We would suggest this tree be pruned back to an overhang of approximately 2metres to allow the natural screening to remain, all to the approval and recommendation of the appointed Arboricultural consultants.
- c. Our Proposals to the South boundary and neighbouring no.10 Fitzroy Park do not look to create a sense of overlooking into the private open space gardens more than what is currently established. We have attempted to alleviate any further overlooking from the evening terrace by creating a 300 to 500mm gap between the two walls and forming a 600mm deep planted high level border. This creates a distance of 1.0 to 1.3metres overall from the face of the wall to no.10 and the face of the wall of the evening terrace. This planted section will also have a solid height of 1.2metres plus the height of the proposed plants. Thin and tall planting to the adjacent courtyard and lower ground floor dining area together with the mature trees of T8, T9 and T10 also add a greater sense of privacy.
- d. We do not feel the proposals create any greater a sense of overlooking to this private garden space than what is currently established by no.6 The Hexagon or the new developments off Merton Lane that look down into these private gardens and the house itself.

3. Arboricultural reports.

- a. Further to concerns regarding the protection and indeterminate damage to the 10no. trees on the site of Highfields Grove and adjacent to The Hexagon access driveway please find attached the email correspondence we have received from Crown Consultants regarding this matter, ref: 160823_Crown Consultants email on Hexagon driveway trees.
- b. It has been requested we respond to the ten observations and the five significant unknowns outlined in the 'Arboricultural Impact Assessment' obtained from Landscape Planning Ltd on behalf of Fitzroy Park Residents Association.
 - i. Observation 1: Extensive design measures have been undertaken to alleviate any possible damage to the Yew T1. This includes redesigns of hard landscaped areas and foundation details. All information can be found in the Arboricultural Report and Impact Assessment prepared by Crown Consultants dated 8th June 2016 and the attached Structural and Civil Engineering Planning Report prepared by ElliottWood dated October 2016.
 - ii. Observation 2,3,4&6: We believe all four of these observations are in relation to the same matter, that being compliant with BS requirements for Arboricultural surveys. We have addressed this matter with Crown Consultants and have their firm confirmation that all survey works undertaken by them and under our instruction comply fully with BS 5837 2012 and section 4 of the BS 'Feasibility; Surveys + Preliminary constraints'.
 - iii. Observation 5: Please find attached Crown Consultants email regarding this matter, ref: 160823_Crown Consultants email on Hexagon driveway trees and Motion information ref: Technical Note 1; Response to consultation comments.
 - iv. Observation 7: Please find attached revised SOUP drawing no.292_101_PL02 and 292_111_PL02 and the Structural and Civil Engineering Planning Report prepared by ElliottWood dated October 2016 now indicating all drainage runs within the gardens.
 - v. Observation 8: Please find attached revised Motion Drawing no. 160128-TK05 revA indicating the new location of the material storage area.
 - vi. Observation 9: We do not believe this to be the case as we are not looking to alter the existing boundary condition and the extent of the existing basement and stepped down entrance area against the proposals is minimal. If re-confirmation on this matter is required we can obtain this from Crown Consultants.
 - vii. Observation 10: Please find attached the Structural and Civil Engineering Planning Report prepared by ElliottWood dated October 2016 that now addresses this matter.

- c. We believe the above and attached information now addresses the five conclusions 'significant unknowns' also highlighted in the 'Arboricultural Impact Assessment' obtained from Landscape Planning Ltd.

4. Privacy during construction works.

- a. As indicated within Motion Ltd's Construction Management Plan dated 26th May 2016 we have included for a hoarding to be installed around the perimeter of the site. We are more than happy to enter into discussions with the neighbouring properties to discuss heights and finishes of this prior to any works commencing. Mature planting is also proposed along the West boundary and this is to be installed prior to works commencing.

5. Listed Structures within the vicinity of the works.

- a. Please find attached the Structural and Civil Engineering Planning Report prepared by ElliottWood dated October 2016 that now addresses this matter and SOUP drawing no. 292_101_PL02 and 111_PL02 including these revisions.

6. Basement impact assessment.

- a. Further to the comments and concerns raised within the following independent reports:
 - i. Campbell Reith, Basement Impact Assessment Audit [Rev D1] dated August 2016, prepared on behalf of Camden Planning department.
 - ii. Alan Baxter Integrated Design, ref 1675/115/JGa/mw dated July 2016 and further letter dated 17th August 2016, prepared on behalf of Fitzroy Park Residents Association.
- b. Please find attached the following information that we believe now addresses many of the matters raised:
 - i. Structural and Civil Engineering Planning Report prepared by ElliottWood, dated October 2016.
 - ii. SOUP Architects revised drawing no's 292_101_PL02 and 111_PL02 indicating the revised wall conditions following the integration of the above information.
- c. We have received LBH Wembley's comments dated September 2016 on the Campbell Reith Hill LLP Basement Impact Assessment Audit [Rev D1]. We have been informed that we should not include this within this documentation as LBH Wembley and CRH are currently in discussions to resolve a number of the issues noted and once an agreement on the report has been reached this will then be formally issued to all parties concerned.

