

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2017/4366/P	Susan Oldroyd	Flat D 64 Fitzjohn's Avenue London NW3 5LT	02/10/2017 16:08:11	OBJ	<p>I wish to lodge my objection to the proposed application.</p> <p>I carefully considered the original proposal and its revised proposal (Application 2015/5847/P) and made clear and detailed comments on the inappropriateness of erecting an oversized and unsympathetic building in this tiny back land site. I should be grateful if you would refer to my letter of 26th January, 2015, its appendix of 2nd February and my letter objecting to the proposed revisions, dated 1st August 2016. These are all lodged on your web site. I would not wish to repeat comments here which you already have.</p> <p>I note that the pre-planning advice is equally clear about the negative impact this proposal will have on the conservation area and I am surprised that the developers are again insisting on maximising everything they can get from this site without any consideration for its impact on the surroundings. I would argue that this is gross over development in the wrong place.</p> <p>Since this is a completely new application, I trust that the planning officers will have the opportunity to look again at the whole application and reject it in total as having failed to address legitimate concerns and having failed to comply with Camden's ambitions for protecting and enhancing its historic heritage.</p> <p>I have some serious misgivings about how the earlier application was approved. Communication was poor from the start and residents most affected were not given the opportunity to present their views at any planning meeting, or to have a public meeting. Was this a procedural oversight? Does it conform to best practice?</p> <p>It was disappointing to find that significant concerns about the design of the building, the immense size of the proposed basement, amenity space, drainage, waste and recycling were dismissed or overlooked in the planning approval at that time. Perhaps things could be treated differently for this new application.</p> <p>There are still serious considerations unanswered in the CMP which relate to the detrimental affects of excavations and removal of spoil from the site. For the developer's team to state that they will take mitigating action and deal with problems as they arise is still demanding that the residents of 64 bear all the risk. This again highlights the fact that this kind of build is completely inappropriate in this space. I would urge Camden to think again about what this will mean.</p> <p>Whilst back land sites may offer commercial opportunities for developers, I believe that Camden should lead the way in supporting the best of new build that enhances and supports its historic heritage and reject clear examples of those which do not. The messy compromise of shoe-horning an overbearing building into this site, even without its third storey, is unacceptable.</p> <p>The advice of the pre-planning meeting of the 9th February 2017 could not be clearer. On all counts the conclusion was negative. On pages 3 and 5 the applicants are advised that</p>

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
					<p>they should not proceed with the planning application and compelling reasons are given. Nonetheless, the developers seem determined to ignore this advice and proceed to press for approval of this ill conceived project.</p> <p>If approved, occupancy will increase dramatically and amenity space will fall. I remain puzzled as to why the developers think that an access driveway leading onto Fitzjohn"s Avenue, and beyond the gated courtyard to 66, constitutes amenity space. This calculation is misleading. In reality, the tiny amount of existing amenity space will be reduced still further because of the increased size of the light wells required to make basement accommodation tolerable.</p> <p>Is it really acceptable, or sensible to approve such a massive underground excavation extending well beyond the footprint of 66 and close on the boundary walls of a large Victorian villa?</p> <p>I note that the pre-planning advice requested a further basement assessment in view of the proposal to include an additional storey to the building. I would hope that this new review of the proposal will afford the planing officers the opportunity to reconsider the very real concerns of residents affected by such a huge undertaking and the equally real and unquantifiable risks posed to the built and to the green environment.</p> <p>The developers state that the basement proposal is already approved. I should like to question this assumption on the grounds that this is a new planning application and the appropriate procedures should be followed.</p> <p>I understand the financial appeal of such a project, and I understand that with modern building practices the developers would like to suggest that this proposal is entirely feasible. The crux of the matter is not its feasibility but its desirability in this particular context. Two large family homes are inappropriate for a tiny back land site. The current building offers two modern and modest homes suitable for young professional couples in Camden. These should be retained as part of the housing mix.</p> <p>I strongly support the conclusions of the pre-planning meeting which are totally in tune with the submissions made by the neighbours surrounding no. 66, but were inexplicably ignored during the planning hearing. At that hearing the developers did at least have the good grace to withdraw the proposal for the third storey. To re-introduce it now shows contempt for the planning consultation process, for the particular environment and for the local residents.</p> <p>I urge you to reject the whole project.</p>

