

KATHY & BRUCE LAMBIE

Dear Mr Bushell and Mr Thuaire

55 FITZROY PARK LONDON N6  
PLANNING APPLICATION 2018/3672/P

We have lived in [REDACTED] for nearly 30 years and have commented on a number of developments in the area but I think it fair to say never have I been involved with a planning application which is so unrealistic and damaging to our community.

This has put us in a difficult position with our neighbours as I have known for some time that Lynne and Richard Turner-Stokes would like to knock their existing house down and replace it with three houses for themselves and their two married daughters. Whilst I appreciated this would involve change and inconvenience we would really try to do everything to support their dream.

However the current proposal goes way beyond this original intention and what we now face is large scale environmental and ecological vandalism and absolutely not what the applicant describes in his letter dated 22 November 2018 as “contributing to the special character of Fitzroy Park” These proposals actually represent a complete disaster for Fitzroy Park, Millfield Lane, the Heath and the Highgate community.

Let me begin with our main concerns from the preceptive of our family  
[REDACTED]

#### **Views**

We currently enjoy views over Private open land to the Heath beyond if this application is successfully we will look at 3 houses at least one storey higher and closer to the road than the existing house with small 5 metre channels between the houses. Our planning Consultant Tony Bowhill has reported in 15.14 of his report that plots 1-3 will be much larger than as set out in the Design&Access report as the floor area calculations include only for two storeys. Also we are told that the existing house is 4575ft<sup>2</sup> but I would like that number verified as the existing house looks considerably smaller than this.

KATHY & BRUCE LAMBIE



The bottom end of Fitzroy park will change from its tranquil, rustic country lane feel to one of a small housing estate with three similar houses all in a suburban row which will be so alien to the design and street-scape of this part of Fitzroy Park . Additionally all the paraphernalia of cars, service vehicles and wheelie bins that will follow will complete the ugly reality.

Please review the accompanying video showing the current feel and tranquillity of the bottom section of Fitzroy Park together with the view we share with our neighbours Ashridge.

### **Road**

Currently 55 Fitzroy Park has one driveway which involves already Lynne and Richard having to reverse their cars onto the road. This at busy times can be difficult and often involves the use of our driveway to facilitate other traffic passing. I have a lot of CCTV footage of a typical traffic jam at our end of Fitzroy Park and the aid provided by Kenview drive.

The proposal to have three driveways with all the cars reversing is seriously dangerous to pedestrians, runners, and other road users and unworkable given the current issues which we experience with just one drive.

Furthermore a layout that incorporates in excess of a 30 m walk from the off-street car parking spaces for Plots 4 and 5 to the dwellings themselves is unfeasible, particularly for delivery vehicles (typical supermarket deliveries, for example, would inevitably mean the delivery vehicle parking on Fitzroy Park, and blocking traffic, potentially for in the region of 30 minutes, whilst unloading and with the delivery driver having to walk up and down the path on numerous occasions

### **Parking**

Much has been said about parking and the point that during the 650 plus pages of supporting documents the developers claim that the site is well served and is not well served by public transport they will have to decide which if it is the former Camden can't grant any car parking permission and if it's the latter then they can't grant any building permission.

KATHY & BRUCE LAMBIE

Although our planning Consultant has clearly stated in his report the proposed granting of 5 car parking spaces is completely contrary to existing policy I wonder if Camden are perhaps going to fudge this by grandfathering 5 spaces as that is what the site currently enjoys ?  
Is this correct ?

Even if this is the case what concerns me more is the displaced parking ? We know how many cars the existing two families who live on Fitzroy Park have and that's without the additional 3 families who will be moving here . We also know how many visitor permits the existing two families have and that without the additional visitors who will come with the additional three families. Please tell me where are they all to park especially as Camden will refuse resident parking permits on the public highway.

### **Hydrological impact**

This is one of the area where there remains today outstanding information so we can only comment on our concerns in having 60% of the site excavated by 5/6 feet and pilings down 25 metres which I understand are half the level of the pilings used for the Shard.

We already have a problem with water backing up to our property and we are extremely concerned that this amount of displacement together with pilings will have a very detrimental effect on properties and trees.

We have seen no structural impact statements of the effect of such extensive sheet piling and the long term ramifications for Kenview and our immediate neighbours.

I now want to comment on some of the wider implications as we are regular users of the Heath ,Millfield Lane and the Ladies pond and generally have concerns for local community.

### **Views from Heath**

Again as stated in Tony Bowhill report para 15:15 “ the proposed massing will be apparent in the views from Hampstead Heath”

KATHY & BRUCE LAMBIE



### **Arboriculture and ecological assessments**

The inaccuracies about the number of trees is unforgivable together with lack of information concerning the impact on rare birds, bats, newts and the decimation of the traditional orchard.

### **Millfield Lane**

I run multiple times a week and together with my running group and indeed many other running groups regularly use Millfield Lane. In all the years I have used this route I can count on one hand how many times I have seen a vehicle on the lane. This is going to change if this proposal is given the all clear. 55 Fitzroy Park currently enjoys 2 vehicle access points and whilst the developer is restraining himself at the moment as soon as plots 4 and 5 are built these access points will come into use. This is already clearly shown on some of the landscape drawings.

An important part of the proposals is for the installation of a pipe below Millfield Lane to reduce the risk of pollution to the Bird Sanctuary Pond Nature Reserve. However we understand that the City of London will not permit this as it will disrupt the existing water regime on Hampstead Heath. Despite the Applicants professional team presumably being aware of this (one would have thought that they would have contacted the City of London prior to the submission of the application) no alternative solution has been suggested. Again for me this represents a glossing over of serious issues which sadly exists throughout these proposals .

### **CMP**

I have seen the substantive document from Mark Shellshear of WSP and share all their concerns especially being one of the main households effected.

### **Tax evasion of Community Infrastructure Levy**

This development is presented as “self-build” with CIL self build exemption forms submitted. Can Camden officers please clarify how this would qualify? Mr Springer who stills remains director and secretary of two property related companies is leading the application without actually

KATHY & BRUCE LAMBIE

[REDACTED]

owning the land . We understand he will only get 60% of the land after he has delivered 3 houses to the Turner-Stoke families . I thought that to qualify for exemption self builders firstly had to buy the land, then design and finally build. It is my understanding that when Mr Springer undertook redevelopment of the Lodge in Fitzroy Park he was not a self builder and paid the appropriate CIL levy. Furthermore his son Ryan Springer is currently a director of 4 real estate related Companies. I would agree with fellow neighbours comments that this group of people are serial property developers presenting a case to avoid paying vital CIL funds which are needed to support the additional services and facilities within the community.

**Lastly I would like to reference the report compiled by our consultant Tony Bowhill which analysis's the planning framework and clearly highlights all the Policy infringements which should alone result in refusal of this speculative application.**

Yours Sincerely

Bruce and Kathy Lambie