7. Damage to infrastructure.

- a. Concerns have been raised in relation to the proximity of the proposed piling works to the structure of No.3 and No.5 The Hexagon. This section of the works has been developed with the safeguarding of these buildings in mind and ground movement assessments have been carried out on both properties. Please refer to section no.8 of the attached Structural and Civil Engineering Planning Report prepared by ElliottWood, dated October 2016.
- b. Concerns were also raised in relation to the proximity of the works to No.6 The Hexagon. Please find attached email correspondence from LBH Wembley, dated 13th July 2016 and section no.8 of ElliottWoods report, dated October 2016 that we believe alleviates any concerns regarding this matter.
- c. The points raised regarding the proposed retaining structure and the impact of this on the groundwater at the corner of No.5 and along the boundary of No.6 has now been addressed within the attached reports by ElliottWood and LBH Wembley and reflected in the revised SOUP drawing no. 292_101_PL02 indicating the revised wall construction to this boundary area.
- d. Concerns raised regarding the possible damage and proximity of the works to the listed garden boundary wall have been covered within item no.5 above.

8. Ground / surface water strategy.

- a. Please find attached:
 - i. SOUP Architects revised drawing no's 292_101_PL02 and 111_PL02
 - ii. Structural and Civil Engineering Planning Report prepared by ElliottWood, dated October 2016 [specifically sections 5.0 and 11.0]
 - iii. As outlined in section 6c we have also received LBH Wembley's comments dated September 2016 on the Campbell Reith Hill LLP Basement Impact Assessment Audit [Rev D1]. Once this has been agreed upon this information will be issued.

- b. We believe the above attached information from ElliottWood and SOUP architects now alleviates the following concerns and comments on the ground and surface water drainage strategy:
 - i. Risk of ground water movement to the site and neighbouring properties.
 - ii. Effectiveness of the proposed land drains.
 - iii. Expanded garden and surface water drainage scheme that creates a more dispersed solution.
 - iv. Subterranean construction methodology.
 - v. Proposed below ground drainage.

- c. The information currently prepared by LBH Wembley within their response to Campbell Reith Hill LLP's Basement Impact Assessment Audit [Rev D1] also covers sections 8bi, ii, ii, iv and v outlined above as well as the following:
 - i. Ground water monitoring proposals.
 - ii. Ground permeability testing and risk of ground water appearing in gardens.
 - iii. Hydrogeological screening.
 - iv. Stiffness parameters for retaining wall designs.
 - v. Impact of increased hard standing area and discharge to groundwater.
 - vi. Bypass drainage systems.
 - vii. Hydrology issues.
 - viii. A site in an area at risk from surface water flooding.
 - ix. Stability issues.

9. General drainage strategy.

- a. It was outlined that there was no obvious integration on one master plan of the location of drainage within the curtilage of No.4. Please find attached SOUP drawing no.292_101_PL02 and the report by ElliottWood dated October 2016 that now respond to this comment. This now includes foul, rain water, ground and surface water drainage strategies.

10. Construction management Plan.

- a. Please find attached:
 - i. Motion 'Technical Note 1: Response to consultation comments' dated 21st September 2016.

- b. We believe the above answers the following comments and concerns raised by Camden Planning Department, independent consultants and neighbouring owners and associations.
 - i. 6.5m HGV's will be the largest vehicles used for the project. We are in agreement that this can also be a condition of any approvals.
 - ii. Confirmation the vehicle in the attached and previous swept path analysis is shown reversing down the access driveway and is a vehicle of 6.5metre length.
 - iii. Confirmation that all concrete will now be delivered to site and not site mixed. Delivery to be by 6.5metre concrete wagons with a capacity of 4 cubic metres and a filled weight of 18 tonnes.
 - iv. Information on the suitability of the existing access driveway for the outlined number of vehicle movements and how the driveway will be monitored and repaired if necessary. To be read in conjunction with Crown Consultants email ref: 160823_Crown Consultants email on Hexagon driveway trees.
 - v. Confirmation the full length of the Hexagon access driveway has been fully surveyed in topographical format by SOUP and Motion. SOUP's survey was undertaken by ABM surveys.
 - vi. Swept path analysis shows that there will be no encroachment onto neighbouring properties when accessing the Hexagon driveway from Fitzroy Park.
 - vii. Access from No.2 The Hexagon is from the access driveway and not Fitzroy Park.

- viii. Alternative parking arrangements generally regarding the allotment areas and possible discussions with the community regarding this.
- ix. Alternative position of the materials storage area.
- x. The cumulative traffic impact.
- xi. Existing pavement durability and integrity – Tree protection.

11. Emergency access arrangements.

- a. As outlined on Motion's drawing no.160128-02 the site hoarding will not extend into the paved area or access driveway areas and 24hour access will remain as outlined in the aforementioned deeds.