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2017/4366/P	Emma Casdagli	Bramley House Mill Street Iden Green TN17 4HH	02/10/2017 15:16:02	OBJ	Dear Sir/Madam, RE: Planning Application # 2017/4366/P Address: 66 Fitzjohns Avenue, London NW3 5LT (the "Site") Please note that I am the owner of 64B Fitzjohns Ave ("64B") and I wish to lodge an objection to the proposed application. I purchased 64B in 2001 intending to live there. Before completion I was unexpectedly transferred to Hong Kong by my employers where I lived for the next 13 years. I returned to the UK in the summer of 2014, but moved to Kent for my son's schooling. As a result, I have rented out 64B since I bought it, but it has always been my intention, and remains my intention, to live in the property myself in the foreseeable future. As a result I am looking at this planning application both as a landlord, but also as a potential resident. I have looked at the Fitzjohns and Netherhall Conservation Area Appraisal & Management Strategy Document on your website which you note is used for the assessment of planning applications for proposed developments in this area. I note as follows: 1. 64 Fitzjohns Ave is mentioned as an unlisted building which makes a positive contribution to the special character and appearance of the area 2. 66 Fitzjohns is already mentioned as a negative feature even without further extension. 3. On page 36, it states that, in an area with large plots with open green land, there is pressure for backland development, but that this can reduce the quality of the visual as well as the ecological environment. 4. In the guidelines section (F/N 1) it states that all development should respect existing features such as building lines, roof lines etc 5. In the guidelines section (F/N 25) it states that extending into basement areas will only be acceptable where it would not involve harm to the character of the building or its setting 6. In the guidelines section (F/N 32) it states that rear gardens contribute to the townscape of the Conservation Area and provide a significant amenity to residents and a habitat for wildlife. It goes on to state that development within gardens is likely to be unacceptable I note that the Site is a back land site having been originally part of the garden belonging to 64 Fitzjohns Avenue. The original out houses were redeveloped and converted to residential use some years ago when planning policy may have been more relaxed. It is apparent from guideline F/N 32 (referred to above) that development of back land is now discouraged (for good reason) and "likely to be unacceptable". In my view, an extension of the type proposed should be similarly discouraged and unacceptable. The proposal would result in a significant overdevelopment of the land and would have a detrimental effect on the surroundings and feel of the Conservation Area (not only is the Site visible from the back of 64 Fitzjohns Ave, but also from the road). Having a development of this size so close behind 64 Fitzjohns Ave would not only impair the look of no 64 (currently noted as making a positive contribution to the special character

Application No: **Consultees Name:** **Consultees Addr:** **Received:** **Comment:** **Response:**

and appearance of the area), but it would also worsen the look of no 66 (already noted as a negative feature).

I also think it would set a dangerous precedent for others who might be seeking to develop, or expand development in, back land areas within the Conservation Area.

In addition to the general "in principle" objection I set out above, I would also object for the following reasons:

1. There is no reason to demolish the current houses – they are relatively recent structures and in a reasonable state of repair. The redevelopment is simply to try and squeeze extra living space out of an already tight area.
2. The construction of a basement under, effectively, the whole of the Site would bring building work dangerously close to 64 Fitzjohns Ave. This could cause irreversible damage to one of the fine buildings that make the Conservation Area what it is. The risk is increased by the fact that 64 Fitzjohns is constructed on a "raft" of clays which makes it particularly susceptible to large excavation work nearby.
3. The basement development is very close to underground water courses and it is impossible to know the effect the Proposal would have on these water courses and how that would impact the neighbouring properties, including 64 Fitzjohns Ave (again, particularly in light of how no 64 was constructed). It is unreasonable to expect neighbours to accept such a risk just for the sake of overdevelopment of a site.
4. The new building being proposed is higher than the current building. This would not only make it an eyesore from the road, but result in a considerable loss of light, and privacy, to no 64, especially 64B which is the flat on the raised ground level. The Site is very close to the rear of no 64 with just a small cobbled area separating the two buildings. Privacy is currently managed by the use of some low level bamboo and other short plants. However, if the buildings on the Site are allowed to go higher than the existing buildings (not just the roof going higher than the current roof, but also the top floor windows in the Site going higher than the existing top floor windows), these low level plants will be wholly inadequate. It will mean that a number of the flats in no 64 (including my own) will be overlooked and suffer a loss of privacy, a loss of natural light and light pollution from the windows/glazing being proposed.
5. Access to the site is a narrow lane running next to no 64. This narrow lane would be unsuitable for construction equipment/lorries and there is significant risk that the wall to no 64 could be damaged.

I hope that the above explains why I feel that the proposal would be detrimental to the Conservation Area generally and to the owners/occupiers of no 64 in particular. I also feel that it is not in keeping with your own guidelines as set out in the Fitzjohns and Netherhall Conservation Area Appraisal & Management Strategy Document.

Application No: **Consultees Name:** **Consultees Addr:** **Received:** **Comment:** **Response:**

Please ensure that I am copied on any notices/further information in relation to this Planning Application and this Site generally.
