

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2023/2258/P	Robert Jones	21/07/2023 14:55:59	OBJ	<p>I am writing on behalf of South Hampstead High School (SHHS) in objection to the above application. South Hampstead High School is one of 23 schools which are part of the Girls Day School Trust (GDST). The land adjacent to 20 Crediton Hill has been owned by the Girls Day School Trust since 1997 and has been leased since then to Hampstead Cricket Club. During term time, under the terms of the lease, South Hampstead High School has sole use of the Sports Ground which means that school PE lessons are undertaken on the land adjacent to this proposed development for 34 weeks of the year.</p> <p>The proposed development at 20 Crediton Hill hopes to convert a single-story office to a three-storey residential dwelling. This is a significant change of use to a building which sits directly on the boundary of GDST's land. By its very nature as a residential property, it will be occupied at all hours of the day and it sits much closer to our land than any other neighbour.</p> <p>The residential property will have uninterrupted views across the land where our pupils (girls aged 4 to 18) play netball, football, cricket and athletics. GDST and South Hampstead High School have serious safeguarding concerns with the residents of this property being able to [REDACTED] from immediate proximity. We understand that the only measures in the proposal taken to mitigate this risk are the installation of louvered blinds. Such blinds will, however, remain at the sole control of the residents, which of course means they could be always left open.</p> <p>Our other significant concern is the changes that this proposal plans to make to GDST's property. The owner of 20 Crediton Hill has not made any contact with GDST or SHHS. The drawings included within the Planning Application appear to remove the existing boundary (party) wall separating the sports ground from the neighbour's property, replacing it with the front of the new dwelling. This wall was only recently installed by the GDST and any changes to it require GDST's consent. The plans also show that the area in front of the proposed property, i.e. GDST's land, as being level whereas, in reality, there is a large raised bed which will have to be removed. This bed belongs to GDST and the owner of 20 Crediton Hill has not been in touch to discuss removing it. GDST would not agree to remove this bed. Any work on GDST's land requires GDST's (and HCC's) permission.</p> <p>Robert Jones Director of Finance &amp; Operations South Hampstead High School for and on behalf of The Girls' Day School Trust</p>

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2023/2258/P	Jean Scott	23/07/2023 16:59:37	OBJ	<p>As Headteacher of Southhampstead High School from 1993 - 2001, I was very involved in the purchase by the Girls' Day School Trust of the freehold of the Hampstead Cricket Club in 1997. Safeguarding of the pupils during the hours from 8:30 - 5:00 daily was a priority, and much time and effort was spent by myself, my Staff and the GDST, in working with our neighbours in Crediton Hill and the Cumberland Club to ensure that their wishes could be accommodated within modern safeguarding requirements for our pupils. Suffice it to say, over the years we have reached amicable agreement, and now 26 years later relationships with Crediton Hill neighbours are totally harmonious. I agree totally with their objections to this building.</p> <p>The proposed development of the "studio", which became, strangely, a "residential dwelling", to be three stories high, next to the boundary fence and overlooking the School Sports Ground is totally unacceptable. At the foot of the garden it is totally outside the existing Crediton Hill building line. Aesthetically, a "modern building, lightweight and durable" is out of keeping in a Conservation Area, where the surrounding buildings are at least one hundred years old. To have a "glass walled basement" is not acceptable in this day and age.</p> <p>I trust that this proposed development will not be allowed.</p>
2023/2258/P	Donald Macleod	22/07/2023 17:31:47	INT	<p>The houses on Crediton Hill which back on to the open sports playing facilities of Hampstead Cricket Club and Cumberland Lawn Tennis Club all have varying lengths of gardens, the ends of which form the boundary with the two Clubs. Hampstead Cricket Club has been there since 1877, well before Crediton Hill was created and the houses on that road were built. The gardens all have large mature trees which provide a natural screen and backdrop between the houses and the cricket and playing field. No other house has any buildings at the end of their garden.</p> <p>This application proposes a large, three level building which is completely out of character with all of the surroundings. If allowed it will become a permanent "eyesore" in what otherwise is a well balanced and attractively planned area.</p> <p>The adjacent cricket and sports ground is used solely from 8.30am to 5pm, on Mondays to Fridays, during term time, by South Hampstead Hill School for Girls, for whom safeguarding of its is paramount for the School. If this new building is permitted, it will be the only property with close up and potential permanent viewing of the girls during their sports time. Outside these school hours Hampstead Cricket Club, which also has stringent safeguarding procedures, offers cricket and other sports on the site.</p> <p>Cricket has been played there since 1877; never before has a building such as this been permitted. The applicant will be 100% aware that the proposed building is adjacent to a cricket field, and therefore it is quite possible to be hit by cricket balls. I personally cannot see any reason to approve this application but, if planning approval is granted, the Council needs to include a condition, to be binding for ever, that forbids any present or future owner, tenant, resident or anyone else who may at any time be on that property, from claiming against the Club, Trust or School for any sort of cricket ball or other related damage!</p> <p>It is also difficult to tell but, from the artist's impression of the proposed building, it seems that the applicant is attempting to build over, or on, part of the freehold land of Hampstead Cricket Club, and over or including the boundary wall, which was recently repaired and renewed, to the benefit of all adjacent home owners, at no cost to them, but at great expense by the freehold owner, The Girls Day School Trust. This surely cannot be allowed!</p>

