

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2014/6224/P	Elizabeth Henshaw	Flat 2 35 Netherhall Gardens NW3 5RL	16/12/2014 13:19:41	OBJ	As a resident of Netherhall Gardens I strongly object to this proposal on three grounds; firstly the destruction of a heritage building of aesthetic and historic value which contributes significantly to the street and the neighbourhood. Secondly I object on the grounds that Netherhall Gardens is already congested with cars and pedestrians because of the three primary prep schools in the street. These schools already create problems with parking and traffic, and massive building works will impact on the safety of the hundreds of pedestrians (including many very young children) walking past the site every day. Thirdly I object on the grounds of noise disturbance for such a long period of time as a close neighbour and someone who works from home.
2014/6224/P	Ruth Basrawy	44 Netherhall Gdns	16/12/2014 00:13:22	OBJ	Dear Ms Ryan thank you for the letter about the revised plans, my objections from 10/11/14 remain unchanged. The application is still for a double basement . There will be serious damage to the neighbouring houses and this planning application is excessive. Please reject it. sincerely Ruth Basrawy

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2014/6224/P	Daniel Schulman	23 Netherhall Gardens	15/12/2014 18:59:04	OBJEMAIL	<p>My objections remain as before. The neighbours have also raised very strong objections. A few days ago I read that Chelsea and Westminster will soon legislate that basements should extend no more than one level deep.</p> <p>As the home owner living opposite to the planned demolition and construction, I am concerned about the plans to dig down below the level of the current house to create a two-tier basement system with sunken garden. Such aggressive development is unnecessary and only serves to increase the financial rewards of the developer, but leaves little regard to the instability created and potential damage to other houses that have stood on this road for over one hundred years. A deeper dig than the current depth of building at number 26 Netherhall should be strongly rejected by the governing body.</p> <p>I share the other views of my neighbour as number 21 Netherhall Gardens listed below:</p> <p>In recent years we have noticed some land movement at the front of our homes which is of concern. This type of land movement appears to have affected many houses on our side of Netherhall Gardens and is apparent in the forward leaning into the street of many of the brick gate posts including that of our house. Some of the gate posts have been rebuilt recently as a result. I believe that plans to excavate down into the terraces of the Netherhall Gardens area should be regarded with extreme caution and should be generally rigorously discouraged by Camden Council.</p> <p>I have read the heritage statement but feel that the front aspect of the house is not in keeping with the surrounding houses, the style is wrong and there are too many windows. The proposed house is also too big and too wide. In particular, the gap between no 24A and no 26 is not in keeping with the feel of the buildings on that side of the road which in themselves are of individual character. That sense of individuality requires a preservation of space between the properties. On our side of the road the architecture is very different, the houses were built to have a terrace feel. Any re-development of no 26 should retain the sense of proportion of that side of the road in line with its evolution since the 1800s.</p> <p>The sun rises opposite the front of our house and in the early morning the sun shines directly through our windows. I feel that the proposed building will reduce our sunlight by more than the 0.2% outlined in the application.</p> <p>I would also like to comment on the proposed changes to the parking bays. Camden Council must ensure that we lose no length in our parking bays and that changes be re-instated to the exact length removed. Parking is difficult due to the density of flats on our side of the road.</p> <p>I am also concerned about how the proposed excavations will affect the third party mature Oak and that this development will mean the loss of the other mature oak in the garden of no 26, another beautiful tree in the area. Even if the other mature Oak needs to be removed due to decay at least with the current garden proportions this tree could be replaced. Notably, last year, another tree in the garden of number 26 was recently cut down but not replaced as far as I am aware.</p>

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2014/6224/P	Dr Neema Sofaer	Flat 1 49 Maresfield Gardens London NW3 5TE	13/12/2014 21:49:51	OBJ	<p>I care enormously about modern architecture and do not believe that all period buildings should be preserved. However, I strongly object to the demolition of 26 Netherall Gardens. This is a distinguished building with original mouldings that is part of an unbroken chain on both sides of red-brick ornamental buildings at the top half of Netherall Gardens, the bottom half of which is blighted by the euphemistically-named Imperial Towers. The area has just lost the old Victorian building of South Hampstead High School. Let us preserve our heritage and the integrity of the upper half of Netherall Gardens. I would not mind it if the developers gutted the building, preserving the façade, as at 59 Netherall Gardens, but please let us now lose 26 Netherall Gardens' distinctive façade and imposing staircase to another block of flats.</p> <p>A second point is that the proposed development, in that it advances into the current garden of 26 Netherall Gardens, reduces the green and empty space in between the houses on Maresfield and Netherall Gardens. I live at 49 Maresfield Gardens (from which I can see the distinctive back of 26 Netherall Gardens) and am dismayed that the new block would protrude into that green, empty space that gives our house the sensation of being situated in the open countryside.</p> <p>A last point (though trivial in comparison) is that the amount of drilling involved will be a real pain (I work from home, on a room overlooking the garden) and exacerbate our existing subsidence problem that our garden is literally creeping into the neighbouring house in Netherall Gardens.</p>
2014/6224/P	Caroline Formstone	21 Netherhall Gardens Hampstead	13/12/2014 16:30:22	OBJ	<p>I have looked at the revised drawings for 26 Netherhall. I still strongly object to the demolition of a Victorian building in a conservation area particularly one which has such elegant features as no 26 and I still strongly object to the excavation of the basement and the erection of an over-sized building which will not fit into the surrounding area.</p>
2014/6224/P	Ray Omoshebi, Director Baston House Ltd	Baston House Ltd 21 Netherhall Gardens Hampstead London	13/12/2014 16:47:06	OBJ	<p>The demolition of this Victorian building would be disastrous for the local community both in terms of architectural loss but also because the new building that is proposed as its replacement is not fitting for the local area and the excavation into the terrace underneath 26 Netherhall to create a basement area is extremely inadvisable based on current local knowledge of land slippage in the neighbourhood.</p>

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2014/6224/P	Dr Maurits Kleijnen	Flat 10 49 Maresfield Gardens	13/12/2014 21:55:08	OBJ	<p>Please, Camden, don't let this beautiful, imposing period house with imaginative arts-and-craft mouldings be demolished and replaced with another block of flats.</p> <p>How many of these grand old period houses are left?</p> <p>Walk down Netherall Gardens from the top and savour the unbroken chain (till you get to Imperial Towers!) of high-quality period buildings.</p> <p>PLEASE CAMDEN, PROTECT OUR HERITAGE (even if you could get more council tax by letting this development go ahead)</p> <p>Also, all that drilling is going to worsen our house's (serious) problem of subsidence.</p> <p>The proposed block will stick out more into the garden. We at 49 Maresfield Gardens love that open space between the houses on Maresfield Gardens and Netherall Gardens.</p>
2014/6224/P	Daniel Schulman	23 Netherhall Gardens	15/12/2014 18:39:52	OBJEMPER	<p>This is a Victorian house in a conservation area and as such should not be demolished (this is my third letter of objection). I have read all letters of objection, the issues raised all remain relevant. We will be doubly affected by the proposed works at the Langhorf Hotel on Froggnal.</p>
2014/6224/P	Suzanne Roux	Flat 1a 22 Netherhall Gardens London NW3 5TH	15/12/2014 13:06:51	OBJ	<p>Not much seems to have changed since the last application, so my objections remain the same. I have real concerns about 2 basement levels in our road which has unstable ground, which could affect the stability of our property further down the road. We have had subsidence problems in the past. The many thin, full height tall windows are out of keeping with the architecture of the Street.</p>