

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2024/1174/P	James Radice	09/04/2024 15:05:58	OBJ	<p>We are the owners and occupiers of Ground and First Floor Maisonette, 81 Canfield Gardens, which backs directly onto the applicant's property.</p> <p>Camden Council will be well aware of the development history of 80 Greencroft Gardens, including the very recent and substantial development which was granted permission following a lengthy process in July 2019. It is hard to believe that the current owner of Flat 2, 80 Greencroft Gardens is already seeking to redevelop the property beyond what was agreed to as recently as 2019, building work on which was only completed even more recently than that.</p> <p>We wish to object to the proposed development plan on the following grounds:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The "Development Type" in the application is described as "Residential Minor Alterations", which is misleading. The plan includes very substantial re-modelling to the basement section (and an increase in occupied space in that part of the flat), as well as a further extension on the ground floor beyond what was agreed to in 2019. 2. The requested extension in floor area is to be achieved through the creation of new bay windows on the ground floor, which would have the effect of increasing the overall size of Flat 2 from approx 220m² to 245m². This is an enlargement of 25m² (11.3% of the total) to a flat in a building which already appears to be the most substantial in the immediate area, judging by the Site Block Plan. 2. The increase in floor space to Flat 2 carries with it a corresponding decrease in the size of the garden. Attention is drawn to the principles set out at paras 7.13 and 7.14 of the South Hampstead Conservation Area Character Appraisal And Management Strategy ("SHCA MS") which are designed to support the maintenance of garden areas. 3. Para 12.17 of the same document requires development to leave as much soft landscaping as possible. This policy is also threatened by the proposed development. 4. The extension in floor space sought by the Applicant is to the rear of their property and has the effect of drawing their living space nearer to our own. In particular the applicant wishes to advance closer to our sitting room and master bedroom on our ground floor, and to a bedroom and bathroom on our first floor. This advancement threatens to disturb our privacy, and is unreasonable. 5. Attention is drawn to para 12.15 of SHCA MS. This requires that "alterations and extensions to the rear elevations of buildings in the conservation area should respect the pattern of development and preserve the character and historic features of existing buildings". How can a further expansion beyond the extension granted in 2019, or a bridge constructed over the basement void, be consistent with these principles?

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2024/1174/P	CRASH	08/04/2024 16:55:03	OBJ	<p>CRASH (Combined Residents' Associations of South Hampstead) objects strongly to several aspects of this application.</p> <p>It also remains unclear whether this application seeks to deal with 2022/4478/P relating to a retrospective application for a "pergola" in the rear garden - CRASH continues to note that the construction of the "shuttered box" in the rear garden is not a "pergola" in any sense and CRASH objects to permission being granted for it as it is constructed in materials and design wholly unsympathetic to the conservation area and is visible by multiple neighbours and does not contain materials that assist with drainage or vegetation.</p> <p>Regarding 2024/1174/P CRASH notes that aspects of previous application 2022/5431/P which was refused by Camden have been replicated in this new application - specifically the glass balustrading which was "considered to be too contemporary looking in design and materials and to be inappropriate to the classically-inspired design of the houses, and thus are considered harmful to the conservation area". This new application sees even more use of glass balustrading across the whole of the surrounding walls of the basement void and the bridge, and the first floor terrace and as such, should be rejected. Having said that the bridge (proposed in green steel) is also completely out of keeping in the conservation area exacerbated by the fact that 80 Greencroft Gardens already extends more deeply into the rear garden than other nearby properties as evidenced in the block plan. Given the scale of the void and depth into the garden - use of metal balustrading would also be highly detrimental to the rear garden, residents with views onto this garden and out of keeping with the local conservation plan and multiple Camden policies.</p> <p>The proposed new "bay window" would also not conserve or enhance the conservation area and is out of keeping with neighbouring properties - given that it extends further into the garden than other properties, the materials proposed are green painted steel and glass and its design. It is not "contemporary in nature" so in design terms would not provide a contemporary juxtaposition with a period property.</p> <p>There would likely be far more light spillage from the void and it seems likely that external lighting would be placed around the balustrading and across the bridge which would affect neighbours and local animals (wild and domesticated) negatively.</p> <p>Greater paving would also be introduced around the void with a consequent loss of vegetated area which would impact negatively on rain sink into an area which is prone to garden flooding during rainfall.</p> <p>CRASH requests that this application is rejected or significantly amended.</p>