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2023/2258/P	Lejovnam	23/07/2023 23:49:32	OBJ	<p>Re: Planning Application 2023/2258/P</p> <p>Proposed Demolition of existing building and erection of part two storey plus basement dwellinghouse and associated works. This proposal concerns an existing building at the end of the communal gardens of 22 Crediton Hill, and up against the boundary line with Hampstead Cricket Club on the East, and up against the boundary line of a private house and garden at 20 Crediton Hill.</p> <p>The property concerned is within the West End Green Conservation Area. Houses on Crediton Hill are mainly brick semi-detached and in the Arts and Crafts style, built in and around 1906.</p> <p>20 Crediton Hill is a larger property and is comprised of flats. The communal gardens at the rear of the property also have garages along the north boundary. These garages are in use and accessed by a private drive at the side of the main house and along the boundary with number 22. They are largely obscured from view due to the angled position of the site in relation to Crediton Hill. Planning Permission for the garages was granted in 1956.</p> <p>Since 1985 Planning Permission was granted for a single storey conservatory in the North-East are of the site adjoining the garages. This 'conservatory' served as ancillary use to the main house. Two attempts to extend both up and out, incorporating two of the garages were refused Planning Permission in 1988 and 1990 respectively. The earlier refusal concerned an attempt to modify the ancillary use of the existing 'conservatory' into a self-contained residential property on top. In 2007 permission to extend down and form a basement under one of the garages was granted.</p> <p>In 2018 an application for the provision of a new basement extension below the existing single storey premises, (originally referred to as 'conservatory') was granted Planning Permission. Considering the two prior refusals, the Council appeared to accept that the existing building could be extended downward precisely because it preserved the existing overall scale of the existing building.</p> <p>In 2023, consent was applied again, presumably as a result of the lapsed 2018 permission, but with the additional change of use, from ancillary to 'designated stand alone residential'.</p> <p>The existing building has served as ancillary accommodation attached to the main building at number 22. It would not have been envisaged as a self-contained, stand-alone residential property when first granted permission in 1985. The site that contains the main house, the garages, the communal gardens and the side drive is larger than the rest of the terraces on Crediton Hill, as it reflects the historical origins of a house that pre-dates the terraces built in 1906. Nevertheless, the rear communal garden of the main house is already compromised by the existing structures that are crowded along the north east quadrant of the site. None of the existing structures merit any architectural value and are all in a varying state of disrepair and poor maintenance. Moreover, the building that was constructed in 1985, reflects the tastes of the day for quasi-industrial modern roof designs and large expanses of glazing. The 'conservatory' makes no reference and forms no architectural relationship to any of the buildings on Crediton Hill. There is no attempt to address the position of the main house, and if any contextual relationship is acknowledged, it is to the side access drive on the West side, and to the Cricket pitch on the East. None of the materials used have any relation to the existing houses, the predominantly red brick used both on the main building or the terraces that continue to both sides of the site. The curved form of the roof is incongruous to any structure in the vicinity and it is</p>

Application No: Consultees Name: Received:

Comment:

Response:

unclear how it relates to the structure of the conservatory itself. In short, the building was never considered carefully nor were the materials and forms conceived with any regard for the existing context. 40 years later, it remains the eyesore that it always was, and all of the materials have aged poorly. There is no argument for preserving it and therefore demolition is by far the right thing to do.

However, this unfortunate history relating to the existing building that is the subject of this application should not be grounds for compounding the negative effects and the Council should not approve anything that repeats the travesties of the past. The main consideration should be to hold the applicant to a higher standard of design and a higher standard of quality of architecture. It is not to say that a new proposal must not be modern, on the contrary, the site is unique enough to merit a modern approach, but it is not enough to use superficial references to 'modern design', 'sustainability' or 'lightweight but durable' when the architectural drawings, the rendered elevations and diagrammatic sketches have only given cursory consideration to how this new much larger stand-alone house will relate to the context in reality and why exactly it claims to be a high quality design. It is unclear why the proposal claims to be 'lightweight but durable' when more than half the proposed structure is reinforced concrete, a material that is neither lightweight, nor sustainable.

