

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"> 1. The application number 2024/1174/P shows a garden that is concreted over. These are not minor residential alterations – that is very misleading. 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 & Management Strategy, the breach of which would set a terrible precedent. 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 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. 5. The application also increases the floor area of the property, which already is at a maximum compared with adjoining properties. 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. 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. 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). 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. 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).