

For the attention of Planning Officer : Jaspreet Chana

Dear Sirs

This OBJECTION is submitted on behalf of CRASH (Combined Residents' Associations of South Hampstead).

First, we note that consent for the removal of the three Lime trees was granted by 2024/5239/T but there appears to be some confusion over their status. The D&A statement says "No TPOs for trees on site", but the Application Form answers the question "Is tree protected by TPO? by TBC (To be confirmed).

a) CRASH considers the proposed building over-large and over-dominant for the site as it stretches the full width of the rear garden.

b) Furthermore, CRASH objects to the finishes of the proposed building, in particular the roof. Both suggested materials - EPDM (rubber) and GRP (plastic) - are far from sustainable, in addition to being unsightly. CRASH always advises the use of sustainable 'green' roofs on garden buildings.

c) Likewise, concrete slab foundations are anti-green. CRASH would suggest - and prefer - a low-impact floor on ground screws or pads.

d) CRASH notes that the Applicant has ignored the request for the colour of the finishes. GRP is suggested for the roof, and although grey is the standard colour other colours are available. Again - the walls are to be rendered, but no colour is given.

e) The use of aluminium for both the windows and the coping is unsympathetic for a building in a conservation area. White-painted timber would be more in keeping with the main house and with the prevailing aesthetic of the South Hampstead Conservation Area.

f) To the question "How will surface water be disposed of?" the Applicant has answered by ticking the SuDS box. CRASH fails to see any indication of Sustainable Drainage Systems. A flat roof in hard plastic or rubber is hardly eco-friendly and the submitted drawings give no indication how surface water is to be harvested.

g) Over the years CRASH has seen a good number of application for outbuildings to be used as gyms, and most - for obvious reasons - include toilet and shower facilities. CRASH cannot recall seeing one where a bath - as opposed to a shower - has been proposed. This, together with the size of the bathroom, suggests that the outbuilding may be used for residential use - the infamous 'beds in sheds'. Such use should be specifically banned if consent is to be granted.

h) Finally, Camden has a duty to promote good design in all developments. This application is bland, boring and totally devoid of merit. It fails the 'good design' test.

Camden is asked to refuse consent.

Yours faithfully

CRASH