



## Camden Council Customer feedback and enquiries

### Comments on a current Planning Application - Ref. 9250464

---

#### Planning Application Details

2. Loss of amenity for neighbouring properties through proposed terraces and balconies causing overlooking and loss of privacy.
3. Loss of green space through approx 8-10 m proposed extension in contradiction with the Camden Biodiversity and Green Policies.
4. Potential loss of existing trees due to the proposed application again in contradiction with the Camden Green Policies.
5. Building materials for the windows, garage door, canopy and other areas do not conform with the character of the conservation area.

The area already suffers from high levels of traffic congestion, pressure on school places and other services and does not require 5 further luxury dwellings. I urge officers to reject this application.

Allbest,

Simon Marcus

If you wish to upload a file containing your comments then use the link below

No files attached

#### About this form

Issued by

Camden Council  
Customer feedback and enquiries  
Camden Town Hall  
Judd Street  
London WC1H 9JE

Form reference

9250464

Camden Council Customer feedback and enquiries  
Comments on a current Planning Application - Ref. 9249999

---

Planning Application Details

Year	2014
Number	1037
Letter	P
Planning application address	10a oakhill avenue
Title	Mr.
Your First Name	frank
Initial	
Last Name	lissauer
Organisation	
Comment Type	Support
Postcode	nw3 7re
Address line 1	8 Oakhill Avenue
Address line 2	LONDON
Address line 3	
Postcode	NW3 7RE

Your comments on the planning application

Planning application refs 2014/1016/P and 2014/1037/P

We have viewed the above planning applications for both the new house and the proposed flats and are happy to give our support to both proposals. As owners of the adjacent property at number 8 Oakhill Avenue we welcome the redevelopment of the site at number 10a. The proposals will clearly provide good quality and well-designed buildings that would sit well within the Conservation Area. The

## Camden Council Customer feedback and enquiries

### Comments on a current Planning Application - Ref. 9249999

---

#### Planning Application Details

redevelopment of the site has been long overdue and we are glad to see modern designs of both proposals rather than copies of older styles. This we feel is very important in giving the area character and identity. Some of the recent imitation developments that simply copy older styles do not do the Conservation Area any good at all. We do not want to see the conservation area become Disney Land. We particularly like the choice of good materials and proportions that respect the local traditions of the existing houses while achieving good solid modern design.

We also welcome the retention of the existing oak tree in the front garden and the clever way that the parking has been included in the design so that the front garden is not just a carpark. We think that this is a very good design and that it respects and compliments the character of Oakhill Avenue completely.

The applicant has talked to us about the side windows on our property and we understand that the new designs for both the house and the flats, will not cause any problems with loss of daylight and sunlight to our windows and there will be no loss of privacy between the buildings.

If you wish to upload a file containing your comments then use the link below

No files attached

#### About this form

Issued by

Camden Council  
Customer feedback and enquiries  
Camden Town Hall  
Judd Street  
London WC1H 9JE

Form reference

9249999



Dear Lilian,

I hope you are well.

I have objected to this application and will let you know any news.

Allbest,

Simon



RE: 10 A Oakhill Avenue, London NW3 7RE

Application Ref: 2014/1037/P

Associated Ref: 2013/3477/P

For the attention of Ms Seonaid Carr,

The character, siting and design form of the proposed dwelling house emphasizes excessively the bulk, scale and size of the building that is in a highly visible location, at the junction of Oakhill Avenue and Greenaway Garden. It detracts from the environmental character of RedFrog CA and in particular of Oakhill Avenue (DP 25.3) It fails to establish a design relationship with Oakhill Avenue buildings and in particular with the adjoining number 10 block of flats. This proposal adds one further floor to the existing building, too closely to the pitched roof of number 10 and is invasive and unrelated to the predominant form of the street skyline and the prevailing material and details that are part of the environmental qualities long established as the RedFrog character.

In contrast, the existing building breaks down the apparent scale and size of the building bulk, using separate blocks and a setback of the main building. The proposed change will obliterate the views from the dormer windows of my habitable room at number 10, which exist by the Northeast side corner from where all the roofscapes and street trees, on both sides of Oakhill Avenue Northwards towards Redington Road are currently in view.

The choice of quite alien materials, such as bronze frames proposed for the window surrounds, bronze canopy, steel panel, and aluminium garage doors makes this proposal for a four-storey dwelling house depart from the traditional RedFrog conservation area character materials, associated with brick and timber windows. Thus, the proposed

four-storey dwelling house departs from the prevailing character of the majority of the street's dwelling houses and flats.

The design proposal fails to justify the demolition of an existing neutral building, choosing to substitute it by another neutral building design. This is an unacceptable loss of opportunity to create a special architectural project for a block of flats for this particular location.

