

| Application No: | Consultees Name: | Consultees Addr: | Received: | Comment: | Response: |
|-----------------|------------------|------------------|---------------------|----------|--|
| 2014/7778/P | R Booth | 20 New End | 29/01/2015 19:38:05 | OBJ | <p>The demolition and construction proposed is dangerous and will have a devastating impact on residents, schools during the building works due to unacceptable levels of traffic, noise, vibration and dust and the travel distance and proposed location for loading and unloading of materials to supply the scheme. Where the site office and proposed site being considered for loading/unloading of materials at the bottom of New End at the junction with Streatley Place and Boades Mews is inappropriate and too far for contractors to be transferring by foot to the site. Builders will have to carry and trolley all materials large and small across the front of a busy primary school and nursery and the dangers of this are significant. Notwithstanding this children are constantly out playing in Streatley Place outside the school and it is absolutely not appropriate and a danger for this passageway to be also used as a Builders path. Although I do not directly have an objection with the proposed scheme itself the access and supply to the scheme needs to be reconsidered. Surely it would be more appropriate to drop materials at the top of Streatley Place from Back Lane or Heath Street. There is a layby at the top of Back Lane that could be used for deliveries. The travel distance to the site would be significantly reduced and it would also avoid the need to bypass New End School and the Nursery. It would also avoid large trucks having to manoeuvre through New End past and in close proximity to two further schools, Heathside Preparatory School and Christchurch Primary. A considerable number of children travel daily to and from these three schools along New End, Streetley Place and Boades Mews. It is therefore a danger and a risk to situate a Builders site and loading/unloading along this route and expect Contractors and children to try avoid each other whilst ferrying items. Please do reconsider how this project is being supplied and the practicalities and dangers surrounding the current proposal.</p> <p>CPG6 8.5: "Camden's planning policies make it clear that the effect on local amenity and the highway network from construction and demolition is a material planning consideration."</p> |

| Application No: | Consultees Name: | Consultees Addr: | Received: | Comment: | Response: |
|-----------------|------------------|------------------|---------------------|----------|--|
| 2014/7778/P | miles visman | 11 new court | 29/01/2015 19:53:24 | OBJ | <p>We object to the proposed scheme on the following grounds:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - the scheme is too large for the site; it appears shoehorned into the space. - the proposed 'screening wall' onto Streatly Place is unacceptably high. It will make this Streatly darker and more intimidating. It will also add to the loud acoustics of area, reflecting and amplifying sound. - the third story and its 'screening wall' will take light away from the homes in Streatly Flats. (the choice of white brick to reflect light does to some extent seem to take this into consideration but in turn creates issues in terms of not being in keeping with materials used in surrounding buildings). - the second and third story will take light away from the main garden of New Court & the garden of 21 New Court - privacy – the roof terrace and windows will directly overlook other peoples' gardens and homes - light pollution – the lights from the large windows and studio will have an effect on the back of the New Court block 1 – 30. Most of the bedrooms in this block are on this side. - noise – this is a very quiet area but the nature of the buildings and narrow streets in this part of Hampstead create an acoustic that amplifies any sound. As it is New Court residents can be disturbed by any revelers walking through Streatly Place. There is no guarantee that those who stay in the holiday home, and who will use the roof terrace and garden, will be sensitive to their residential surroundings. There is no repercussion as they leave and a new set of people comes to stay. - trees: there are a number of mature trees on the site that with a little tree work would gain a category A. These should be allowed to remain. They are a natural amenity and living architecture. All the trees are effectively protected being in a conservation area. The inclusion in the plans of a new fruit tree, usually happiest in a well drained sunny aspect, by the bathroom window of the scheme does not seem to consider the north east shady aspect or the soil conditions. - flooding/structural: There is the issue that in removing the trees and their root systems that this site, which gets extremely water logged, will get even more water bound and the soil heavy, potentially compromising the large boundary wall with New Court. This wall was restored as part of the New Court refurbishment (2005 -7) but for years prior to this had to be shored up with scaffolding by Camden Council as it was buckling with the weight of the earth behind it and as such was considered dangerous. What provisions have been made for drainage? <p>The proposal seems out of keeping with the usually sympathetic concerns of Living Architecture. Can they try again, this time consulting with local residents?</p> |

| Application No: | Consultees Name: | Consultees Addr: | Received: | Comment: | Response: |
|-----------------|------------------|------------------|---------------------|---------------|-----------------|
| 2014/7778/P | SPSS | | 28/01/2015 13:38:36 | OBJLETTE R | Dear Mr Tulloch |

I write with reference to planning application 2014/7778/P.

