

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2023/3816/P	Audrey Mandela for Hampstead Hill Gardens Residents' Association	13/02/2024 15:44:12	OBJ	<p>I write as Chair of the Hampstead Hill Gardens Residents' Association, regarding the revised planning application related to "14a" Hampstead Hill Gardens. The relevant Planning application is 2023/3816/P.</p> <p>Although we appreciate the effort that has gone into modifying the previous plan for the site, we still object to this development. Our objection is based on a number of issues:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Loss of light for neighbours: the proposed structure would loom over 12 Hampstead Hill Gardens and completely cut off light to one side of this home, as well as to 14. It would also block light to the homes and gardens of other surrounding properties, including 2 ½ (the Coach House), 10, and 16 and possibly also to 2 and 2A. This loss of light would seriously reduce the enjoyment and value of the properties of many residents. 2. Inappropriate height, mass and scale of the building: While the new plan is somewhat more in keeping with the style of the street it's still not consistent with either 12 or 14. It will also loom over number 12. No other recent construction in the area does this. Its bulk, form, and massing will cause harm to the street scene on our road. The design and materials would jar with the surrounding buildings. 3. Loss of privacy for surrounding homes: this development would reduce privacy for a number of homes in the street, in particular 12, 14 and 16 but also for 2 1/2, 2, and possibly properties on Rosslyn Hill. It would also remove privacy for several near residents' gardens. This is a serious loss of amenity for these homes. 4. Loss of views for many residents: in addition to blocking light the proposed development would block views of the sky and of Hampstead for several neighbouring properties. 5. Loss of green space and view of greenery: Currently the interior of the curve of Hampstead Hill Gardens is an uninterrupted flow of greenery from the back gardens of the even-numbered homes. The positioning of this development, close to the back wall of the property, would interrupt that flow. Further, the planned design reduces the space allocated to garden space in the development to less than 9m; the area behind the garages and no. 14 was once a single extensive garden with many mature trees. It's still not completely clear where 14 ends and "14a" begins. It would be very unfortunate if the Council were to allow the reduction of the gardens and greenery of a road named for this very feature. 6. Possible risk of flooding: this development would likely create a greater risk of flooding for surrounding homes as more hard surfaces are introduced where previously water could drain away. This problem of rain run-off has already been increased by the relatively new and unauthorised basement construction at number 14, and as mentioned in previous objections there has been flooding at no. 12 recently during heavy rains. In fact, it would appear that the BIA calculation provided with this application don't take into account the basement construction at 14. Further, the applicant's BIA states they found groundwater at 3 meters. It should be clear that a basement at this site would severely limit groundwater flow and should be rejected based on Camden's Basement policies. 7. Risk of ground movement: the creation of a basement creates a serious risk of ground movement in an area where this is already an issue. The applicant's own BIA states: "Construction of the proposed basement will cause ground movements that have the potential to cause damage to existing neighbouring structures." The planned basement would be much too close to number 12, which would undoubtedly see damage and movement from the work. Other homes in the area are very familiar with ground movement on the hill. This project would almost certainly exacerbate the issue. 8. Risk to the Hampstead Tunnel: The proposed property would sit directly above the Hampstead Tunnel. The application does not contain an audit by Campbell Reith that would allow a more technical assessment of the proposed basement works by Network Rail as part of this consultation. The applicant's BIA states: "It should be noted that Network Rail would not permit a borehole extending beyond 6 m unless the existing tunnel was surveyed." It seems reckless to build a large concrete box directly above this tunnel when Network

Application No: **Consultees Name:** **Received:**

Comment: **Response:**

Rail will not even allow a borehole.

Further, a number of homes that currently sit above the tunnel have been plagued by noise and vibration from the London Overground trains and goods trains that make use of the rail line. Adding another structure above the line could make the noise and vibration worse for neighbouring properties if the sound and vibration bounce off another structure rather than dissipating.