The RedFrog CA does not need a mega-block of flats that will result from this proposal which extends beyond the existing rear building lines, spreads through and reduces large areas of existing verdant garden. This will alter completely the rain water regime that sustains trees, plants, shrubs, worms, insects, birds, owls, squirrels and foxes. Recent Camden Biodiversity report accepted responsibility to ensure that the fledgling new and revised green policies support such biodiversity values and seeks to protect the existing green corridor, which is one of the topographical features that runs between Oakhill Avenue and Heath Drive, enhancing their value to control climate change. The level differences ensure a biodiverse green valley and corridor to the this area. The current proposal will, thus, have a detrimental effect on the existing air quality and noise pollution to this valley of outstanding biodiversity.

Furthermore, the block of flats spread by affecting the existing topographical levels will also affect its entire water run regime, thus deserving entirely the serious comment produced by Thames Water that stated their inability to accommodate into their waste water infrastructure the needs created by application proposal Ref 2014/1016/P (DTS Ref 39753), which I presume is also applicable to the present application.

Even if the report's conclusion considers the loss of sunlight and light as being minimal, this finding bears no relationship to the effect that will be created by the substantial loss of garden and boundary trees to make room for construction, that will certainly introduce overlooking of number 10 habitable rooms on the North East and West facades by the proposed increase over the height and depth of garden take-up next to number 10, beyond the existing rear envelope. It will obviously open the opportunity for noise and visual intrusion from the various levels of excessively large patios, balconies and terraces of number 10 A to the side and back gardens of number 10 block of flats.

The new block of flats side extension, above the upper ground floor level is located approximately at 700 mm from the site boundary from number 10, and 1200 mm from number 8. However, the basement, sub-basement line is sited next to the boundary line of number 10 block of flats. Due to further depths use to create flats numbers 1 and 2, the resulting height and the associated structures, the total basement may result in a depth of 11m down from the ground floor level at the front of number 10A and number 10. Considering the comments provided in number 10A IBA report, there is a clear need to investigate further the hydrological report findings and the possible risk of subsidence for number 10, as well as the landscape report which apart from suggesting the need for substantial planting does not shy of endorsing the loss of substantial number of trees necessary to make room for extending (by 12.5 m) the new construction of excessive accommodation, balconies, terraces, patios, oversized lightwell and garden or how the proposal could endanger number 27 Heath Drive garden/property or avoid subsidence claims in the future. It should also mention that this block of flats extension would impose an obstructive blank wall, possibly 4m in height over sections of the lower garden level of number 10.

The London Plan and Camden policy advice for blocks of flats near transport links should be limited to 1 parking space per flat. The proposal suggests 5 parking spaces and to include 2 car parking spaces already leased to number 8.

No proposal to attenuate the levels of noise and vibration to be expected from lift over run and motor room, water tanks, plant equipment, as well as basement air-conditioning is put forward. These are very important details to protect adjacent roofs, as well as to protect flank walls and back gardens. They should be centrally located, inside the dwelling house, so as to contain the impact they will create. Proposal for extensive terraces, green roofs and photovoltaic panels should be tested, not simply empirically suggested. Local conditions can defeat design solutions. Remedial measures must be realistically proposed for the reasons I described previously for application number 2013/3477/P, which was refused. I sincerely hope that Camden has been able to address and progress the reserved reasons already published as part of refusal, particularly reason number nine raised for this refusal, that required sufficiently comprehensive and robust assessment of the provision of affordable housing, which the applicant has failed to demonstrate that an on-site or off-site contribution is not the appropriate method for ensuring the provision of affordable housing (policy CS6 and policy DP3). It is an important element for balancing the socio-economic and environmental balance of RedFrog conservation area as well.

No concession should be allowed, to accommodate the demolition of the concrete embankment of number 10A, which is located next to number 10 or demolition and erection of main stairs to first floor entrance door that might prejudice the life of very important oak trees. The survey plan excludes this concrete embankment outside number 10A and connects it to number 10. Even if ownership of this tree is a civil matter, independent of planning, at this point this should be questioned as to why the proposed site plans depict this embankment and oak tree outside the boundaries of number 10A.

Considering my arguments I strongly urge you to refuse permission to this application and avoid the creation of precedents. I also wish to be notified of the committee date and the decision that is finally reached.

Thank you for your attention.

With best wishes,

[REDACTED]



Simon

Dear Mr Khadivi,

I have objected to this application and will keep you in touch with any news.

Allbest,

Simon Marcus



RE: 10 A Oakhill Avenue, London NW3 7RE

Application Ref: 2014/1037/P

Associated Ref: 2013/3477/P

Associated Ref: 2013/6777/PRE

For the attention of Ms Seonaid Carr,

In reply to your letter dated 19 February 2014, I would like to object strongly the above planning application because of the following reasons:

1. The site stands on the Claygate Member – Clay, Slit and Sand. It is highly shrinkable type of clay hence it is subject to potential subsidence and movements. The proposed basement deep excavation with its generated earth movements and vibrations will no doubt affect the present harmonious earth balance of the territory. This change will affect on the foundation of our building located so close to the proposed project risking a substantial subsidence of our building (No 10).
2. The proposed basement deep excavation with its concrete building spread in the proposed layout of the new building (from boundary to boundary – which itself is wrong and has to be stopped - unlike ground floor layout which is 1 metre from boundaries on both sides) is a serious obstruction for the underground water levels or rivers directing the current towards adjacent buildings. Unfortunately our building No 10, is located in the lower position (street's general gradient) hence all obstructed current with its increased level will be forced towards No. 10. Again unfortunately my property is located in the lower part of the No. 10 building (Lower Ground); therefore our property and garden flooding will be inevitable.
3. Loss of sunlight and natural light due to the effects which will be created by the intense overlooking of No. 10 habitable rooms, considering the expansions of the



existing layout in all directions. This would specially affect badly our kitchen and lounge natural light through the existing windows.

