

From: John Malet-Bates [REDACTED]
Sent: 05 November 2016 09:39
To: 'Michael Nourse'; [REDACTED]

Subject: RE: Hillview, Vale of Health, Application number: 2016/5613/P

Thankyou Mr. Nourse.
We will look into this and comment to Camden. By the look of things I am afraid some developers have decided they can roll through planning with a tank - too much talk about our LPA lacking resources. Hopefully not lacking the will. There should have been a CAC application of course for any demolition.
Best regards,
John

John Malet-Bates Dip Arch RIBA
Consulting Building Surveyor



Blenheims Estate And Asset Management
15 Young Street (Second floor)
Kensington
London W8 5EH



Arcturus Corporation Limited is a limited liability company registered in England and Wales:
No. 05503540

Registered office: Pembroke House, Torquay Road, Paignton, Devon TQ3 2EZ. The information in this e-mail (which includes any files transmitted with it) is confidential and may also be legally privileged. It is intended for the addressee only. Access to this e-mail by anyone else is unauthorised. It is not to be relied upon by any person other than the addressee except with our prior written approval. If no such approval is given, we will not accept any liability (in negligence or otherwise) arising from any third party acting, or refraining from acting, on such information. Unauthorised recipients are required to maintain confidentiality. If you have received this e-mail in error please notify us immediately, destroy any copies and delete it from your computer system. Any use, dissemination, forwarding, printing or copying of this e-mail is prohibited. Copyright in this e-mail and any document created by us will be and remain vested in us and will not be transferred to you. We assert the right to be identified as the author of and to object to any misuses of the contents of this e-mail or such documents.

From: Michael Nourse [REDACTED]
Sent: 05 November 2016 07:29



Subject: Hillview, Vale of Health, Application number: 2016/5613/P

Hampstead CAAC

Dear Mr John Malet-Bates

I am writing to ask if the Hampstead CAAC will consider supporting our objections to the above application. All the neighbours in the terrace strongly object as does Ellen Solomons in her personal capacity, she is the Chair of the VOHS. I expect that the VOHS will also object at their next meeting.

I have copied my objection letter submitted to Camden Planning Department below. It is long and I know contains things that won't be admissible but it gives a good idea of what is happening. The application makes it appear that "5.12 This is a modest redevelopment of a building in severe disrepair." the severe disrepair was caused by the owners who within a very short period of buying it demolished every single internal wall, removing the plaster from all 4 boundary walls (the only walls now left standing) and ripping out many floorboards, all pipes and wires etc. All without any planning permission. It is in fact not a modest redevelopment but a major demolition and redevelopment project which will cause disruption in the Vale for 18 months or more if anything subsides or collapses. What is proposed is actually the removal of everything except the front façade. Effectively viewed from the rear of the property there will be only the front façade, the left and right walls stripped down to brick (the rear wall demolished) and the earth floor, the roof gone with nothing left but sky or scaffolding above.

Kind regards

Michael Nourse

Faircroft
Vale of Health.

From: /O=FIRST ORGANIZATION/OU=EXCHANGE ADMINISTRATIVE GROUP(FYDIBOHF23SPDLT)/CN=RECIPIENTS/CN=00011A185885C0D1
Sent: Thursday, 03 November 2016 10:31
To: 'Kristina.Smith@camden.gov.uk'
Subject: Application No: 2016/5613/P

Faircroft
Vale of Health
London NW3 1AN

Dear Kristina Smith
Planning Officer Camden Council.

[Application No: 2016/5613/P](#)

My house directly abuts Hillview. I am giving an initial most strong objection to the planning application. The loss of amenity, overlooking, noise, loss of privacy, light pollution, the 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. Our consultants will follow up with more detailed objections.

I find it incongruous that the Planning Officer who advised on the application will also determine the application.

Statements in the applicants 'Planning Statement' that are untruthful or mistaken:

All my comments to the untrue or mistaken items below are also objections of mine to the planning application.

4.14 "Terraces or balconies are an established feature of the surrounding properties and the proposed terrace would not be out of character"

This is completely untrue. There is only 1 small terrace at the far end of the terrace **which is only there because it was built over 40 years ago**, and only 2 other small traditional cast iron Juliet balconies.

