

49 Fitzroy Park
LONDON
N6 6HT



22nd September 2017

Ben Farrant
Planning Officer
London Borough of Camden
5 Pancras Square
LONDON
N1C 4AG

Dear Mr Farrant

RE: 2017/4301/P – The Wallace House, Fitzroy Park, N6

My husband and I are neighbours to the Wallace House (and Little House) owning two properties, Dormers at 49 Fitzroy Park where we live, and Farm End Cottage, next door, which we rent out to a tenant. In this respect, any development at either the Wallace House or the Little House will have a direct impact on us.

So that there is no ambiguity I am writing in my personal capacity as a resident of Fitzroy Park rather than as Chair of the Fitzroy Park Residents' Association ("FPRA") which oversees the management and maintenance of the road. Mr Harley Atkinson will be writing separately with comments from FPRA, comments that will be supported by a technical assessment of the CMP undertaken by WSP Parsons Brinkerhoff.

Having lived at our property for 12 years we are aware of the 2 previous lapsed consents for very similar Applications at this site. Our property, also designed by Richard Paxton is very similar to the Wallace House in that our elevations to the south are fully glazed. This leaves us very vulnerable to overlooking, especially where an entire new storey is being added, and were initially very disappointed that previous promises to ensure fenestration facing our property would be opaque had not been included in the design drawings.

However, having found the relevant emails in their archive, SOUP have now amended the relevant drawings for the single window directly facing us in Bedroom 3, for which we are grateful. We did also ask the architects to consider wrapping round the opaque treatment to include one of the three side picture windows facing our pool and guest annexe, but we understand this proved unacceptable to the Applicant, which is disappointing. If there is any way this latter request can be considered a reasonable proposal by Camden, we would be grateful as it would still leave 2 out of 3 picture windows clear along that elevation.

We will not be commenting on the impact on the RPA of T10 of the new side extension as that has no impact on our property. Nor will we be making comprehensive comments about the CMP as that, as I have already mentioned, is being dealt with by FPRA.

However, having read the CMP ourselves, and as the owner of Farm End Cottage, we are very concerned that a number of significant issues have been omitted from the draft CMP, particularly with regard to HGVs and concrete trucks turning out of Bowling Club Lane ("BCL") into Fitzroy Park.

As the Applicant is well aware from the 3-year development at Fitzroy Farm (that also relies on BCL for access) HGVs cannot turn easily at this junction and it is disappointing that knowing this, the relevant Swept Path Analyses have been omitted from the draft CMP. This is unacceptable as the consequence was a significant over-sail of our property by HGVs at Farm End Cottage and damage to our boundary and driveway.

Nor has any mitigation been proposed for protecting the various water meter/supplies in BCL that previous were seriously damaged by the Fitzroy Farm works. This needs to be addressed in any S106 agreement.

We support the recent amendment to limit large deliveries to shorter working hours from 10am to 3.30pm but would suggest all proximate residents need reassurance that, should it be determined HGVs will need to reverse the entire length of BCL to access site, our amenity is not destroyed by the incessant peeping of HGV reverse alarms throughout the day.

With regard to parking, the Applicant has no rights to park contractors' vehicles in Fitzroy Park along our curtilage, nor along the Allotment verge. Yet no provision has been included in the CMP to deal with LGVs. This is another serious omission as the long-term chaos caused by contractors' LGVs on previous construction sites is a matter of record.

Finally, turning to the BIA, we are waiting for final comments from Jim Gardiner from Alan Baxter Associates ("ABA") and will forward these to you early next week. We also note that a BIA audit instruction has recently been posted on your web portal. It would seem ABA's main concern is treatment of the ground water flows. Specifically, the potential contamination of the Heath (as occurred when the original house was built) and clarification of the method proposed for temporary works as the documents are contradictory.

In determining this case and detailing the S106 agreement and conditions, we would be grateful if you could take our comments and concerns into consideration should you be minded to grant conditional consent.

Yours sincerely

Karen & Anthony Beare