



Faircroft  
Vale of Health  
London NW3 1AN

Dear Kristina Smith  
Planning Officer Camden Council.

Application No: 2016/5613/P

My objections exactly match those of Michael Nourse, we live in the same house. I would like to object to the proposed development in the same terms as his. Please do not disregard or give lesser weight to my objections because of this, I have carefully considered every detail of his objections and they match my own objections exactly. Please do not count us as only one objection because we share the same views, we should be counted as two objectors.

My house directly abuts Hillview. I am giving an initial most strong objection to the planning application. To start with loss of amenity, overlooking, noise, loss of privacy, considerable impact on my property, etc. The proposed measures to address these amenity issues do not effectively do so and create further loss of amenity. I will follow up with more detailed objections.

“As part of the pre-application submission stage, the owners of Hillview contacted each immediate neighbour in early October (namely Lakeview to the north and Faircroft to the south) to illustrate the development proposals and welcome feedback. Additional cards were dropped through the doors of other neighbours close by and informal conversations have taken place.”

I categorically state that I was not consulted in October indeed not at all until last week and even then the crucial information that the back wall was to be demolished was withheld from me.

“Feedback has been mixed from the residents. Some have been generally supportive of the proposal.”

None of us have been at all supportive of the proposal. For the application to imply that we neighbours were even remotely supportive is grossly misleading.

“We consider that some neighbours’ suggestions of a pitched roof scheme for the rear extension which would look out of character with its neighbours (see image on the previous page).”

Again not true we were strongly wanting the existing conservatory, and make no mistakes that although not of the prettiest design it is most certainly a conservatory, to be replaced in our Victorian setting with another conservatory no bigger than the existing and in the same traditional style and in exactly the same footprint and not be replaced by a huge cube of brick

and glass. It is on Metropolitan Open Land and already occupies a big part of the houses' garden.

“It is appreciated that a development cannot satisfy all matters raised by neighbours, but the design team are thoroughly confident that we have been considerate of neighbouring amenity, with this all aspects of the development. The proposal has been designed to a very high standard, which is reflective of the positive pre-application feedback received from Camden Council”

They have certainly not been considerate of neighbouring amenity. What is proposed is a monstrosity, a carbuncle on the perfect rural location of the Heath Pond.

“Despite the level of structural works required, the resulting development will maintain the height, scale and bulk of the original building which is similar to its neighbours.”

The rear large extension, for that is what it is, is in no way in scale or at all similar to it's neighbours.

“In preparing the application proposals, the applicant's design team have paid due regard to the aspirations of policy DP26 to protect the quality of life of occupiers and neighbours. The existing property has been designed so that no direct overlooking occurs.”

This is completely untrue and will become even more evident in further submissions.

“a door at upper ground floor level... which suggests a balcony of some sort had been there previously..”

I have been here 33 years and I attest that there has never been any balcony there whatsoever. I am sure neighbours of 50 years standing will attest the same.

This is a massive application for a big construction not simply an internal refurbishment **with huge issues for neighbours and the Vale at large** which should it be passed will set a precedent. We will be disputing the Structural Engineers opinion that it is necessary to demolish the rear wall ie most of the house putting all our homes and perhaps lives at risk. We will also be disputing other matters and assertions.

We have seen no Management Plan. As you know the Vale is a cul de sac with only one access which is narrow and will not allow vehicles to pass each other when lorries are in situ.

**Considerably more than 21 days are needed for comments.** The plans without which we could do nothing were only posted this morning and the location is still incorrect. We also need time to consult with planning advisers, engineers etc. The time given is totally unreasonable and therefor unjust. The applicants have had over one year to put their plans in place.

Yours sincerely

D Burnett