

Application N	Consultees Name	Recipient Address	Received	Comment	Response
2025/2089/P	Yvonne Klemperer	60 Aberdare Gardens London NW6 3QD	01/06/2025 14:09:02	JUST	Pitch roof design a disturbing and unnecessary feature of this gym construction which takes up a huge portion of garden. There are other buildings which occupy neighbouring gardens which affect the whole scene perspective and the addition of the gym's emergence cannot be deemed to be discretely within Conservation rules. Where is our green heritage? And why was no-one (56 and 60) ever consulted about Dr Smith's intentions as neither was the lady who actually owns the top floor flat of 58? Even CRASH's recommendation for a flatroof was overruled. The building has been constructed very well but clearly there has been no co-ordinated consultation before work between builder/architect and client who should have understood and considered the larger heritage picture and impact of this building against conservation considerations and neighbouring properties. What precedent does this send out? The builder himself has admitted that these types of construction always cause upset...Needs serious review, correction and discussion. The new garden is very attractive but this does not save impact of the above.
2025/2089/P	CRASH	Flat d 11 Compayne Gardens South Hampstead London Nw6 3DG	03/06/2025 12:28:58	OBJ	<p>CRASH (the Combined Residents' Associations of South Hampstead wishes to OBJECT in the strongest terms to this application which seeks to justify and gain consent for a number of breaches of a consented application (2022/3540/P) granted 16.02.23.</p> <p>First and foremost, the Applicant has blatantly ignored the consented requirement for a 'green' roof on the outbuilding, substituting clay tiles without permission.</p> <p>Secondly, in the application form, the Applicant affirms that the only element of the superseeded prior consent requiring revision is the "roof material". She avoids mentioning the walls which have consent for "timber with shingles cladding" - and this treatment is again shown on the elevational drawings now re-submitted - whereas the photographs recently added quite clearly show a treatment quite different from shingles (quite possibly cheap composite boarding).</p> <p>Thirdly, CRASH notes in the MBP that the Applicant had agreed that the maximum height of the pitched roof should not exceed 3.7m. The drawings show the height at the ridge to be 3.76m and there are reasons to believe - according to overlooking neighbours - that even this height may have been - like the roof and walls - "adapted".</p> <p>Finally, the submitted photographs show what appear to external light fittings on two elevations. These are not shown on the consented documents.</p>