

Re: [2023/3081/P](#). Pool filtration and irrigation sheds
[2023/3078/P](#). Games hall and gallery
[2023/3074/P](#). Gym
[2023/3072/P](#). Swimming pool

These 4 applications for 5 outbuildings clearly amount to being the same as the single application 2022/5583/P that Camden refused after a large number of local residents objected, as did Tulip Siddiq MP. I object to all these applications:

- The applicant has been completely disingenuous in trying to get permission for these 5 buildings, having gained permission to demolish a summer house (2021/6257/P) with the promise to re-landscape and re-wild the gardens with an emphasis on biodiversity, and the removal of an existing swimming pool. The original application should be upheld with all the associated landscaping and biodiversity, and these applications should be refused in the same way that 2022/5583/P was refused.
- One reason Camden refused 2022/5583/P was that the applicant must “reasonably require” these buildings, as opposed to being an “unrestrained whim”. How can the same family of 4 suddenly reasonably require this when there was no mention of it in the original 2021 application. Taking to account the already massive extension to the house outwards and underground, the “reasonable requirement” of this for any residential family purpose is frankly laughable. All these facilities could easily be incorporated into the main dwelling.
- Their garden is a huge “T” shape that is nearly 100 meters wide and 90 meters long. It connects to no less than 14 other houses (and many more flats), all of which are already adversely affected on the whim of one small family. The current building works (much without planning permission) are already having a major adverse visual impact. They have already taken the axe to a number of mature trees, and laid a large amount of concrete. They do not seem to be getting the message that you get permission before building!
- A swimming pool, games room etc., yards from my property, is not in keeping with a Conservation Area or section 6 of the Redington Froggnal Neighbourhood plan, and does not bode well for the quiet leafy neighbourhood that we thought we moved to.
- It’s interesting that they put the noisy pumps etc as far as possible from their own house. Just place them by your neighbours instead! Shouldn’t they be underground anyway? At least ensure that pool pumps, games rooms (“dance zone” in original application) etc. are sound proofed.
- How can this all be possible when people around here are unable to make minor alterations to their property, due to being in a conservation area etc..?

Individually the applications can easily be incorporated into the main dwelling, and collectively they are the same as the original application that was refused. individually or collectively these applications are not reasonably required. This is also why they weren’t in the original 2021 application. Please uphold 2021/6257/P thereby not adversely affecting the 14++ adjoining properties, and not wrecking local biodiversity, and ruining the lovely leafy Hampstead views

Please can you reply to this stating that it will be taken to account, and loaded into the portal.

Dr Robert Leane

Copper House, 2X Chesterford Gardens, London, NW3 7DE