

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2014/2116/P	Robert Maclean	11 Christchurch Hill	19/05/2014 16:34:44	OBJ	This proposal is of a scale and appearance that is out of all proportion to the surrounding buildings and Christchurch Hill generally. The proposed basement is a particular concern in this geologically sensitive area. The site is completely unsuitable for development on this scale, and the application should be refused.

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2014/2116/P	Mrs Carolyn Harms	41 Christchurch Hill, Hampstead, London NW3 1LA	19/05/2014 12:49:13	COMNOT	<p>I live directly opposite to 10 Christchurch Hill and object to the proposed application 2014/2116/P. on the following grounds.</p> <p>This proposal is totally out of keeping with the buildings on the opposite side of this narrow road leading to the Heath, which are sympathetic to each other. I certainly do not want, each time I look out of my windows, to have to gaze upon what appears to me to have the appearance of an industrial unit which is to be faced in red tiles with rusty brown cladding and grey windows. These drawings represent a building which is totally out of keeping with this prime conservation area of Hampstead Village.</p> <p>Afer studying the proposed plans I cannot appreciate that the improvement in the living space shown in the drawings could be achieved with the proposed partial demolition of the existing external envelope. These proposed major works would more than likely require the demolition of most of the existing building.</p> <p>It would also appear that the necessity for ground water run off, flooding and subsidence have not been taken into consideration.</p> <p>It would appear from the drawings that there could be a problem regarding light issues</p> <p>The proposed house would back on to historic Gainsborough Gardens and the proposed extension would be bulky, obtrusive and unsightly</p> <p>The obvious noise and disruption of these major works would cause serious disruption to the business of The Wells Tavern and also to the lives of the local residents in this narrow road for some considerable time.</p> <p>The extensive proposed plans for the basement appear not to have been considered. This locality is one of London"s most notoriously unstable areas with bagshot sands and claygate beds and there have been many instances of roads collapsing in this Hampstead area.</p> <p>The major proposed basement excavation would most likely have a direct effect on the fragile substance of this unstable area where there are two underground springs close by and, in fact, an underground stream running down under Christchurch Hill directly in front of No. 10.</p> <p>Surely, this proposal to demolish the existing house, built less than 30 years ago, and the erection of a 3-storey plus basement house with rear addition at first floor level and mansard roof extension following partial demolition of existing external envelope clad in red tiles and tecu oxide rusty brown cladding with elevations and grey windows is totally out of character in this prime conservation area. The industrial appearance of this proposed construction does not respect the renowned character of Hampstead Village.</p>

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2014/2116/P	Lucy Tusa	21 Christchurch Hill	17/05/2014 09:45:57	OBJ	<p>This application is totally out of keeping with the Victorian and Georgian architecture of this conservation area and wholly unsympathetic to it. The proposed basement works show no consideration to the water table issues well documented in this area.</p> <p>it beggars belief that the proposed window designs and exterior finish would be permitted in this Conservation area. The application shows no consideration at all of any of these issues and should be rejected. The planned development is not consistent with CS 14 or DP 24 and 25. The Design and Access statement is factually incorrect.</p>

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2014/2116/P	Mr Adam Cooper and Mrs Gabrielle Cooper	39 Christchurch Hill Hampstead London NW3 1LA	16/05/2014 11:58:47	OBJ	<p>The design of this building, if constructed, will materially harm the character and appearance of Christchurch Hill and the Hampstead conservation area.</p> <p>No consultation</p> <p>It's important to note that, although we live directly opposite the property and will be substantially affected by these plans both during and after construction, no attempt at all has been made to contact us to discuss their impact.</p> <p>In addition, we were not directly notified of this planning application by the applicant or by the council, and no public notices have been attached to the lamppost outside our house and opposite the property where such notices are usually published. It is also noteworthy that while the applicants and their architects have not been able to consult with neighbours living less than 10 meters away from their proposed construction, they have found time to publish a piece on the UCL website regarding the architectural problems raised by the job - see http://discovery.ucl.ac.uk/1370724/.</p> <p>Background</p> <p>The application should be considered in the context of the planning history of the property, and the council will be aware that this includes a long community campaign to preserve three historic and beautiful lime trees positioned at the front of the property, screening it from the road during the summer months.</p> <p>These trees were recently uprooted and destroyed, despite continuing community protests. I understand that a condition of the permission for their destruction was that they should be replaced by the specific deciduous trees currently in place which, in time, would grow to significant heights and be proper replacements for the lime trees which enhanced the character and appearance of the street and the conservation area.</p> <p>We see from the proposed drawings however that they too are to be chopped down, to be replaced by some form of conifer. This would be entirely out of character with the street and surely a breach of the existing conditions. If they must be replaced, the council should require that the replacement trees should be lime trees, as before, and not agree in any circumstances to the harmful changes to the character and appearance of the street that the conifers would deliver.</p> <p>Design and Access Statement</p> <p>In the introduction to the Design and Access Statement ("DAS"), it states that the proposal relates to "a rear addition, a mansard roof addition with alterations to the external envelope". However, on review of the proposed new plans for the front elevation, it's clear that this description omits to say that the front walls and windows of the house would be demolished and replaced. In contrast, it's worth mentioning that the UCL publication noted above refers to the proposals as a "New Build House".</p>

Application No: **Consultees Name:** **Consultees Addr:** **Received:****Comment:** **Response:**

In relation to the scale of the proposals, the DAS (on page 13) claims that the design “makes alterations with an insignificant change to the volume of the existing residential property”. However, on pages 38 and 39 of the DAS, the increase in the house’s gross internal area is stated to be 78 square metres, or almost 840 square feet. This appears to be a very significant increase – almost one third again of an already substantial house – which is being crammed into a very small plot of land. It may account for the bulky, over-inflated appearance of the proposed front elevation.

The design itself appears alien to the street and the area. The brick expanse looks endless, and windows are irregular and disproportionate. The largest window, which will be directly opposite our bedroom windows, looks quite intrusive to our privacy. In addition, the choice of materials for the windows is inappropriate for the street. Overall, it looks like an industrial office building that will be entirely out of place in its setting.

In relation to light and views, the increased roof height and extra bulk and massing caused by the mansard will impair our long views over Gainsborough Gardens. The DAS references a light study which was included in the planning application, but does not seem to have been published on the Camden website. I don’t know if the study was meant to take account of our house, directly opposite and less than 10 meters from their construction? We were not consulted and it would certainly be a harmful change for us.

We are also concerned about the possible impact of the basement works upon soil stability and the local environment, particularly given that an underground stream runs beneath Christchurch Hill. Has this been investigated?

The DAS concludes that the proposals “are sympathetic to the context by complimenting the existing traditional setting”. From our perspective however (directly opposite the property) the proposals ignore the existing architectural context, and attempt instead to interpose the style of late 20th century urban industrial estate, with inappropriate bulk, massing and height, into this quiet, narrow, residential street on the edge of Hampstead Heath.
