

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2014/2116/P	Hazelanne Lewis	37 Christchurch Hill London nW3 1LA	08/05/2014 10:59:32	OBJ	<p>The look of the house is industrial which is completely inappropriate in the context of the semi rural nature of both the streets it is joined to. The asymmetrical windows are out of keeping of with the whole area but are totally different to all of the Gainsborough Gardens and lower Christchurch Hill windows which are either Victorian or Georgian in style.</p> <p>DP24 requires re-use of existing buildings, to minimize construction waste and reduce the use of new materials. There is no reason to demolish this house for a relatively marginal improvement. There are many recorded collapses of roads in the Hampsstead area, including in Gainsborough Gardens, as a result of the instability of Bagshot sands on Claygate beds and London clay. The proposal to excavate a basement on the side of a steep hill in area criss-crossed with underground streams is fraught with difficulties, if not reckless. The mid-Victorian terrace houses in Christchurch Hill across the road from the proposed development show substantial historic subsidence and minor, though not insignificant, subsidence over the past 35 years. Number 37 tilts towards the Gainsborough Gardens. A tributary stream of the Fleet river runs down the hill beneath the roadway between the proposed development and numbers 37 to 41. The proposed excavation of the development site will disturb fragile geology and carries a real risk of danger to the stability of the homes on the other side of Christchurch Hill. There appears to be no attempt in the planning application to address hydrological issues. In our view the Council has an obligation, and possibly a statutory obligation, to protect its residents from the risks of subsidence and not to increase them.</p> <p>There is no Arboricultural Assessment accompanying this application. We are extremely concerned that the proposed basement will result in the loss of mature tree specimens.</p> <p>The lower part of Christchurch Hill is a one way going down. The proposed works look very considerable, There will undoubtedly be huge disruption for a considerable time at the top of Christchurch Hill with access being blocked off to allow access heavy transport. The applicants have failed to address the impacts of the scheme's development in terms of the considerable disruption it will cause to the occupiers of neighbouring properties in terms of excessive noise, dust, vibration, and loss of on street parking provision. Neither have noise levels been addressed.</p> <p>We strongly object to the plans to extend the house and also to the fact that we were not informed by Camden or the owners of their intention.</p>

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2014/2116/P	David & Jane Cornwell	9 Gainsborough Gardens London NW3 1BJ	01/05/2014 13:10:37	OBJ	<p>We object strongly to the above proposals for the following reasons:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"><li>1. No.10 Christchurch Hill, NW3, where the applicants propose their complete redevelopment, is situated in a conservation area which is cherished by local people as well as by visitors from all over the world who come to see its beauty for themselves.</li><li>2. The style and materials of the new development - a four-story slab-and-block building, huge windows threatening the privacy and stealing the light from neighbours' houses, and the free use of ultra-modern tecu oxid material more suited to Canary Wharf - are all completely out of kilter with the surrounding buildings.</li><li>3. Quite apart from the aesthetics of the proposed redevelopment, there are structural issues which must be recognised. We have lived in this area for more than thirty-five years and remember, as will some members of the Council, the problems posed by the Fleet River which from time to time has caused road collapses - for example: in the road outside No. 9A Gainsborough Gardens on one occasion, and on another when a lorry fell into a hole that appeared in the road outside the Wells Tavern, and another occasion a collapse outside Burgh House. So the idea that this huge building will dig down into Christchurch Hill for its basement seems to be courting problems with drains and disruption on an unprecedented scale, especially given recent dramatic climate changes with torrential rains and consequent sudden rises in the water table. I will be sending, under separate cover in case the Council no longer has a copy of it, Dr Eric Robinson's geological objections to a proposal by an earlier neighbour of ours at No. 10 Gainsborough Gardens when he wanted to excavate to build a swimming pool in his garden which faced onto Christchurch Hill. The instability of the rock underlying the whole of this area is clearly explained in Dr Robinson's report.</li></ol> <p>We urge the Council to decline permission for this redevelopment of No. 10 Christchurch Hill.</p>

