

Comments on Planning Application 2024/5138/P - 14A Keats Grove NW3 2RS

I write to object to this application on the grounds below.

It is unacceptable that the supporting documents: Preliminary Construction Method Statement and Construction Management Plan states that "The site will operate during normal hours from 7.30am to 5.30pm Monday to Saturday with occasional Sunday operations as required" (pages 4&5). This is against Camden's noisy building works regulations which states working hours could be permitted only 8am-6pm Monday to Friday and 8am to 1pm on Saturdays with no Sunday working permitted.

<https://www.camden.gov.uk/noisy-building-works>

The map of neighbouring properties within the Design Heritage and Access Statement does not fully identify which neighbouring properties are Grade II listed nor which boundary walls are curtilage listed.

Neither the Structural Design nor the Construction papers state how they will protect No35 Downshire Hill's rear perimeter wall – a Grade II Listed Georgian wall. The proposed extension and proposed basement will impact the features of this original Georgian brick wall at No35 Downshire Hill.

Heritage, Design and Access statement (pg 18) erroneously states No36 Downshire Hill has a garden building in rear garden larger than the proposed extension – In truth No36 does not have a garden building of any size.

Proposed side Elevation to No16 Keats Grove shows an unlabelled beige rectangular box drawn on the lower left corner, and Proposed rear Elevations show an unlabelled beige rectangular box and a grey rectangular box where the extension wall meets the original house into the garden of 36 Downshire Hill - it is unclear what these are. The submitted Proposed Elevations and plans are lacking accuracy and do not account for the slope of the land. Depending which image is looked (eg Proposed Elevations and CGI) at the colour of the "vertical latch cladding" to the rear varies; As a result there is no clarity on what colour the proposed latch cladding will be - orange or brown or otherwise.

The submitted Tree Protection Plan shows a proposed tree protection fence would protect 14a Keats Grove's own trees but there is no mention of how the multiple trees in the garden of No36 Downshire Hill along the joint boundary wall will be protected. Of the 5 established trees on the boundary only one is mentioned with no protection proposed. Submissions are inconsistent on the impact to trees - Heritage Design and Access Statement states (pg18) "no trees" will be removed; Application states "trees" will be removed; and the Structural Method Statement states "one tree" will be removed. No new trees are proposed in the plans.

Camden's Residential Amenity Policy is breached - both the Policy on visual privacy and outlook and the Policy on artificial lighting levels - including the newly proposed side and front extensions and the newly proposed basement together including multiple new windows to the front and side 3 storeys and new windows to the basement, and including a new proposed full height clear glass window and a two other replacement windows positioned looking directly into neighbouring private adjoining gardens of Downshire hill. Hampstead Local Plan Policies D1 and D2 are breached- The proposal fails to take the opportunity to improve or protect the character or quality of the area. Camden's Local Plan and Hampstead Neighbourhood Plan policies on Design are both breached - proposal does not respect or enhance the character of the area. The proposal is for new and replacement windows to be "pc aluminium frame" with "clear glass" in what is a Conservation area

directly overlooking and looking into neighbouring private properties which are Grade II Listed.

Camden Local Plan Policy A4 Basement is breached- proposal does not comply with requirements including being inches away from Grade II Listed Georgian wall and being on a slope. There are known flooding issues on the street and surrounding streets in recent years including flooding of the garden at No35 and No34 Downshire Hill.

Designated Protected Open Space (POS) will be reduced by this proposed over extended extension. Adding a shallow green roof of wild flowers to the proposed rear extension does not compensate for loss of garden lawn/trees/planting/ deep flower beds etc. Proposed ground floor plan shows extensive new paving adjoining the proposed rear extension which further encroaches into the existing garden and Designated Protected Open Space. The drawing PL-01-10 is misleading as it shows only the rejected pre-app line and the previous application of March 2023 as opposed to showing the existing line of the garden (reference drawing 2307 SV 03). PL-01.10 ignores the proposed hard standing in front of the property which proposes an external access point to the basement. The proposed encroachment of the POS is in excess of the previously rejected Pre-application.

Hampstead Local Plan Policies DA1 and DA2 are breached- the proposal harms the appearance of buildings and harms the amenity of neighbours plus threatens trees.

Hampstead Local Plan Policy BA1 is breached- proposed basement impacts trees and biodiversity corridor.

Hampstead Local Plan Policies NE2, NE3 and NE4 are breached - size of extension into the garden could impact the neighbouring habitat and the proposal inhibits biodiversity and leaves less room for growth of trees.

Hampstead Conservation Area - proposal contravenes the planning controls with regards to the overdevelopment of the residential site, the removal of garden open space and an incongruous design. The original house is c160sqm and the proposed building will be c300sqm with a loss of Designated Protected Open Space as the proposal extends into their garden.

The proposed basement that runs under the entire enlarged footprint could be a self contained property - bedroom, bathroom, guest WC, reception room, utility/kitchen, door to the front lightwell. Any planning consent should be secured by condition that this proposed basement could never be used as a separate property.

It is notable that again neighbours were not consulted nor responded to ahead of the application.

With regards
Nicola