Due to the recent political controversy related to basement developments, planning applications that propose basements have extensive requirements for a variety of highly technical issues related to the existing land, neighbouring properties, drainage and potential damage to existing structures on the site and nearby. Applicants are obliged to make substantial financial investments long before anything is built. That may be one way to encourage responsible development, but it also has the danger of overshadowing the importance of good architectural design in relation to everything above ground.

In the case of this proposal, the basement is the best solution to increasing the volume, and again, as is evident in the planning history of the site, precisely because it is the only way to preserve the subservient nature of a new building in the back gardens of a host building, along a residential street and backing onto an open sports field. The rear elevation of a garden structure should be subtle and private given the proximity to the boundary. If the origins of a conservatory building at the back and side of a large house were so very obviously ancillary to the main house, why does the proposal create a 3 storey façade facing away from the house? The orientation of the communal areas of the house on top of the private spaces at lower ground level, confirm an about-face from the origins of the 'conservatory'. The host building now looks down on a building that has turned itself away from the main house, erasing any traces of the original.

The proposal is objectionable not because it is 'modern' or because it does not seek to compete with the Arts and Crafts style, it is objectionable because of the unsympathetic scale, massing, position, relationship to the existing context and the imposition of a new, contrived siting. In response to local concerns regarding the proposed massing and materials some very limited attempts were made to mitigate the overshadowing and overlooking of a 2 storey proposal. By simply annotating a schematic elevation with 'reflective material' to denote a substantial elevation towering 1.8 m above the existing tall boundary fence can only be evidence of a reluctance to consider the impact of such an out of scale dominance would have on a neighbouring property.

The schematic nature of the rendered drawings with reference to a non-specific 'reflective surface' and how it would impact the neighbouring properties, or why a repetitive vertically detailed cladding system in the form of movable louvers would enhance the design and why this should be accepted as 'quality design'? In 1985, a

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
				<p>curved metal roof with extensive 'green anti-sun' glazing was probably thought to be stylish and good quality design too. The Design Access Statement that accompanies the proposal reads like a marketing brochure.</p> <p>The West End Conservation Area is designated a Conservation Area for good reason. There are very successful examples of modern extensions in the gardens along the terrace of adjoining properties. The substantial gardens are long and reach all the way to the cricket pitch or to the tennis courts of the large open space at the rear. Houses have long reaching views across from a variety of angles, and in the summer the gardens are framed from all sides by greenery and a variety of mature trees. Some of the gardens are natural habitats for wildlife and a variety of plant life. The open space at the back affords these rear gardens an abundance of light and exposure to the elements which must be preserved. The imposition of structures far above the existing fence lines, is not a positive contribution to any of the amenity that exists at the rear of Crediton Hill.</p> <p>The side access drive and the dilapidated mix of existing garages at number 20 are an anomaly and would benefit from demolition but this proposal worsens the problem by creating an additional verticality at the very place where a lower profile to any proposed structures is needed. There must be a greater effort required of proposals that go beyond the limits of garden development.</p>

---

Printed on: 24/07/2023 09:10:06

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2023/2258/P	Cllr Sharon Hardwick	23/07/2023 15:40:45	COMM	<p>Cllr Sharon Hardwick Camden Town Hall Judd Street London WC1H 9JE</p> <p>22 July 2023</p> <p>Dear Mr Hodgson, RE: 20 Crediton Hill Planning application 2023/2258/P</p> <p>I am writing on behalf of local residents and users of the Hampstead Cricket Club and the South Hampstead Girls' School playing fields to express concerns with Planning Application 2023/2258/P.</p> <p>This is an infill site between 20 and 22 Crediton Hill in the West Hampstead ward. There have also been strong objections from the West End Green Conservation Area Advisory committee, Fortune Green and West Hampstead NDF, and Hampstead Cricket Club itself whose boundaries look to be breached with the removal of their boundary wall and the planned property directly overlooking the pitches, which are owned by South Hampstead Girls' School and used by their pupils as well as the Cricket Club.</p> <p>I would like to request that this application go to a full planning committee for discussion.</p> <p>From the objections that have been made, it is additionally not clear that the applicant has any ownership or share of ownership for the right of way of the pedestrian and vehicular access to the land for the proposed development, or to the proposed boundary that directly borders Cricket Club land. The plan also notes removal of trees that are not owned by the applicant and are long established within the boundaries of the properties of 20 and 22 Crediton Hill.</p> <p>I further note that while the plans describe a two-storey property with basement, the accompanying images in the application illustrate a building with three storeys above ground, (p13 of the plans).</p> <p>Additionally, the plans show two offices and a 26.5 sq. m shared workspace capable of "holding meetings and workshops" which, as a resident has noted, would indicate that the intention is not to use it solely for residential purposes and could lead to an increase in foot and vehicular traffic in what objectors have already established is very narrow (and contested) access.</p> <p>The Fortune Green and West Hampstead NDF notes that the Local Plan, adopted by Camden Council, has specific notes on Infill and Garden Developments (page 19 paras A12, A13) which states that infill development:</p> <p>"Should be built to the same scale and of similar materials, and that garden developments should be avoided but should anyway have a much lower profile than the existing housing."</p> <p>I would also like to refer to page 44, item 6.3 of the West End Green Conservation Area Appraisal and Management Strategy, also adopted by Camden Council, which says:</p> <p>"new work should reflect the materials, colour palette, scale, and character of the area".</p>