It is a well-known, devious strategy to submit a planning application just before a major holiday period, so that opportunities for responses are, de facto, minimised. In this particular case, I note that the application was received on Wednesday 17th December 2014, registered on Thursday 18th December 2014 and the consultation was opened on Christmas Eve (!!!) 24th December 2014 and originally scheduled to close on 9th January 2015 which would have encompassed the entire Christmas holiday period when people are generally away, often only to return the second week of January. So, I thank you for extending the consultation period to at least to the end of January in order to give residents and neighbours more time to respond. This is a particularly critical planning application, considering not just its location in Hampstead, not just its location in prime Hampstead village, but also specifically its location at the confluence of some of the narrowest and yet most heavily pedestrian streets that line of one of the most densely populated and yet the quietest residential pockets in Hampstead.

Mr Tulloch, I write to firstly object that while New End Primary School and New End Nursery have been listed as neighbours, 14-18 Streatley Place, which are located between the nursery and 19 Streatley Place (which too is listed as a neighbour) are not listed as neighbour. This discrepancy needs to be corrected since the location of the proposed development at 6 Streatley Place impacts every single property and resident on all of Streatley Place.

I venture further to insist that, considering the density of development in this small area, its strategic location with respect to access to/from the underground station, high street and heath street, and the resulting pedestrian circulation through this area, the consultation should pro-actively include residents who, while they may live outside the consultation area so far identified, do walk past the subject site twice a day, on the way to and from work. The development at 6 Streatley Place, if handled insensitively (such as, as I will argue below, how the current proposal stands), will adversely impact all these peoples' visual sensibilities and psychological sense of security.

Now, secondly, my specific objections with respect to the various requests put forth (and here I will refrain from reiterating very valid objections already put forth by other area residents, in my expectation that your office will give equal consideration to each objection, and a repetition of an objection should not be necessary to underscore its relevance or severity):

Regarding the request for change of land-use from B1 to C1:

- if there would be any possibility of a land-use change, it should be converted to residential, given the paucity of housing and pressures on new housing development in London in general, and in conservation areas such as Hampstead, in particular.

- a hotel, however small, and however well-managed by however reputable a firm, is nevertheless grossly undesirable in the intimately-built Streatley Place, New Court, Lutton Terrace, Mansfield Place, Back Lane, Streatley Flats, New End Primary school area. This is a very closely-knit residential

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

Comment: **Response:**

community where many of the residents have been living continuously for decades, and have developed a community where children play freely, unsupervised; neighbours look after each other's homes during holidays; and everyone enjoys the unparalleled quiet that descends peacefully on this area after the office-goers return home. It is not acceptable to punctuate this oasis of peace, quiet and privacy with transient holiday-makers, with no affinity to the neighbourhood, violating the privacy of the closely-placed homes and their residents, potentially drinking (perhaps even binge drinking?) and using drugs (a bad influence on the several children in the area, not to mention the several hundreds of children at New End Primary School), playing music publicly, or boisterously conversing with complete and utter disregard of the permanent residents.

- under an ideal scenario, and if it were commercially feasible, a convenience shop could be very useful at this location – selling affordable lunch sandwiches to the school staff and children, in addition to household sundries. Such a shop would also complement the village-like character of this neighbourhood. However, such shops are romanticisations that may not be feasible in today's 'Ocado-economy'; nevertheless, I mention it as food for thought to paint a picture of an idyllic urban residential-scape in order to demonstrate how grossly inappropriate is the contrasting proposal for a hotel.

- this space will also serve well as storage for businesses on high street or heath street (as it was being used) – which will better optimise economic allocation of land-use, and perhaps alleviate pressures on retailers.