12. Transport planning [requests from Camden Transport Planner]

- a. Please find attached:
 - i. Motion 'Technical Note 1: Response to consultation comments' dated 21st September 2016.
 - ii. SOUP drawing no's 292_110_PL02 and 111_PL02.
- b. The site will be registered with the 'Considerate Constructors Scheme'.
- c. The site will follow and adhere to all principles of the CLOCS scheme. The responsibility and requirements of which will be outlined to the contractor prior to any works commencing.
- d. We agree a pedestrian survey should be commissioned in order to find the most appropriate times to deliver with the least amount of disruption. We would be satisfied for this to be conditional.
- e. All evidence of any future consultation will be included in any future Construction Management Plans.
- f. We can confirm extensive discussions will be held with neighbours and any other contractors in the area to alleviate and agree upon any concerns they may have regarding the general construction and cumulative impacts from multiple developments within the area.
- g. We are currently awaiting Fitzroy Park Residents Association response to the possibility of accessing the site from northern gated entrance [The Grove]. Once we have a decision from FPRA we will inform yourselves.
- h. Swept path analysis shows a vehicle measuring 6.5metres in length.
- i. Please see attached SOUP drawing no.292_111_PL02 indicating the revised internal cycle storage area. We are proposing 2no.Semi vertical cycle racks similar to: <http://www.thecodestore.co.uk/> ref:SKU:1-0013-SVCR.
- j. Please see attached SOUP drawing no's 292_110_PL02 and 111_PL02 now indicating the allocation of 1no. parking space. The rights of ownership, use and access of the hard standing area currently indicated as paved on the attached drawings is covered in the later section no. 14.

13. Access Driveway and neighbouring trees.

- a. Please find attached:
 - i. Motion 'Technical Note 1: Response to consultation comments' dated 21st September 2016.
 - ii. Crown Consultants email, ref: 160823_Crown Consultants email on Hexagon driveway trees.
 - iii. Plan drawing no. 689251-01. Extract from Landscape Planning Ltd 'Arboricultural Impact Assessment' dated 26th July 2016.
- b. We believe the attached information responds to the following comments and concerns raised by Camden Planning Department, independent consultants and neighbouring owners and associations.
 - i. Results of the recently obtained CBR data and access road build ups evaluated to ascertain if additional engineering is required.
 - ii. Tree survey information was undertaken by Landscape Planning Ltd and forwarded onto Crown Consultants.
 - iii. A thorough assessment carried out on the existing condition of the access driveway and the risk posed by the construction traffic to its integrity.
 - iv. Impact of circa 1000 HGV movements on the existing driveway.
 - v. Temporary roadway protection measures if required.
 - vi. Concerns regarding the protection and indeterminate damage to the 12no. trees on the site of Highfields Grove and adjacent to The Hexagon access driveway. Tree ref T14 to T25.

14. Access rights, Ownership and Parking arrangements.

- a. Please find attached:
 - i. SOUP drawing no's 292_112_PL01 and 292_114_PL00
 - ii. Original Land Registry deeds plans ref: LN197144 and LN206484
- b. The original Land Registry deeds for No.4 The Hexagon ref:LN197144 and LN206484 states that the owner of No.4 has the following rights:
 - i. *The right for the transferee or his successors in title jointly with all others entitled to use with or without motor vehicles the access road and paved area hatched green, light brown and orange on said plan.*
 - ii. *A right for all persons entitled with or without motor vehicles **to use** that part of the access road hatched yellow on the said plan.*
 - iii. *The right for the Transferee his successors in title and assigns with or without workmen and appliances to enter upon adjoining land shown on the said plan and edged blue, brown, light brown and green respectively being parts of the land now originally comprised in the title above mentioned for all necessary purposes connected with the carrying out of repair and renovation to the said land.*
- c. The original Land Registry deeds for No.5 The Hexagon ref:LN210137 states that the owner of No.5 has the following rights:
 - i. *Together with a right of way jointly with all others entitled to use the same with or without motor vehicles **over the** access road and paved area shown as hatched yellow on the said plan.*
 - ii. *Right for all persons entitled with or without motor vehicles **to use** the access road and paved area shown grey hatched grey on the said site plan. [indicated as orange hatch on SOUP drawing no. 292_112_PL01 and LN 197144 and LN206484]*
- d. The area hatched in yellow and indicated as a paved area on the attached SOUP drawings and Land Registry plans is clearly under the ownership of No.4 and they have the right to use this section of their land to park as they see fit [not the access driveway] while affording No's 5 and 6 the agreed access rights to their properties.
- e. The area hatched in orange and indicated as a paved area on the attached SOUP drawing no.292_112_PL01 and Land Registry plans is clearly under the ownership of No.5 and they have the right to use this section of their land to park as they see fit [not the access driveway] while affording No's 4 and 6 the agreed access rights to their properties. [This is the area outlined as grey in section Cii above]
- f. We cannot find any documentation, deeds or covenants connected with these properties that states that the paved area between properties 4, 5 and 6 is a communal area or an area reserved for deliveries and visitors.

If you have any queries regarding the enclosed, please do not hesitate to contact me.

Kind regards,

Jamie Le Gallez

On behalf of SOUP Architects Ltd.

Enc.

RIBA East Region Award 2014 + 2015 - Winner
RIBA South East Region Award 2014 - Winner
The Sunday Times British Homes Awards 2015 - Winner