

LETTER TO CAMDEN CONCERNING 28 CANFIELD GARDENS.

APPLICATION NUMBER : 2017/0859/P

Flat 3B, 66 Fairhazel Gardens

London NW6 3SN.

12th.April 2017

TEL [REDACTED]

Dear Ms. Roe,

I am writing to you, as a member of the Fairhazel Cooperative, about the proposed planning application for an enlargement of the existing basement level, including front and rear lightwells, at 28 Canfield Gardens.

Having lived in the Co-operative for over twenty years, I wish to raise objections to this proposal. All the houses on the same side of the road, numbering 14 to 38, belong to the Fairhazel Co-operative, excepting nos. 20 and 28. We maintain all our houses and mansion blocks in their original external state, altering only internal facilities, according to health and safety and decent homes standard regulations – and because the whole of this street belongs to a conservation area. The owners of no.20 have retained the original structure, too. The Triangle Green, onto which no.28 also backs, belongs to the Fairhazel Co-operative, and to which tenants/owners of the flats/flatlets at no.28 are also welcome, provided that they maintain our very generous rules and regulations. We do not wish to see this wonderful facility altered or changed because of the whims of an offshore owner. If other private owners were to apply for and build extensions to their properties – front or back – the character and cohesion of the street would be inevitably spoilt. This is one of the reasons why I and many other local residents, object to the requested extension of the property.

Members of our Co-operative are also worried about the possible structural damage caused to our properties, on either side of no.28, by extensive digging, vibration and possible subsidence. If you are not already aware of this, a tributary of the Westborne river flows under the Triangle Green, on its way from South Hampstead to Chelsea! Our property, no.30, had to have a permanent pump installed in the basement to protect the building from flooding after prolonged heavy rainfall – which can happen at any time. This was carried out several years ago. The basement area at no.28 must surely be equally vulnerable and it is possible that our buildings nos.26 and 30, on either side of the dividing walls, could be affected by building works in the basement of no.28, too.

We would neither expect to pay for any costs incurred, caused by destabilization to our own properties during and after any extensions made to no.28, nor for any repairs needed on the dividing walls between the private property and our own buildings, nor for any damage at the front and back of our buildings and nor to the wall separating no.28 from the Triangle Green.

Finally, I would like to point out that the buildings in Canfield gardens, whether private or part of the Fairhazel Co-operative, share a cohesion, which provides a community that is very pleasant and tranquil and which we wish to maintain and will defend. We can see no reason why property

developers, who neither live in the building, nor have any interest in this community, should be able to impose their wishes unchallenged. If the owners of no.28 wish to make even more money through their tenants, it would surely be better to develop fewer, larger flats from the many small flatlets currently within the building and so provide viable homes for families; rather than to proceed with a risky development, which could affect the lives of families in other buildings very negatively and against which there will be many objectors.

One last point: why was the public notice concerning this application issued so late by Camden and did the owners of no.28 ever apply for, or receive permission to carry out the division of the building that they then made, when it was first bought from its original owner, probably about 2008?

I remain, yours sincerely,

Mrs. Janet Coles.