Printed on: 24/07/2023 09:10:06

Application No:      Consultees Name:      Received:

Comment:

Response:

This issue of the proposed design and the character of this Edwardian Conservation Area has also been noted on many of the objections logged thus far.

Furthermore, residents and users of the Cricket Club and school grounds are extremely uncomfortable that the design of this property will directly [REDACTED] playing on the pitches. I understand that the school is also submitting a strong objection to the plans.

I hope that these concerns and those of the residents of the West Hampstead ward can be addressed before planning permission is granted and reiterate my request that this application is discussed at full committee.

Yours faithfully,  
Sharon Hardwick  
Councillor, West Hampstead

---

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2023/2258/P	Dr Lara Lagutina	23/07/2023 12:13:18	OBJ	<p>Dear Edward,</p> <p>I am a resident and a flat owner at 20 Crediton Hill and would like to submit my objection to this planning application (allocated reference 2023/2258/P) going ahead because I strongly feel that peaceful enjoyment of my property would be adversely affected should this planning permission be granted. I list the reasons for my objection below.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"><li>1. The new development would deprive me of private recreational / resting space in the communal garden because the proposed sliding doors would be overlooking that space, which would mean that it is no longer private and secluded, and that whenever I sit there I would be in full view of the residents of the new development.</li><li>2. This development would also mean losing some exotic trees (e.g. palm trees) in the garden, which would affect the quality and the beauty of garden and the private secluded spaces it currently offers.</li><li>3. It would affect the refuse and waste spaces essential for the day-to-day life of the house residents. We do not have enough bins as it is and adding any greater volume of waste to the existing one if simply unsustainable. The allocated bin space is full if not overflowing already and this issue would seriously impact the quality of life and the aesthetic value of the house exterior.</li><li>4. And last but not least, the building works that would ensue as a result of the planning application being granted would last for a significant length of time and would be disruptive to my daily life and the peaceful enjoyment of my home.</li></ol> <p>I trust that the Council will take my objection and the reasons for it into account in making a decision in relation to this planning application.</p> <p>Kind regards,</p> <p>Dr Lara Lagutina</p>

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:	Printed on: 24/07/2023 09:10:06	
2023/2258/P	Jordan Potter	21/07/2023 18:30:28	OBJ	<p>Mr E Hodgson Planning Solutions Team 5 Pancras Square London N1C 4AG</p> <p>21 July 2023</p> <p>Dear Edward,</p> <p>Ref: Planning Application 2023/2258 - Demolition of existing building and erection of part single part two storey plus basement dwellinghouse and associated works</p> <p>The Girist Day School Trust (GDST) are the freeholders of land at 25 Lymington Road and Landlord to the Hampstead Cricket Club (HCC), who occupy the grounds on a long lease with shared access arrangements by South Hampstead High School. As immediate neighbours to this major development, the GDST are an important stakeholder and the age of our students makes them vulnerable to the types of impacts that will be associated with this development. As such, the GDST vehemently object to planning application 2023/2258 for the reasons outlined below.</p> <p>[REDACTED]</p> <p>The proposed elevations of the scheme show a major invasion of our [REDACTED]. Whilst it is acknowledged that there is an existing view over the sports ground, the current proposals give additional views at lower and high levels. We recognise that the proposed scheme provides for louvres over the windows, but nevertheless, our [REDACTED] is further compromised by the introduction of the additional windows. Given that [REDACTED] use the ground on a daily basis, we strongly believe that further views across the field are alarming and a safeguarding concern.</p> <p>Light Spill/Light Reflection</p> <p>The submitted proposals fail to identify how the scheme will counter the affects of unwanted light spill from the proposed windows. Our pupils use the sports ground into the afternoon in winter months and the light spillage could detrimentally affect teaching and learning. Similarly, during bright and sunny days in the summer, the glare and reflection from the windows and the proposed aluminium cladding will adversely affect our pupils. It is beyond doubt that the impact of the light spill and reflection will negatively impact our pupils as well as the neighbours, visitors and the HCC.</p> <p>Circular Economy and Whole Life Carbon</p> <p>The current proposals show that the existing building will be demolished, and a new building erected in its place. This approach completely goes against the principles of circular economy in terms of reusing and refurbishing existing buildings. Sensitively retrofitting the existing building stock should be considered first. This is a crucial theme throughout the London Plan in order to combat the Climate Change emergency.</p> <p>It is acknowledged that in line with Policy D3 (Optimising Site Capacity Through the Design-led Approach) in</p>		