---

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2014/2116/P	Helen Andrews	12 Gainsborough Gardens	01/05/2014 12:20:58	OBJ	<p>Ashton Porter's Design and Access Statement</p> <p>The Design and Access statement is factually incorrect. Although the current house does lack architectural merit it is directly adjacent to a listed terrace and house and at the back can be seen from the view point of a street where every house is listed. Gainsborough Gardens is Hampstead's only Garden Square and is very important part of Camden's heritage and is an important example of late Victorian vernacular architecture where every house was designed by a respected architect and approved by the Trustees of the Campden and Wells Trust.</p> <p>Number 10 Christchurch Hill is one of a "contiguous terrace" of three which are sympathetic to each other and next to another listed property, The Wells Tavern. Making No 10 so different from its group on Christchurch Hill will make that group of three look very odd especially since there is then another group of three next door (11-13 Gainsborough Gardens).</p> <p>The basic problems with the current structure could all be addressed by a refurbishment of that structure. There are no Mansard roofs on the Gainsborough Gardens side and it should not be allowed for houses that back onto Gainsborough Gardens. The look of the house is industrial which is completely inappropriate in the context of the semi rural nature of both the streets it is joined to.</p> <p>The Report mentions that number 10 is "on a sight line" to Gainsborough Gardens but it does not mention the architectural importance of Gainsborough Gardens. The Site context photo with number 14 Gainsborough Gardens shows the importance of number 10 within the Gainsborough Gardens context but this has been ignored in the design. The Design and Access Statement that there is an insignificant change to the volume of the existing property is wrong. The proposal does not constitute a high quality design.</p> <p>The map which shows the location of number 10 in Conservation Sub Area Two is wrong as it does not have the correct shading to show that all of the Gainsborough Gardens Houses are listed buildings.</p> <p>References to the "urban condition" of Christchurch Hill only are misleading as it is the last line of development before the heath. The façade shadings cannot be determined clearly from the website so I am not clear what colour the brick will be visible from Gainsborough Gardens. Clearly it should be red and there should be no metal cladding visible from Gainsborough Gardens. Tecu Oxide cladding is a totally inappropriate effect for Gainsborough Gardens.</p> <p>The ridge line proposed looks very unsightly from both sides but especially the Gainsborough Gardens side.</p> <p>I don't understand how a plan to demolish a house for no good reason except that the owner wants to build a bigger mansion can be compliant with any sustainability policy. The house has not been there for that long so although energy efficiency has improved, the difference would not warrant the waste of materials, especially when replacing a boiler is such an easy matter.</p>

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

**Comment:**    **Response:**

Of course the Design and Access Statement does not deal with the massive sub-surface excavation with the new basement, except a brief mention in the appendix.

Although not stated anywhere, the huge subsurface basement excavation will result in the loss mature trees so it is very misleading to show them on the proposals pictures.

The asymmetrical windows are out of keeping of with the whole area but are totally different to all of the Gainsborough Gardens windows which are either Victorian or Georgian in style.

Report on Daylight and Sunlight

There are aspects of this report which do not even make sense. There is an entire paragraph of gobbledegook see paragraph 4.4. In 4.5 the report acknowledges that there are sunlight reductions for the listed property at number 14. The report however has been dictated but not proof read so it is not intelligible. This sloppy approach reflects the lack of care taken with the whole application.

Paragraph 4.6 shows shadow diagrams which show a significant light reduction to the garden of number 14 which will affect planning and the garden of number 14 is a huge asset to the area.

Camden Core Strategy and Development Strategies

Under CS14 the Council must require that development is of the highest standard of design that respects local context and character. The use of tecu oxide cladding is particularly offensive in a street where every other house is listed and although each house is different, has a harmonious character. The loss of trees in a heathside setting is also wrong, although of course the application for permission does not mention that trees will be destroyed. The proposals for number 10 are not high quality design and are not interesting or attractive. The negative impact on the view through Gainsborough Gardens to Christchurch Hill should also be considered. The size of the new house is also out of all proportion to the site.

DP24 requires re-use of existing buildings, to minimize construction waste and reduce the use of new materials. There is no reason to demolish this house for a relatively marginal improvement. Local character must also be respected and the character of this house does not respect the character of either the street of listed houses or fit in with the needs of the site on Christchurch Hill. There is a strong pattern of identity in both streets and the proposals for number 10 are not in keeping with either.

Geological Condition of the Area

Minutes from the Campden and Wells Trust at the time of development of numbers 11-13 Gainsborough Gardens show that the Trustees gave the developer extra space to accommodate a defunct 18th century drain which runs from the Wells Tavern. The location of this and the impact of the basement of the subsurface area has not been considered by this poroposal. There are many

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

**Comment:**    **Response:**

recorded collapses of roads in the Hamsptead area, including in Gainsborough Gardens, as a resut of the instability of Bagshot sands on Claygate beds and London clay and there are two underground springs on Well Walk alone. It cannot be sensible to disturb the fragile subsurface environment with abasement excavation.

Planning should be refused because:

- It is not a good design, with unsightly asymmetrical windows and an industrial style
  - Tecu oxide cladding is not compatible with the listed buildings surrounding number 10 which have red roof tiles.
  - The new elevations upset the sight lines of Gainsborough Gardens
  - The marginal improvement of living space could be achieved by refurbishment without demolition of the existing structure which is wasteful and damaging for the environment
  - There are implications for ground water run-off, flooding and subsidence which have not been taken into consideration
  - The noise and disruption would affect the business of important community venue The Wells Tavern
  - The planned development is not consistent with CS 14 or DP 24 and 25
-