Regarding the design per se, I wish to respond to the design features of the proposed building, drawing from my dual qualification and expertise as an architect and a town planner. Therefore, it would not be unreasonable to assume that I speak with some professional authority when I raise my objections below, because I maintain that architecture and design impacts not only the residents and users of the building, but also the passers-by who see and experience being near the building. Furthermore, it is our collective social responsibility to preserve for posterity the heritage of our built environment, and where such environment must morph, ensure that such change does not brutally vitiate the wabi-sabi and violate the vernacular that is our heritage. To add further credibility to my objections, I want to point out that I have also been a resident, for eight years now, barely 30 yards from the proposed development.

I raise my objections as comments on the proposal drawings submitted. Please see attached PDFs of architectural drawings annotated with my comments (these PDFs I shall also be sending via email as there seems to be no provision to directly upload directly on the website – kindly publish the PDFs of the architectural drawings on the website for the benefit of all).

To enumerate, any building that is build on this site:

- must reuse the existing old bricks in its Streatley Place facade
- must not have a three storey component to the structure, and instead be limited to two storeys
- must have a form that reflects the local vernacular (no incongruous, out-of-context, disproportionate eye-sore elements, such as vaults) – more so in the midst of a conservation area

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

Comment: **Response:**

- should not use any faux elements in the facade, such as blocked windows – historically, blocked windows reflected a response to the tax basis, but there is no need to superficially replicate this in the midst of a conservation area
- must be designed by a sensitive architect in partnership with a sensitive landscape architect in order to maintain all existing trees on site, and let the built form incorporate the existing trees, rather than require them to be felled
- incorporate and put to adaptive re-use the 19th century structures to the extent possible

Lastly, I would like to point out that the pedestrian alley-way on which this proposed development is set, and wherefrom the construction material and equipment will likely be conveyed is as narrow as 1.5 metres in part, is defined by a steep slope (on which many an elderly resident has slipped), and interjected with a flight of stairs. It is also this very alley-way that is actively used twice a day by (literally) hundreds of the four-hundred or so children at New End Primary School, and their accompanying parents, younger siblings in buggies, and dogs. Construction scheduling and planning must take this into consideration, in addition to considering the fact that Camden is separately proposing to plant two medium-sized trees smack-bang in the middle of Streatley Place (this alley way), and constant flow of construction traffic could neither be good for newly planted saplings, nor can such middle-of-the-alley planting locations assist smooth transportation of construction material and equipment.

Sincerely,

S.P.S.S.

(Full name and residential address withheld for data protection and privacy, but can be contacted by post at:
Box 152 Hampstead House, 176 Finchley Road, London NW3 6BT)

| Application No: | Consultees Name: | Consultees Addr: | Received: | Comment: | Response: |
|-----------------|------------------|---|---------------------|----------|---|
| 2014/7778/P | Karyn Ray | New End Primary School Streatley Place Hampstead | 29/01/2015 14:38:24 | COMMNT | <p>As a school, I am writing to express our concerns about the above development.</p> <p>Our main concerns re: the development are as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Possible limitations to access of New End during the building work - As a local school we need access to roads to ensure that deliveries can occur. Families with younger children also drive to drop off or collect, particularly in the colder months and such a closure would cause issues of access. The recent temporary closure of Flask Walk demonstrated the impact on the school with parents and deliveries being delayed due to congestion around other roads. • Part closure of Boades Mews for the storage of materials - 440 children attend New End. Families use Boades Mews to access the school every morning and afternoon. They enter the school via four access points depending on age. Many families have to access two or more playgrounds to collect children. There are families that also have younger children so are moving around the area using pushchairs. Add in the fact that there are families who move up and down the Mews to and from Christ Church and Hampstead Hill schools each day. Limiting the access by closing off nearly 2/3 of the top of the Mew as shown in the plan, would cause a large amount of congestion and increase safety issues with such volumes of pedestrian traffic. • Increased pedestrian / site traffic on Steatley Place - 440 children attend New End. Families use Streatley Place to access the school every morning and afternoon. They enter the school via four access points depending on age – three of which are all situated on Streatley Place. The school's nursery is situated opposite the main school. Children from the Nursery come over to the school at least twice a day with their teachers to eat lunch and to access the larger play spaces that they lack on their site. Having tradesmen moving materials on trolleys up and down Streatley Place would have to be carefully planned so as to not endanger children and their parents coming into the school. |
| 2014/7778/P | Karyn Ray | New End Primary School Streatley Place Hampstead | 29/01/2015 14:38:06 | COMMNT | |