

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2023/3816/P	Jasbinder Bains	13/02/2024 08:29:19	OBJNOT	<p>I have never see such an extreme play of the planning system as is the case with this application, to which I object for at least the following reasons:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none">1. 14 Hampstead Hill Gardens has historically been one property - a house and adjoining garages. The developer is setting a precedent in claiming it is two separate titles and seeking to develop the outbuildings and garden behind those outbuildings.2. The proposed basement mass and volume appear too large relative to Camden's own guidelines, whether or not you accept that '14a' historically and intrinsically remains outbuildings that are a part of 14 Hampstead Hill Gardens.3. The light/air analysis shows clear harm and does not take into account the current light/air harm from the existing basement development at the same site.4. The risk assessment associated with the proposal relative to the train tunnel running underneath does not acknowledge the existing basement - it was developed without engaging the appropriate authorities - and there is a heightened risk of catastrophic failure with an adjacent development on this scale at the same property5. There is a heightened risk of flooding with two proposed basements adjoining each other at the same property. The flood risk does not take into account the existing basement at the same site, which was developed without a flood risk assessment. <p>Finally, this same developer has previously at 14 Hampstead Hill Gardens conducted material unapproved works, some of which still have not been approved. This included the unapproved felling of multiple tress and industrial-scale soil leveling. This developer has flouted other planning rules, for example, by letting out parts of 14 Hampstead Hill Gardens as short term lets lets without proper authorisation to do so, and then attempting to suggest the required remediation required by Camden was fulfilled when that was not the case. Representations in the planning application should be viewed accordingly.</p>