Application No: Consultees Name: Received:

Comment:

Response:

the London Plan (2021), development proposals should seek to optimise the capacity of sites. However, it is considered that this is overdevelopment and will result in an incongruous development, which is predominately traditional Victorian dwellings.

Additionally, logistics information has been submitted in support of the planning application, which outlines high-level details in relation to the construction of the proposals. However, due to the close proximity of the development site to the sports ground, serious health and safety concerns are raised. Students at the sports ground are, of course, young people who will spend time on the grounds throughout the day. Their health and wellbeing are of paramount importance, and it is clear to us that the construction stage of these works could be extremely disruptive.

#### Incongruous Design

The proposed development does not respect or reflect the existing and established building line along Credon Hill and this will be substantially and irreversibly altered as a result of this development. Fundamentally, the proposed building materials are not appropriate whatsoever and are not in keeping with the existing buildings in the immediate setting. The property is situated within the West End Green Conservation Area (WEGCA). There is also limited reference within the submission to the Appraisal and Management Strategy for this Conservation Area dated 28 February 2011. The GDST categorically disagrees with the applicant's position set out within the design and access statement that the development will contribute to the WEGCA. The GDST has reviewed the objection to the development by the Chair of the WECA Advisory Committee dated 07 July and the Trust concurs with all statements contained therein.

#### Boundary Ownership

Finally, the proposal shows incorrect land ownership details. The proposal shows the removal of the existing timber railway sleepers. The boundary wall and railway sleepers are owned by the GDST and permission is not given for any alteration of the railway sleepers on the GDST's land. The GDST have not been consulted on any aspect of the proposals put forward by the applicant. As a key adjacent freeholder, the GDST finds the lack of engagement by the applicant as astonishing and insensitive.

The GDST hopes that you will reject this planning application considering the immense impact it will have on our pupils and staff, local residents and the HCC. We hope these comments are taken into consideration when determining the planning application.

Yours sincerely,

Jordan Potter MRICS  
GDST Estates Manager  
GDST Estates Department  
For and on behalf of The Girls' Day School Trust

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2023/2258/P	Ron Marx	22/07/2023 18:14:15	COMMENT	<p>These are my objections to the above development.</p> <p>I own and now rent out my flat 3A 20 Crediton Hill. It has a small terrace with steps leading down to the communal gardens. The proposed development will affect the use of the secluded area at the back of the garden which will be made redundant by the proposed direct opening of this new building through sliding doors onto the communal patio. Previously users were not overlooked as the existing wall was opaque. In addition this is the only part of the garden with a view beyond the boundary wall onto the green. My tenant of 5 years is very upset by this. as are all of the tenants of the house.</p> <p>Looking at the proposal, i feel that the addition of a second above ground floor is both ugly and completely out of character with the main building and does not suit the conservation area.</p> <p>A very important feature of the communal garden is the mature and valuable trees that are next to and around the proposed development. I believe that these may be effected both</p> <p>by the proposed building work and by the effect of shade caused by an additional second storey.</p> <p>I believe that such a large structure on a very small piece of land will be problematic in several ways. The main house is fully occupied, an additional 3 storey house can potentially greatly increase the number of occupants using the garden, bin facilities and very narrow access side road. There is at the moment very little turning space for cars and an increase of traffic will be precarious and possibly dangerous.</p> <p>I understand that the basement will be dug by hand and can only conclude that this will be a very messy and above all a very long process. This will effect and intrude peaceful enjoyment of all the residents over a long period.</p> <p>In conclusion, I have read the objections of my fellow residents and flat owners and I endorse all their detailed objections.</p>