9. Noise: aside from the inevitable construction disruption and noise, the original application included an air conditioning unit. It isn't clear to us if that element of the application remains. Camden has already rejected such a unit at 14 (although it apparently remains in place). The disturbance during summer would again dramatically decrease neighbours' enjoyment of their properties.

Finally, as you will know, a number of our residents have over the past several years submitted objections to planning applications related to some or all of the completed or proposed work to the site that was once a single entity, 14 and its garages.

We assume that many of these have been brought to your attention directly; as you will know, the Residents' Association also wrote to Camden in 2020, 2021, 2022 and 2023 on this matter.

There continues to be a serious concern regarding the applicant's actions while renovating 14 Hampstead Hill Gardens and his lack of respect for the planning process, and for neighbours. We ask that Camden review all of the correspondence it has received regarding the work on 14, including the impact on neighbouring properties; the creation of a basement without a Basement Impact Assessment (and through the duplicitous method of dramatically reducing the level of the garden); installing an air conditioning unit without permission; felling a protected tree that was not in fact diseased, etc., etc. It is difficult to trust that this project, if approved, would not go beyond the application's plan, with little recourse for neighbours.

It should be very clear that this development would cause significant harm to neighbours and to the area. We strongly object to this application and urge you to reject it.

Sincerely,
Audrey Mandela
Chair
Hampstead Hill Gardens Residents' Association

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2023/3816/P	Audrey Mandela	13/02/2024 17:31:30	OBJ	<p>I'm writing to object to the revised planning application related to "14a" Hampstead Hill Gardens. The relevant Planning application is 2023/3816/P. Reasons are as follows:</p>

1. Loss of light for neighbours: the proposed structure block light for a number of surrounding properties, including potentially our own at number 2. This loss of light would seriously reduce the enjoyment and value of our properties.
2. Inappropriate height, mass and scale of the building: While the new plan is somewhat more in keeping with the style of the street it's still not consistent with either 12 or 14. It will also loom over number 12.
3. Loss of privacy for surrounding homes: this development would reduce privacy for a number of homes in the street, including our own. There was once a tree that stood between our property and this plot. It was cut down more than a year ago and hasn't been replaced. The back windows would look directly into our garden. The lack of privacy would be a serious loss of amenity for us and others.
4. Loss of views: in addition to blocking light the proposed development would block views of the sky and of Hampstead for our property and others.
5. Loss of green space and view of greenery: The positioning of this development, close to the back wall of the property, and therefore very close to our garden, would interrupt the flow of greenery from the back gardens of the even-numbered properties in our road. The allocated space for a garden for this property is very small. No 14 once had a large garden with mature trees that helped to block sound from the hospital and light from 14 and other buildings. Putting another building where once there were trees would be problematic. And unfortunate if the Council allowed the loss of garden space in a road named "Hampstead Hill Gardens"!
6. Possible risk of flooding: this development would likely create a greater risk of flooding for surrounding homes as more hard surfaces are introduced where previously water could drain away. This problem of rain run-off has already been increased by the relatively new and unauthorised basement construction at number 14. During recent heavy rains the bottom of our garden, which is close to the planned site, flooded. It seems very likely that a basement development down the hill from us would limit groundwater flow.
7. Risk of ground movement: the creation of a basement creates a serious risk of ground movement in an area where this is already an issue, for us and near neighbours.
8. Risk to the Hampstead Tunnel: Our home, built in 1890, sits on top of the tunnel. We have been plagued by noise and vibration from the London Overground trains and goods trains that make use of the rail line. Adding another structure above the line could make the noise and vibration worse for neighbouring properties if the sound and vibration bounce off another structure rather than dissipating.

Finally, I am very concerned about the applicant's actions taken while renovating 14 Hampstead Hill Gardens and his lack of respect for the planning process, and for neighbours. I suggest that Camden take another look at objections and other messages that many of us have sent over the years regarding the work on 14.

We believe this project would cause significant harm to neighbours and to the area. We strongly object to this application and urge you to reject it.

Sincerely,
Audrey Mandela