4. Breaching of privacy by proposed terraces and balconies and introducing of new noises caused by use of motor room, water tanks and swimming pools machinery and plant to our building and garden (No 10).

5. Taking a big portion of the back garden for the proposed extension (some 10 metres) hence eroding the green area and its conservation which is clearly in contradiction with the Camden Biodiversity and Green Policies.

6. Different architectural character of the proposed building compared with other buildings located in Oakhill Avenue in general, and with 2 neighbouring buildings (No 8 & No 10) in particular.

7. Destroying the valuable irreplaceable existing trees that must be uprooted for the proposed project and those located downstream of the natural underwater current that will be disrupted by the excavations. This will be in contradiction with the Camden Biodiversity and Green Policies.

8. The choice of building materials proposed for the windows, garage door, canopy and other specified small areas in contradiction with the traditional conservation area character associated to brick and timber windows materials.

9. The proposed 5 flats will add to the local traffic problems that in Hampstead Area have been always a subject for critics. Also it will add to the existing local schooling problems accordingly.

Considering the above points, please refuse.

Also, I wish to be notified of the committee date and the decision that is finally made for this application.

Thank you for your attention.

Attention: Ms Seonaid Carr

**RE: 10 A Oakhill Avenue, London NW3 7RE**

**Application Ref: 2014/1037/P**

**Associated Ref: 2013/3477/P**

**Associated Ref: 2013/6777/PRE**

Dear Ms Carr,

Many thanks for your letter of February 19<sup>th</sup>, in regards to the above application which arrives in tandem with another application for a dwelling house. Although the applicants have tried to improve from their previous (failed) application, their newly proposed plans present with similar unacceptable features, such as:

- The proposed building is totally out of character with the existing Oakhill Avenue buildings, both in terms of bulk/ volume/height and the design. Even their choice of materials of bronze frame and steel panel, aluminium garage door and bronze canopy proposed for the window surrounds and other specified small areas is completely alien to the surrounding buildings and the traditional RedFrog conservation area character associated to brick and timber windows materials.
- The proposed building will clearly affect the natural topography and its water run deserves entirely the serious comments produced by Thames Water (DTS Ref 39753, regarding Ref. 2014/1016/P) that will surely also apply to this application. Given the topography and natural gradient of Oakhill Avenue, the risk for our adjacent building, situated at a lower level from 10A will remain significant.
- The proposed building is in complete discord with the Camden Biodiversity Report emphasizing the need to ensure protection of the existing green corridor, which is one of the topographical features that runs between Oakhill Avenue and Heath Drive, to control climate change and protect biodiversity. The proposed building extends well beyond the existing rear building line, utilising most of its secluded verdant garden. Thus, it will alter completely the rain water regime and will certainly affect what will remain of the existing trees, plants, shrubs and will also affect life of worms, insects, birds, owls, squirrels and foxes.
- The proposed building will, indeed, result in a substantial loss of garden and boundary trees which will affect overlooking of No. 10 habitable rooms on NE and W facades by the proposed increase over the height and depth of garden use next to No. 10 beyond the existing rear envelope. Noise and visual intrusion from the various levels of patios, balconies and terraces to the side and back gardens of No 10 block of flats.
- The proposed building construction is located at only ~ 1m plus of the site boundary. However, the basement and sub-basement line is sited by the boundary line ( due to further depths to the swimming pool height 11m down from ground floor level at the front of No. 10A with number 10). Considering the comments provided in No. 10A's IBA report and the need to clearly investigate further the hydrological report findings, the risk of subsidence for No. 10 remains therefore significant.
- Enhanced noise and vibration nuisance are to be expected from motor room, water tanks and plant equipment, as well as the basement structures. Enhanced traffic and reduction of available street residents' parking places.
- Their landscape report confirms the loss of substantial number of trees to make room for the new construction in the garden.
- The proposed extensions will result in an out-of-character obstructive blank wall, 4m in height over much of the garden level at No 10.

My wife and I sincerely hope that Camden will address the above and other shortcomings and inherent problems to the adjacent buildings and the area, notwithstanding the loss of biodiversity and issues related to Camden's affordable housing programme. We appreciate Camden's adherence to its policies and do hope that this application will also be considered based on the same criteria.

With kind regards,

