

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2024/4134/P	Evelyn Brown	17/10/2024 22:39:06	OBJ	<p>I am writing to object to the planning application submitted under application no. 2024/4134/P due to the clear oversight by the registering party across a number of areas, making the proposed development wholly unsuitable.</p> <p>1. Construction Management</p> <p>a) The justification to demolish the garages and flat to the rear of the site is fundamentally flawed. The application is wilfully misleading in its description of the residential property as a “caretaker’s flat”, when this is in fact a privately rented property and has been for many years. The description of the garages as “unsightly, under-utilised, and unnecessary” is purely subjective, and lacks any supporting evidence beyond unsupported speculation that the garages are too small for modern cars. Additionally, this is a judgement made without liaising with current occupiers, many of whom would wholly disagree. These garages, and the driveway in front of them, act as valuable parking and storage for the residents of Hylda Court, and help minimise the need for disruptive on-street parking. Removing these garages, and the functionality of the drive in front, will only put further pressure on St Albans Road parking; off-street parking is essential due to its location off the ever-popular Hampstead Heath which attracts visitors all year round.</p> <p>b) The application does not provide sufficient measures to monitor and mitigate noise and vibrations generated through the construction process. Not only is no current, comparable pre-construction noise survey provided, but the application provides no detailed study of projected noise disturbance as a result of the construction. Generic statements on “quietest available machinery” without comprehensive supporting evidence, are insufficient and should be disregarded. Vibration is not taken into account at all despite the extensive works proposed, which shows a clear oversight by applicants due to the densely populated area, meaning impact could be extremely disruptive.</p> <p>c) The Construction Management Plan fails to provide sufficiently detailed plans for safety management on site. There are no clear plans for waste management in what would be a very constricted construction zone, nor guidelines for site cleanliness despite the considerable impact this would have on current residents. Additionally, conduct of construction workers is left overly vague, suggesting a lack of concern for current residents’ comfort and wellbeing amongst these highly disruptive works.</p> <p>d) The current plans fail to recognise ongoing structural issues within the building which have been routinely recorded with both the owning party and the agents managing the property. Many of the flats face extensive issues with damp and black mould in external walls, as a result of structural defects allowing water to leak into the walls, especially during periods of heavy rain. These issues have been continuously disregarded but would need to be considered in any building works to or around the roof. Furthermore, any planned construction to or around the roof that fails to address this ongoing problem, shows clear disregard to the wellbeing of current residents, as well as the owning party’s responsibilities as landlords to provide a safe and habitable environment.</p> <p>2. Impact to Local Community</p> <p>a) The community liaison during this planning phase was wholly inadequate. Despite the applicants having a direct means of contact with current residents of Hylda Court through their property management company Hamways, no contact was made ahead of submission. This evidences a clear lack of transparency and engagement with the local community most impacted by these proposals. In particular, the resident of the flat submitted for demolition to the rear of the property was not contacted ahead of submission. To suggest that appropriate community outreach was done as part of this application is a deliberate misrepresentation of the facts.</p> <p>a) The garages and rear flat back onto local secondary school La Sainte Union. There is significant concern</p>

Application No: Consultees Name: Received:

Comment:

Response:

for the impact both construction, and subsequent properties would have to the students. Construction would inevitably - even if temporarily - lower air quality, exposing local children to health risks, particularly from inhaling significant amounts of dust. The application does not include any kind of Dust Management Plan, and does not factor in the risks specific to children in the area. Additionally, the proposal for these flats does not suitably address the concern of close-level oversight from the flats into the children's playground.

c) The impact of new townhouses at the rear of the site on daylight and sunlight to local residents, both within Hylde Court and neighbouring properties, are not appropriately reviewed. Although a DLSL assessment has been provided, at no point were current daylight/sunlight levels in Hylde Court or neighbouring properties actually assessed, nor were different markers throughout the year (e.g. midsummer versus midwinter) measured. As previously referenced, the applicants have access to flats if so desired through their managing agents, however no effort was made to conduct an up-to-date assessment of light levels within impacted flats at the rear of the building. Additionally, the application chooses to exclude any analysis of potential solar glare without clear empirical reason.

d) There is no reference to or analysis of the impact of an additional storey to daylight through the central atrium of the building. For flats to the rear of the building, this atrium is an important source of light, and measures must be taken to properly measure and mitigate this impact.

e) There are clear and apparent privacy concerns to local residents at the rear of Hylde Court, and in neighbouring properties as a result of the proposal to build 3 multi-storey houses in place of the current garages. The report chooses to disregard the significance of existing balconies to residents; these are the sole offering of outdoor space and would become uncomfortably overlooked if multi-storey homes were to be built, and so pose a significant impact to residents' quality of life. Furthermore, the plans indicate extensive glazing and bay windows directly facing existing flats, impact of which no amount of opaque glazing or privacy screens could relieve. Although not clearly marked in proposed plans, the space between the proposed structure and existing flats is just 6m, resulting in direct overlooking of habitable rooms and creating an uncomfortable and distressing experience for current residents.

f) The decision to build new "luxury" homes during a time when both the current council and government recognise the desperate need for increased affordable housing, comes with clear disregard for the wellbeing of the local community.

3. Environmental Impact

a) Hylde Court resides in Sub Area 8 of the Dartmouth Park Conservation Area, an area of note due to its historic and architectural character. A primary contributing factor to this, is the extensive greenery throughout the area, much of which would be at risk were the proposed extensive construction to go ahead.

b) Although the Biodiversity Net Gain Report claims an increase in biodiversity, the proposed plans do not in any way offset the clear negative impact to local biodiversity. At least 2 mature trees stand on the proposed demolition site, as well as a number more within close proximity. Risk from construction activity, potential for future pruning pressures, and loss of light all indicate a clear negative impact to the immediate ecology. Were this not enough, the proposed Urban Greening Factor score is just 0.19, which is well below the recommended target of 0.4 showing clear disinterest by developers for local biodiversity.

4. Design Factors

a) Hylde Court is considered a "building of note" within the local area, perfectly exemplifying 1930s Art Deco architecture. The proposed addition of a penthouse floor will not fit the aesthetic of the building, and will negatively impact its facade. Although applicants have expressed a desire to acclimate the new floor to the existing design, the proposal's materials and design features do not adequately address this. Moreover, the

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
				<p>modern “mews properties” proposed for the rear of the building do not in any way align with this 1930s styling, and would negatively impact the overall aesthetic and art historic merit of the site.</p> <p>b) As part of the historic Dartmouth Park Conservation Area, the proposals of the extended penthouse floor and modern townhouses to the rear pose significant risk to undermining the historic and architectural integrity of the area.</p> <p>In summary, there should be no question that Camden Council reject this proposal due to the numerous oversights outlined above. I implore those leading this review to carefully consider these objections, and rule in favour of our local community to protect a valued and historic neighbourhood.</p>
