
From: [REDACTED]
Sent: 14 March 2024 10:40
To: Planning
Subject: Objection to Application 2023/5162/P in respect of 14A Keats Grove

[REDACTED]

We OBJECT to this application on the following grounds:

1 Protected Open Space ("POS").

The new extension will be partly built in the POS of Keats Grove, South End Road and Downshire Hill. **This is contrary to Policy A2.**

The Camden pre app letter to the applicant of October 2023 (" the PreApp") confirms that this encroachment is "*technically contrary*" but then says, almost with relief, that in the light of the previous much larger development, that the new use of the POS is smaller.

- **It may be smaller but it is still an encroachment.**

The POS is a wonderful amenity that a large number of us cherish. It provides a haven for wildlife, absorbs pollution and noise and is exactly what a green borough should encourage.

The impact here is seemingly modest but it creates a precedent which is unwanted and unwise.

- **We submit that any unnecessary use of the POS should be refused.**

Recommendation: The extension should be reduced to keep within the current footprint. The development would not be damaged in any significant manner given the large overall floor area.

2 The Construction Management Plan is mentioned as needed in the PreApp.

We appreciate that a Construction Management Plan is often provided after approval of a planning application when a builder is appointed and is then looked at by Council Officers.

- **However in this case, we submit that here there are so many serious access, traffic, amenity, safeguarding and environmental issues that the applicant should address these (even if not in detail) BEFORE approval.**

- Leaving the Construction Management Plan until after approval would deprive the many interested parties of any input.

Rationale:

A) Access to the Site is very restricted. Lorry and large vehicle access to 14A appears almost impossible.

- Keats Grove is very narrow, especially at this point. It is one medium lorry wide.
- The drive from house to road is long and narrow. The drive is partially obstructed by 14 Keats Grove.
- Experience with the works currently at 12/12B Keats Grove demonstrates the access challenges clearly.
 - a. The 12/12B site has much large double width gates allowing trucks to enter, albeit with great difficulty and damaging the pavement at times. 14A has a really small access point.
- The works are extensive and will need a large number of lorries, skips and deliveries. Excavation for the very large basement alone will mean a many cubic metres of spoil removal.

The application should set out how this can be done without disrupting the neighbourhood. – through the house; where will the skips be? How will the skips be removed?

B) Pedestrian and other traffic.

- Pedestrians: The pavement of Keats Grove is very narrow - often one or two persons wide. Keats Grove is busy with tourists (for Keats House and looking at Hampstead), young children (for the library, Keats House and walking from school) and visitors using Hampstead Heath (it is one of the key routes).

○ The Library is opposite this site and has 6000 visitors a month.

- Cars etc: The road is narrow and has constant traffic. It is a relief road to Downshire Hill which has enough traffic.

- **Safety: Any access plan needs to demonstrate that the existing public users will be able to use Keats Grove safely at all times when works are ongoing.**

C) Work on Site: The existing house fills the plot making access to the extension essentially through the house, which is retained. As the work is so extensive, the applicant needs to show how this will work. Where will materials be stored?

A Construction Management Plan in advance is clearly essential for planners (and other parties) to assess the potential impact of the works.

3 Design.

Keats Grove and Downshire Hill preserve some of the best architectural features in London. Many houses are listed. It is common ground, and stated in the PreApp that any new building should enhance the area.

The PreApp, reading between the (polite) lines, is really scathing on the design. Extracts:

- *"The two scale nature.. modernist design means the extension dominates the irregular site ..[Extension is]larger than the dwelling"*
- *"..Modernist appearing at odds with the main dwelling house."*
- *"The two styles appear at odds resulting In a contrived and incongruous proposal"*
- *" No link bringing the ..house ..to the extension".*
- *"It would help to reduce the scale of the extension, making it single height... ensuring that the architecture is less harsh.."*

The PreApp conclusion even says that it *"needs further work"* and *" a two story extension in this location would appear excessive"* ; Further amendments needed. *"To ensure ..highest standard of design.. (to) preserve the nature of the conservation area..etc "*

We agree with all this and add that to us the new extension looks more like a 70's school building from the garden and is indeed incongruous.

4 Environment:

As stated in the PreApp, there needs to be more work on noise, overlooking (it is far more visible than stated) green roof detail etc

Thank you for taking this objection into consideration

Yours Sincerely

Steven and Victoria Bobasch
12a Keats Grove
NW3 2RN