4.14 "It would be preferable to not have the privacy screening which is likely to appear bulky"

Any screens will be essential to preserve privacy as well as overlooking so going with "It would be preferable to not have the privacy screening which is likely to appear bulky" means we will lose privacy and be overlooked if there is a terrace, ergo there should be NO terrace permitted.

4.27 "Views from the terrace down into the glazed roof of the neighbour would be shielded to some extent by the gable end of the adjoining property's extension. Where the gable end is not of sufficient height a privacy screen is considered appropriate solution to prevent overlooking."

The planning officer now suggests screens... this is unacceptable and completely contradicts the officer's statement at 4.14 above. The gable end if left as it is unencumbered with any side screens is attractive, with any screening it will become oppressive and ugly. It is the openness and airiness to its sloping sides giving some further leafy view that makes it attractive.

4.29 "Given that there is a degree of mutual overlooking along the terrace into rear gardens and the coverage provided by mature trees, it is not considered that a privacy screen would be required on the other side. However to prevent 'easy' views back into the rear windows of Lakeview from the end of the terrace it is recommended to reduce its depth by approx. 1m, especially given the curve of the terrace."

Without a privacy screen there will definitely be considerable overlooking. With one which will have to be 2 stories high from ground level to be effective there will be much bulkiness and oppression. Even with a screen it is impossible to screen the bedroom windows which will always be overlooked.

4.33 "The side dormers are acceptable in principle however their size should be reduced to prevent visibility from as many views as possible.

Response: It has been assured that the proposed will be screened from street level."

Maybe at street level however they will be clearly visible from a large part of The Heath path and grassland down the hill directly opposite the roof dormers and over the long winter months from the path along the Heath's Pond's water's edge.

4.35 "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.

4.36 "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.

4.39 "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 mistake that although not of the prettiest design it is most certainly a conservatory, to be replaced with another more attractive 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.

4.42 "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 right on the perfect rural location of the Heath Pond.

5.12 "This is a modest redevelopment of a building"

An outrageous statement. The proposals are for a major demolition and rebuild not 'a modest redevelopment' A 39 page planning statement does not come with a modest redevelopment.

This is a massive application for a large redevelopment not simply an internal refurbishment **with huge issues for neighbours and the Vale at large** which should it be passed will set a bad precedent.

7.22 "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, will in no way be in scale or at all similar to it's neighbours.

7.53 "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. Even with some unpleasant screening there will be overlooking, particularly into the bedroom windows and onto the gardens. In any case the Planning Officer has stated at point 4.14 "It would be preferable to not have the privacy screening which is likely to appear bulky" Noise and light will always be a pollution as will loss of privacy particularly to the bedrooms.

APPENDIX 2 PRE-APPLICATION FEEDBACK 5. "It is proposed to provide a terrace on part of the roof extension. There is already a door at upper ground floor level in the same location 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.

My further objections to demolishing any more walls than have already been demolished.

Our terrace of somewhat 136 years old was built without foundations, concrete never even existed then. The terrace is built on unstable ground with many streams running from the hill above to the pond at the bottom of our gardens. Our entire terrace is completely reliant on each house in the terrace for stability and support. Our terrace as a whole is currently safely stable and settled as it has been for so long. This has worked without fail for the past 136 odd years. Now we are all put at unacceptable risk and all for the apparent extreme perfection desired by the applicants. Hillview has only one superficial crack in the back wall of some 30 cm across the one corner above the upper ground rear window. There are no other cracks whatsoever. Furthermore there are no cracks in any of the other houses. Removing the back wall puts all of us at unacceptably large risk of our houses falling sideways and / or subsiding. We think this risk is unreasonable in the extreme. We will be put at risk so that the new owners can have 100% level floors and perfect back walls, this is unacceptable. It is expected to have un-level floors in all old Victorian houses. There will be little left of our heritage, Victorian Georgian and older houses if every wall with cracks is demolished. If perfect floors and walls are required applicants should buy a new house or indeed build one of their own. We wonder did the new owners purposely quickly / immediately on purchase rip every wall out of the house and even remove all of the walls plaster so as to make it more likely to get planning permission and thereby to virtually destroy a fine Victorian house as well as to meet their own possible end desires for perfection in their own home completely without regard to their many neighbours. Given the situation I have been forced into there will be no access given to any part of my land/property whatsoever except that required by law. They may not remove so much a grain of my soil from under my house and may not place any concrete or anything else under it again except that required by law. The entire side wall is built entirely on my land, is my property. As they say in their application my house was built well before theirs. They may also not enter or encroach on any part of my land or into my house for any reasons whatsoever again except that required by law.

