

Application N	Consultees Name	Recipient Address	Received	Comment	Response
2025/0981/P	Casimir Knight	2b South Hill Park NW3 2SB	01/04/2025 17:44:45	OBJ	<p>Dear Connie Marinetto</p> <p>Re: Objection to application ref: 2025/0981/P</p> <p>I am the owner of 2b South Hill Park, and our garden is right next door to the proposed development. We have consulted with other local residents concerned by the disproportionate nature of this application. I object to the application on the following grounds.</p> <p>1. Scale, bulk and massing</p> <p>The proposal now asks for permission to extend from the existing building by between 3.59m and 6.33m and is full width. It's on a completely different scale to what is appropriate for its position and sadly eats up greenery – leaving less than 50% of the original garden will remain as soft landscaping.</p> <p>2. Sense of enclosure</p> <p>The proposed extension will further enclose what is already the most enclosed part of the green spaces between South Hill Park and the mews where the doctors' surgery is. It's impact on our outlook and light is less pronounced than its overwhelming impact on our other neighbours at number 8 South Hill Park, but is still material. The surgery, which has itself developed, abuts our houses, enclosing the west flank entirely. This is the tightest part of the mews space – and what is proposed therefore has a much greater impact than those extensions further up the mews.</p> <p>3. Character of the Conservation Area</p> <p>The comparison with the extension at 10 South Hill Park is marked. The extension at 10 lines up harmoniously with the extension at 12. The opposite applies to the subject application. It does not match or fit in with either of the adjacent buildings.</p> <p>4. Trees, reduction of garden, surface water run-off and biodiversity</p> <p>Both trees at 6 SHP have now been cut down in their entirety in preparation for this application (the photos submitted with the application are wrong and deceiving in this important detail). The proposal will result in less than 50% of the original garden being soft landscaping. This will reduce attenuation of surface water run-off further stressing the already overwhelmed drainage system. The further loss of garden will also reduce potential biodiversity at a time when the government is keen to promote an increase, not loss.</p> <p>Summary</p> <p>We (and other neighbours) are not NIMBY naysayers. But the bulk and scale of this application is wholly inappropriate and excessive, and has already and will do further ecological damage. We and others would support a new application which was appropriate in bulk and character for no.6.</p> <p>Yours sincerely</p> <p>Casimir Knight</p>
2025/0981/P	Mohammed	8 south hill park	01/04/2025 12:56:26	OBJ	<p>I have lodged in the basement of 8 south Hill Park since 2020. Please see attached proof of address. Peter and Sara, the owner occupiers, kindly allow me access to the garden.</p> <p>I object because the amenity value of the garden will be greatly reduced if the proposed development goes ahead. The new extension at no 10 has completely destroyed that side of the garden.</p>