

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2024/1174/P	G Power	06/04/2024 21:00:14	OBJ	<p>I realise that the residents of Flat 2, 80 Greencroft Gardens are looking to create what for them is an amazing home, but my concern about this planning application is not just about how it affects my property and the enjoyment of my property, but whether it stays true to the South Hampstead Conservation Area Character Appraisal &amp; Management Strategy, which I believe is what guides the planning process in the area.</p> <p>Firstly, this area IS prone to flooding.</p> <p>The application number 2024/1174/P shows a garden that is concreted over. This will make the area even more prone to flooding, together with the adverse effect on biodiversity.</p> <p>The South Hampstead Flood Action Group does not specify in particular Canfield Gardens or Greencroft Gardens, but rising groundwater levels are a perennial problem in the area, and there is a basement at 83 Canfield Gardens.</p> <p>A Damp Investigation Report carried out at 83 Canfield Gardens by surveyors in 2012 mentions that "this area of London sits on a stream and is partially prone to flooding in times of heavy or prolonged rainfall".</p> <p>The garden at 83 Canfield Gardens used to get flooded a couple of times a year, and now it is a regular and persistent occurrence, since 2021. I have also lost a mature magnolia tree as a result.</p> <p>No mention in the planning application number 2024/1174/P is made of the mature ash tree on the property – one of a dwindling bunch of mature trees in this stretch of South Hampstead, and a tree that rises well above the tops of the building, and which must be over 100 years old.</p> <p>I would refer to Sections 12.17, 13.30 and 13.31 of the South Hampstead Conservation Area Character Appraisal &amp; Management Strategy.</p> <p>I would also refer to Camden Council Planning Application 2019/1628/P, Conditions 6-8, as it appears that these conditions have not been upheld.</p> <p>With regard to the shutters and the pergola, I would like to point to Section 13.42 of the South Hampstead Conservation Area Character Appraisal and Management Strategy, which reads:</p> <p>"There are many attractive, historic rear elevations in the conservation area, visible both from neighbouring gardens and often in long views (e.g..across the private amenity spaces). As such, alterations and extensions to the rear elevations of buildings in the conservation area should respect the historic pattern of development, and preserve the character and historic features of existing buildings."</p> <p>Neither the shutters nor the pergola respect the 'historic pattern of development, and preserve the character and historic features of existing buildings". And neither does the bay window. Other windows in the area tend to be linear rather than circular.</p> <p>In addition, this planning application includes "external roller shutters to basement windows and doors" and to "singular door at ground floor level. Shutters to be GLV-INS95 Insulated Model (Quiet Operation Model)." However, no measurement of sound is given.</p>

**Application No:**    **Consultees Name:**    **Received:**    **Comment:**    **Response:**

The name of the pergola as a pergola could be misleading, as from the view from the garden of 83 Canfield Gardens it is a black, metal, closed-in structure.

The 'view as proposed' document is also misleading. It features a tree to the right that does not exist; sedum roofs are not bushy as shown; the pots are decorative; it does not show where the paving extends to, and how it will affect the tree; and it is not clear what is to scale and what is not... in reality, for example, the ridge of the main roof at No 80 is higher than the two neighbouring properties.

The application also increases the floor area of the property, which already is at a maximum compared with adjoining properties.

I apologise for bringing up so many points, but never has a development in this area of South Hampstead Conservation Area caused so much commotion, and we have had a couple of other neighbouring properties totally redeveloped in recent years with no issues or causes for concern arising at all.

---

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2024/1174/P	Neela Ebbett	07/04/2024 13:11:19	OBJ	<p>2024/1174/P</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The application number 2024/1174/P shows a garden that is concreted over. These are not minor residential alterations – that is very misleading.</li> <li>2. I cannot reiterate enough how much this proposal will destroy the character of the conservation area. The garden at 80 Greencroft is right in the heart of the South Hampstead area and the proposal looks like complete concreting over of the garden (of which they have already removed half when the first application was registered). I think it absolutely contravenes the South Hampstead Conservation Area Character Appraisal &amp; Management Strategy, the breach of which would set a terrible precedent.</li> <li>3. Any proposed extensions to the rear elevations of buildings in the conservation area should preserve the character and historic features of existing buildings, and also take into account the view from other properties directly overlooking the gardens</li> <li>4. The first, second and third floor flats of at least numbers 79 to 83 Canfield Gardens, and 78 to 82 Greencroft Gardens all directly overlook the garden at 80 Greencroft, and whilst the green roofing seeks to appease the upper floor residents of 80 Greencroft it does nothing to mitigate the horrible view these other properties will have if the proposal goes ahead.</li> <li>5. The application also increases the floor area of the property, which already is at a maximum compared with adjoining properties.</li> <li>6. The rounded bay extension is not in keeping with flat flush extensions either side. The proposal looks like it and would extend the back of the house much further back than the houses either side. This is not so much as an extension- rather it is replacing what remains of the garden with more dwelling space. These are not minor alterations. I wish the council to take into account the impact this will have on the view and levels of noise on my flat and others overlooking.</li> <li>7. This proposal is misleading . The 'view as proposed' document is misleading. It features a tree to the right that does not exist; sedum roofs are not bushy as shown; the pots are decorative; it does not show where the paving extends to, and how it will affect the tree; and it is not clear what is to scale and what is not. In reality, for example, the ridge of the main roof at No 80 is higher than the two neighbouring properties.</li> <li>8. This proposal will make the area even more prone to flooding, together with the adverse effect on biodiversity. I can see all the gardens clearly from my flat. In the last few years, the gardens at 83 Canfield Gardens and either side now often get waterlogged often when it rains heavily (that did not used to happen and I have been here for almost 20 years).</li> <li>9. There is currently a very tall tree on the property, and yet I am not told how its location and roots will be impacted be this proposal – The development is unsightly already and if the tree has to be removed as a consequence, there will be even less to block the awful view of concrete.</li> <li>10. The applicants have already proven to have misled the council in previous applications: for example, the application for a so-called pergola (application 2019/1628/P): 'pergola' is be misleading, as from the view from my flat is of closed black box, often used as living space day and night with heat, light and noise).</li> </ol>