The terrace is actually one very big block/building from Lea Steps to Beechy Cottage and Heathurst with walls in-between defining the houses. It has stood for 136 odd years on precarious ground without foundations (in the modern sense) and with many streams running under it and without subsiding or cracking or having water rising into the ground floors because it is one big block sitting on a very big area of soft ground. It is this mass and structure which keeps it safe as well as all the walls between which are supporting each other as well as the roof beams. If left alone it will no doubt last another 100 or more years, however if it is interfered with by demolishing any of its structure (which is in fact what keeps it sound) it will be weakened and start to move. Getting permission to demolish entire walls means others can do the same and the more walls demolished the more the terrace will crack up and subside. There is no damp in Hillview's or Lakeview's or Faircroft's lower ground floors or conservatories.

Digging down and under both Hillview and Faircroft to underpin and putting all the concrete on all four sides of Hillview has a likelihood of changing the ancient pattern of our underground structure. It may cause the river which we know is under Hillview to be pushed to the sides ie to Lakeview, Silverdale, Beechy Cottage and Heathurst and who knows where else and what else. This puts our homes at risk of major damp and/or flooding and subsidence.

All the concrete will only protect Hillview on all their 4 sides. With only one side of Lakeview and one side of Faircroft having loads of concrete under it and the other sides none it will be unbalanced. Currently our entire big block falls or moves all in one piece but when the middle is underpinned with concrete any movement may cause a split right across the centre. Underpinning will disturb the balance of the existing terrace. With Lakeview and Faircroft underpinned on only one side as opposed to Hillview being underpinned on all 4 of it's sides there is likelihood that at some time our outer unpinned walls will fall causing the houses to split.

My further objections to a rear extension instead of the replacement of the existing conservatory with another conservatory.

My garden is only about 7 feet wide. My little terrace outside my sitting/dining/kitchen already has a very, very high wall on the south side and if the application is passed it will have a similar wall almost as high on the north side effectively boxing it in giving a dark damp feel to it. Their huge terrace will if allowed effectively destroy my little garden terrace. Perhaps the applicants want everything for themselves regardless of the cost to others. Replacing the conservatory with a very big rectangular room with a very large terrace on top of it will mean a considerable loss of amenity, overlooking, noise, loss of privacy, light pollution and detrimental effect to my house and terrace/garden as will the proposed large terrace on top of it have. Replacing the existing conservatory with a new more elegant conservatory gives the applicants the same floor area at no considerable cost to neighbours. That is what should happen.

The proposed terrace will be very intrusive and prominently sited and highly visible from all round including the Heath during the winter months when the leaf cover disappears. It will be very out of character with the existing terrace of houses. Being raised so high it will impact on the quiet enjoyment of our gardens and all the neighbours gardens as well, not just the 2 neighbours abutting the terrace. There are grave concerns about noise as the terrace will be only a few metres from our bedrooms and looking into them as well, again noise not just for the 2 neighbours abutting the terrace but for all those around.

We dispute any opinion that it is necessary to demolish the rear wall ie most of the house putting all our homes at risk. Effectively viewed from the rear of the property there will be only the front façade, the left and right walls stripped down to brick and the earth floor, the roof gone with nothing left but sky above.

We have seen no Management Plan. The proposed works will take a long time to complete probably at least 18 months. 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.

The plans for the large rear extension do not accommodate the existing outflow of water from a part of my conservatory or the water from Hillview's own roof.

More than 21 days are needed for comments. The plans without which we could do nothing were only recently posted. We also need time to consult with planning advisers, engineers etc. The time given is unreasonable and therefore unjust. The applicants have had over one year to put their plans in place.

Yours sincerely

M Nourse.