

[REDACTED]

From: Bernard Carnell [REDACTED]
Sent: 02 February 2017 17:37
To: Planning; Henry, Kate
Cc: [REDACTED]
Subject: 2016/3252/P - 4 The Hexagon, Fitzroy Park, Highgate London N6 6HR

Dear Kate Henry,

I have been in at least two minds about taking up even more of your time by submitting yet one further communication Objecting to this application but, for reasons set out below, have decided to do so.

Whilst appreciating that applicants' intentions are not a "planning issue", nevertheless I consider that the apparent conduct of these applicants and their architect reflect a disregard for the consequences of their proposals, namely that were their application to succeed it would have a detrimental effect on the character of this area.

At various meetings early last year with my neighbours and me the architect and his clients repeatedly explained that the application to demolish and rebuild was based on "need". We were aware that the clients had recently bought the house following the death of Mr Crawley (who, with his late wife, had lived there for well over 20 years). We were told both by the architect and his clients that they loved the location and wished to make 4 The Hexagon their permanent home for themselves and their large family for many years to come. They had explored whether the house could be adapted and expanded to meet their needs but had concluded it could not: hence their application for total demolition and the construction of a considerably larger house.

I for one, and I know that many of my immediate neighbours too, have attempted to be as helpful as we felt we could be to try to understand, and accommodate, the clients' domestic needs. My wife and I have lived at 1 The Hexagon for over 20 years. The recently deceased Etta Pollard (she died in late August 2016) at 5 The Hexagon for even longer. Mr Winston at No 6, Mr and Mrs Edwards at no 3, Mr and Mrs Jones at no 2, and Mr and Mrs Benham at 10 Fitzroy Park have also each lived here for some 10 years or so. For us each home is our sole residence. For us not only The Hexagon but also Fitzroy Park is a community. Mrs Pollard, in her 70s and having undergone a stroke and being treated for cancer, was deeply worried about the likely effect on her, her home and the locality, and the problems that would inevitably arise from restricted access to her and her home by emergency and other medical services. It is distressing to her family and friends that the last few months of her life were blighted in this way. There is a human cost to planning applications – and especially those that may well be excessive and unjustified – which all concerned need to be reminded about from time to time.

I understand that the clients do not live - have not lived - at 4 The Hexagon since they purchased it but live at - own – another property in a neighbouring area of north London. I now learn that they have recently exchanged contracts on another – far larger – house also in Fitzroy Park and which is to be for their and their family's personal use and residence. Neither the architect nor the clients – anxious as they were in early 2016 to make contact with us and gain our support for their application – have been in contact with us to inform us of the clients' purchase of this other property now to be their home let alone what their intentions are for 4 The Hexagon or the planning application.

Although not relevant to you as a "planning issue", I and my neighbours, as well as the Residents' Association, have spent hours upon hours not only considering the architect's proposals but doing so on the basis that they were considered essential for his clients' personal, family, domestic needs. I and my neighbours, as well as the Residents Association, have also spent money instructing experts to do work and prepare reports which – so I am informed – the architects should have obtained, but failed to. Others in Highgate, including knowledgeable organisations, have also devoted their time and experience to assess the application.

What, therefore, has been – what is – the purpose of this costly time consuming exercise? Are the clients property speculators who have simply been seeking to exploit a site and, if able to gain planning permission, sell on for profit

- unconcerned and regardless as to the damaging and detrimental consequences to the character of the area

Even if not, are they

- so wealthy that, already living elsewhere, on whims they can buy and sell, never occupy, apply for permission and “see what comes of it”
- careless of the time, effort, and financial and emotional cost on those whose lives are affected
- unconcerned about the many many hours that you and your colleagues in the Department have had to spend
- careless about the likely damage and destruction of essential trees
- unconcerned about the damage to road infrastructure and amenities
- unconcerned about neighbours’ loss of enjoyment of their homes and disruption to their lives

If they were intent on making 4 The Hexagon their permanent and long-term home it is more likely that they would be concerned and more likely restrict their application accordingly. That it would now seem that they have no intention of making 4 The Hexagon their home supports the possibility that their main care and concern is the exploitation of a site for potential profit. I have no way of knowing how or where to “place” these clients: because – as I say – neither they nor their architect have made any contact to explain themselves.

Recent “history” in Fitzroy Park has demonstrated how developers have bought sites simply to seek planning permission to demolish and then build a significantly bigger building for the sole purpose of either building and selling on for gain, or not building and selling on with the planning permission. History has also demonstrated that subsequent purchasers – often also developers - come along and apply for permissions to extend and expand the permissions already granted: seeking to demolish and build something even bigger. And so, gradually, the ambience changes, the area changes, and the very ambience and attractiveness that developers (be they small or larger) have sought to exploit for personal gain is destroyed, to the detriment not only of those who have the good fortune to live in Fitzroy Park but the many others who benefit from and enjoy using it as access between Village and Heath.

I am in no doubt that this application, if granted, would result in a detrimental change to the character of this area.

I am encouraged in believing that my objections are justified in view of all other objections you have received which, if my analysis is correct, are from

- 29 other immediate neighbours: within The Hexagon, from 10 Fitzroy Park and (the 24 houses within) Highfields Grove
- 3 other individual property owners along Fitzroy Park
- 13 allotment holders
- Fitzroy Park Residents Association on behalf of all property owners within Fitzroy Park
- 4 professional or respected individuals or associations including Highgate CAAC and The Twentieth Century Society
- as well as experts’ reports obtained by our Residents Association; Highfields Grove; 10 Fitzroy Park, and my neighbours and me

The clients have not presented any support for their application except from their own experts: whose reports the experts instructed by others consider to be inadequate

I would be grateful if you would kindly take my further Objections into account.

Kind Regards

Bernard Carnell
1 The Hexagon
Fitzroy Park, Highgate

London N6 6HR