

## Mohammed Ahmed

---

**From:** Ewan Campbell  
**Sent:** 24 April 2024 15:37  
**To:** Planning  
**Subject:** FW: Objection to: planning application no: 322024/0222/P

Can this be uploaded

Thanks

Ewan Campbell  
Senior Planning Officer  
Supporting Communities  
London Borough of Camden

Web: [camden.gov.uk](https://camden.gov.uk)



---

**From:** Stephen Grosz  
**Sent:** 19 April 2024 14:44

**Subject:** Objection to: planning application no: 322024/0222/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.

Dear Mr Campbell,

We are writing to object to planning application no: 322024/0222/P—described in the application as ‘the demolition and reconstruction of the residential annex in connection with the redevelopment of the Police Stables, 53-54 Downshire Hill NW3 1PA’ (Revised Application Form, Description of Proposed Works)

First, we would like to question this description. The ‘annex’ was not previously residential. As the applicant’s own Design and Access Statement (and photographs) confirm:

04 CONSERVATION STATUS: THE ANNEX: The Annex is a single storey addition to the Stables which was developed in the 1960’s/1970’s as part of several iterations of development. It has been variously used as offices, as storage, for plant and equipment, for dog kennels and for parking. The building has no architectural or heritage value and is unsafe in its current state. The plan would be to raze the building entirely and rebuild on a slightly larger footprint in a style and design aesthetic that is consistent with the Stables.

This is not, and has not been a residence. Replacing a small open garage, a car port—built in the 1960s/1970s for washing cars and storage—with this development is inappropriate.

. The police used the Stables to hold evidence; prior to that, police horses were kept there. During the time that we have lived here, after sunset, the stables and car washing area have been dark and peaceful, with little or no noise or foot traffic. This development would change all that.

Second, the proposed development is described as an ‘annex’ to the Stables. It is not an annex. As the drawings—and two new addresses 53 and 54 Downshire Hill make clear—this is a second, wholly independent residence.

The only thing missing in the ‘annex’ is a kitchen, which could easily be installed later. Behind the ‘entrance’ are two separate front doors for the two separate addresses—53 Downshire Hill and 54 Downshire Hill. We are concerned that this second house could be rented out as an independent residence or let as an Airbnb vacation rental.

This small area cannot take a second house. We are concerned about the density of the proposed development, with its incumbent noise, disruption, and refuse.

For historical reasons, the three adjacent Downshire Hill properties (50, 51 and 52 Downshire Hill have lost their rear gardens to the police station. (Examination of historic OS maps demonstrates this.) As a result, 50, 51 and 52 Downshire Hill, have atypically small rear gardens when compared to nearby properties of commensurate scale. Even though this development is within a conservation area, it seeks to take advantage of this historical anomaly. For example, a large refuse area, six large bins, and two more bicycle racks, has been pressed against the small garden space at 50 Downshire Hill. A large outdoor area, which the residents of the proposed development at 53 and 54 Downshire Hill could use for entertainment, has been squeezed up against the small rear garden of 51 Downshire Hill—this is adjacent to the small rear garden at 52 Downshire Hill.

Further, because 50, 51, and 52 Downshire Hill are so close to the proposed development, we are concerned that the proposed four large roof lights will cause light pollution in what is currently a dark space. We are particularly concerned that light from these roof lights will illuminate the rear windows, including the rear bedrooms, of these three homes. Light pollution from these roof lights would also affect Hampstead Hill mansions, and other nearby properties as well.

As the Heath and Hampstead Society’s comments on the initial application for conversion of the Stables building to a house pointed out: the garage structure should be removed and incorporated into the Stable’s amenity area. That would be ideal. (A single room attached, and subservient to the Stables would have been a sensitive, balanced development.)

Finally, we agree with the broad points about damage to the setting and sense of enclosure raised in the letter submitted on behalf of the residents of 50 Downshire Hill.

Stephen Grosz and Nicola Luckhurst