
From: John Malet-Bates <[REDACTED]>
Sent: 25 April 2024 17:45
To: Sam FitzPatrick
Subject: Fwd: 14 A Keats Grove London NW3 2RS (2023/5162/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 Sam,

Apologies, my email draft appears to have been truncated. Therefore further and to add to my last: In case of Council's preference or acceptance for London Plan policy to override normal and important general policy to preserve and enhance open space and green areas within the CAs - Camden Conservatives' comment on Draft London Plan Policy H2 - Housing is as follows ".....there is no requirement for the Design Codes (yet to be proposed or adopted in Camden?) referred to in Policy H2B(2) to be designed to preserve and enhance the character and appearance of conservation areas. This requirement must be (is already) expressly written into the "general" policy to ensure that development, causing harm to the Conservation Area, is not automatically presumed to be acceptable under Policy H2(E) once Camden adopts its design codes. 11. For all of these reasons, Policy H2 is unsound."

I hope this can be considered \also.

Best regards,

John

[REDACTED]

Dear Sam,

HCAAC Objects to this proposal. It seeks further to occupy an area of valuable and valued open land referred to by some as Metropolitan Open Land (MoL), disturbing, reducing biodiversity, ignoring the privilege of the existing adequate building's presence in this setting. The extent of the proposal and its MoL toocation presents an undesirable precedent. The proposal is visibly excessive and insensitive in the area context. There appears to be no necessity for such an enlargement which appears to be an opportunistic market development; it breaks normal approaches in such settings greatly to restrict extensions to original houses in extent and impact. The stated pre-app requirement to reduce the new floor area is to be considered irrelevant - it is the overall impact of the proposal as a new visibly separate building that is to be considered. It is hoped that Council's understandable wish, in the circumstances of central government's savage treatment of local authorities, to maximise development and income can be tempered in this insupportable case. There appears, also to be the opportunity now and in the future, to regard the proposal as placing a separate building in the extension area, having, in due course, its own PD or other right. Any substantial demolition operations are likely to have catastrophic effects on the immediate area; such effect cannot be dismissed as such often are - an unfortunate and temporary aspect of an eventual highly beneficial development outcome. The proposal does not offer benefit to the immediate area and in this context is harmful to the CA as well as the immediate area and setting. We note the current general tendency in Hampstead area for carefully-considered

more modest and apparently sustainable extensions against which this proposal runs. The Carbon involvement in this proposal is unwarranted

Best regards,
John

John Malet-Bates
for Hampstead CAAC,



John Malet-Bates

