

From:
Sent: 26 June 2014 21:29
To: Planning; Ampoma, Nanayaa
Subject: APPLICATION REF NO: 2014/3625/P & PREVIOUS APPLICATION:2013/4006/P

Categories: Red Category

RE: FLAT 1, 8 LINDFIELD GARDENS, NW3 6PU - BASEMENT & REAR EXTENSION

I am OBJECTING to this new application for the following reasons:

DESIGN, APPEARANCE, CONSERVATION

- * Previous planning was rejected for light wells-new plans show much larger light wells that are against Camden planning policy.
- * The basement proposal has not been reduced -it has been increased. Basement plans now show 3 bedrooms (was 2).The rooms are larger in size with the addition of a new plant room.
- * Light pollution of the glass rear box at night is still a major concern & now with addition of side glass panels, will cause even more light spillage to neighbours.
- * The depth of the extension has not been reduced in size & the integration with the existing rear elevation of the house has still not been addressed. It is still disproportionate in depth to the balcony above, projecting much further into the garden & still drastically affecting the view of the most beautiful & tranquil garden from my balcony. I want to be able to keep looking out at this view, not an ugly metal covered box beneath me!!
- * Owners have rejected the proposal of a green roof "due to the size of the extension".....That says it all.
- * In the officer's Delegated Report in respect of the recently refused application 2013/4006/P, it was stated "a significant scaled back rear extension that is subservient to the form & massing of the host building is considered to be the starting point".
The proposed rear extension has not been reduced in depth & is certainly not subservient to the main building. In elevation the rear extension takes up @ a third of the area of the rear facade.
- * In the same report it also states "that alterations should always take into account the character & design of the property & it's surroundings. The new plans still propose the use of contemporary design & materials that set it totally apart from the original character & appearance of the host building & conservation area.

* The terrace now increased in depth will take away even more of one of the most spectacular & well established gardens in Hampstead within this conservation area. The view of the current beautiful garden was one of the main reasons why I bought my flat in the first place-so I don't want it ruined!!

* The applicants suggest that the proposed single story extension is on the same scale as the winter garden historically on the site, in particular the projection into the garden.

There is absolutely no evidence submitted by the applicants to support this & I suspect the original structure would not have projected so far into the garden. It was also built whilst the property was a single dwelling, so not impacting on others.

* Digging up the foundations of a Victorian property such as no.8 Lindfield Gardens de-stabilises the property-this is especially relevant when this property has already suffered recent subsidence issues.

* In the Conservation Area Statement (2000) it suggests "that Lindfield Gardens is possibly one of the poorest stretches of road in the conservation area, due to unsympathetic alterations, dereliction & unsightly forecourt parking areas & to a lesser extent recent new developments".

It is also stated that the only exceptions to this are no.8,10 & 22.

Therefore the original character & merit of no.8 MUST be preserved in this conservation area.

The only incongruous detail on the rear elevation of no.8 is the metal balcony added some years ago, which has not been taken into account in any shape or form in the planning application.

There is a potential planning gain to Camden in having this unsightly balcony removed & integrated into a redesigned ground floor addition.

NEIGHBOUR AMENITY

* Disturbance during construction will still be a major problem & concern.

The applicants have absolutely no regard or care the effects of their major construction work will have on the lives of the residents, as they would happily be living off site during the works for a minimum of a year.

* Noise from increased intensity of the flat will be greater now, due to the larger basement proposed. And what plans are in the place to also eliminate any noise or fumes from the new basement plant room?

* The new plans do not take into ANY consideration the impact on the other 4 leaseholders in the building.

The majority of the examples presented by the Gillermans of other local successfully approved extensions are mainly individually owned properties

(eg:1 Rosslyn Hill, 38 Arkwright rd) -so these examples are irrelevant in their argument, compared to the effects on a converted multi occupied building like 8 Lindfield Gardens.

* There is no evident plan to tackle the inevitable increased amount of waste & rubbish - the current set up could not accommodate any more bins.

* It is frankly absurd that such a large family have bought a property that is way too small for them in the first place, who are relying on totally modifying it, in order for it to be fit for purpose. This is totally to the detriment of this prestigious building & the other residents' lives. I would suggest they use their money more wisely & buy a house in Hampstead that serves their needs from the onset.

OTHER MATTERS

* To date there has been NO formal consultation process conducted by the Gillermans ahead of this new planning submission with the 4 other owners of 8 Lindfield Gardens.

* An S106 planning agreement cannot be the subject of a condition & must form part of the planning agreement.

* No Construction Management Plan has been submitted.

* I understand it is a requirement of Camden that the applicants need an ARUP study in support of CPG4, which appears not to have been actioned.

Yours sincerely

Lidia Tyszczuk

Flat 2, 8 Lindfield Gardens, NW3 6PU

Owner