

From: Karen Beare [REDACTED]
Sent: 19 June 2019 00:12
To: Thuair, Charles [REDACTED]
Cc: Little, Tom [REDACTED]; Vicki Harding [REDACTED]; John Kennedy [REDACTED]; Kathy Lambie [REDACTED]; Harley Atkinson [REDACTED]; Bob Warnock [REDACTED]; Marc Hutchinson [REDACTED]; Michael Hammerson [REDACTED]; Steve Barber [REDACTED]; Nicola Mayhew [REDACTED]
Subject: 2019/0666/P - 53 Fitzroy Park trees

Charles

I note this Applicant has provided a few further documents to support 2019/0666/P - Condition 7- Trees & 2019/0665/P - Condition 5 - Landscaping and these were uploaded onto the Councils portal today.

My initial comments are as follows:

1. The Addendum AIA, considering the use of a Private Road by No53 is incomplete
This document is supposed to be 16 pages long, but pages 10 - 16 inclusive are blank, so none of the Appendices have been included namely Appendix 1, 2 and 3. Obviously FPRA and other stakeholders are unable to comment fully on this document until the missing Appendices are provided. Please advise.

However, what I can immediately confirm to the Council, on behalf of FPRA, is that Mr Hollis of Landmark Trees is incorrect in his statement that the significant development of Fitzroy Farm did not require re-engineering of the carriageway. It did, and about half of the lower part of the carriageway (up to No51 Fitzroy Park) was both re-engineered to facilitate construction and also then re-surfaced after the 3-year project was over.

And what Mr Hollis has also omitted to consider in this blanket statement, is that the proposed CMP for the basement and new dwelling at 53 Fitzroy Park, is a factor of at least x3 the number of HGVs required to build Fitzroy Farm, 51 FP or the Lodge totalling over 30,000 sqft between them.

I believe the HGV loading for 53 FP was compared to over 60 fully-laden Jumbo Jets in order for everyone to get a feel of the impact on the environment and the carriageway of this proposed development.

2. Arboricultural Method Statement

I have printed out this 33-page document and the details of the arboricultural proposals need careful reading and consideration. We would be grateful if you could please confirm the deadline for consultation on this and the Landscaping Condition 5 - 2019/0665/P.

FPRA will be commenting on this document more fully in due course, but what we immediately note is that Mr Hollis has once again relied in his documents on CMP details that have already been confirmed to the Council by WSP Global, once again on Monday this week, as being incorrect, and misleading.

For example, the Phase 1 Loading Platform has been exaggerated by almost a half to include an area that is 2.2m lower than the existing driveway. This area is currently accessed by very steep stairs from a much reduced very narrow driveway and overshadowed by the two very healthy Sycamores, one of which has a TPO on it. To use this space would require backfilling the entire area, changing the levels by at least 2.2m directly adjacent to these two trees. The final ground level would be more than half way up their trunks.

Photographs previously sent to the Council show the proximity of this proposed platform (and Phase 2 & 3 platforms) to be much nearer to these two trees than suggested on the drawings submitted. An overlay of the 2010 Arbtec Tree Constraints Plan, used to support a previous Application at this site, also appears to show the RPAs of these two trees extending much further into the site than shown here.

Mr Hollis for Landmark Trees has overseen the entire clearing of a heavily wooded Private Open Space site. All but 7 of the original 29 trees are left and these are located along the FP carriageway. The previous canopy covered almost the entire site and acted as a green buffer to the Heath as part of an important wildlife corridor. It is a now shocking sight to behold. It looks like a clearing in the Amazon rainforest and will take generations to recover. It is therefore vital the Council affords these 7 remaining trees every protection.

3. Landscaping

Our initial observation is that this Applicant appears not to have addressed the fundamental issue of 70% of his Private Open Space site, adjacent to Hampstead Heath, being developed by a combination of footprint, hard landscaping and SUDs. The footprint cannot be reduced at this stage, but the total amount of hard landscaping can - and needs to be - reduced radically. This will have a knock on effect of also reducing the area of SUDs needed for re-infiltration and will ultimately reduce the total figure of 70%, to a more acceptable percentage of this POS site.

Having also now read the H&HS & KLPA letter, summarising the Opinion of leading counsel, Paul Brown QC regarding Policy A2, FPRA will in due course be highlighting relevant considerations of this Policy with regard to this site and the issues raised here.

KR Karen
Chair - FPRA