
From: alan.mason11d [REDACTED]
Sent: 07 April 2024 14:19
To: Planning
Subject: Ground Floor Flat, 253 Goldhurst Terrace 2023/5375/P

[EXTERNAL EMAIL] Beware – This email originated outside Camden Council and may be malicious Please take extra care with any links, attachments, requests to take action or for you to verify your password etc.

For the attention of Planning Officer Lauren Ford

Dear Sirs

This OBJECTION is submitted on behalf of CRASH (Combined Residents' Associations of South Hampstead) and deals only with the street-facing elements of the application.

Although CRASH is pleased to see that some effort has been made to include some further planting in the redesign of the front garden, it remains true that the proposed changes show 90% of the garden area as given over to hard landscaping - gravel on the left, with some sort of paving on the right. The paving of the bin and bike storage area is, rather vaguely, described as "permeable flooring", with no detail (type, colour, size of slabs etc) indicated. Without this detail it is impossible to make further informed comment on this element of the application. The use of gravel - a harsh and ugly material - on the opposite side of the garden is to be regretted. To compensate for the hard landscaping in the bin/bike area a softer, greener, material other than gravel would be welcomed.

CRASH is generally sympathetic to the introduction of double-glazing to reduce heat-loss and improve the comfort and wellbeing of residents. However, in this case the applicant claims that it is impossible to introduce double-glazing without the loss of the delightful glazing detail that is so characteristic of this part of the South Hampstead Conservation Area. CRASH finds it hard to believe that double-glazing cannot accommodate this period glazing, but if this can be proved then CRASH would suggest that secondary-glazing would provide virtually the same benefits as double-glazing, but without the loss of valued period detail. The D&A Statement claims "...it is evident that the proposed development [it is referring to the front windows] will preserve and enhance the appearance, setting and character of the Conservation Area." CRASH finds it difficult to understand how the destruction of much-valued period features can preserve, let alone enhance, the conservation area .

CRASH would welcome additional detail (as indicated above) and a revised scheme addressing the points of objection.

Yours faithfully

CRASH