

Dike, Darlene

From: John Gardiner [REDACTED]
Sent: 13 March 2015 18:24
To: Planning
Subject: Grove Lodge, Planning Applications as shown in letter caption below
Attachments: Drawings and photo.zip

By e-mail and letter

**Admirals House
Admirals Walk
Hampstead
London
NW3 6RS**

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

Camden Council
Regeneration and Planning Development Management
London Borough of Camden
Town Hall
Judd Street
London
WC1H 8ND

13th March 2015

Dear Sirs,

Objection to the following Planning Applications
Planning Applications 2015/0886/P and 2015/1032/L
Grove Lodge, Admirals Walk

We object to the above planning application.

Our family have had the privilege of living in Admirals House for over twenty eight years and we like to think that we cherish the historic background and beauty of this part of Hampstead. Admirals House and Grove Lodge are adjacent and are seen together and alone from Hampstead Grove at the top of Admirals Walk. Grove Lodge has very recently been purchased and the new owners have made the above planning application. It is certainly the most serious planning application affecting this part of Hampstead that we have seen and, if accepted, will result in the loss of a significant part of our heritage for the reasons which we summarise below:

1. Grove Lodge and Admirals House are both listed Grade 2. The historic significance of Grove Lodge is that it was originally a 17th or 18th century farmhouse, probably the only one in the area, and at some stage a lodge house to Admirals House (then called The Grove) and was lived in in the 1920's by John Galsworthy who wrote The Forsyte Saga there (and in respect of whom there is a blue plaque on the house). In conjunction with Admirals House it was painted by John Constable on no

less than three occasions (paintings in the Victoria and Albert, Tate Britain and the National Museum, Berlin).

2. The proposed development involves the demolition of part of the listed building – the extension built under Galsworthy’s ownership (and the existing garage) and the new build extending the house almost to the road at Admirals Walk, incorporating a new double garage into the house and excavating and building a thirteen room basement extension underneath and into the garden area. The Galsworthy extension has two windows and the new build has nine and two basement window lights. The sheer scale of the development creates a new mansion destroying the characteristics that presently remain of an early farmhouse and subsequent lodge.
1. You can see the difference between the present and proposed drawings of the east elevation (what you see from the top of Admirals Walk) which are attached together with a drawing of the proposed basement. These are taken from the Grove Lodge application.
1. We like to think that Grove Lodge and Admirals House are a very special part of this area of Hampstead. Grove Lodge is illustrated as being of particular interest in sub area 4 of the Camden Conservation Area document and that view will be lost forever if these plans are approved. We attach a recent photograph of that view of Grove Lodge. Likewise we will lose the view painted by Constable from the south which is still visible from the footpath opposite Admirals House (contrary to what the applicants’ consultants say). The view from Hampstead Grove will be of a substantial modern house and not of an old farmhouse/lodge in conjunction with Admirals House. In consequence, these proposals will result in harm to the special interest of the listed building (Grove Lodge) and for the setting of its neighbouring listed building (Admirals House). It results in the loss of its real historic significance as a listed building – the old farmhouse of this part of Hampstead; it involves the destruction of the Galsworthy extension and has an unbalancing effect on Grove Lodge by the new extension dominating the old. It also has an unbalancing effect on its relationship with Admirals House.
2. For all of the above reasons we do urge you to reject this application. We thought that the purpose of listing was to protect us from this sort of thing and this application should not be allowed to create a precedent for the demolition of listed buildings in whole or in part.
1. Finally you should be aware that the demolition and rebuilding (with basement) of Fleet House, Admirals Walk is about to commence and the construction period will be a minimum of eighteen months. If Grove Lodge gets consent their works will likely commence just when the Fleet House construction will have ended and, if they get consent, it is almost inevitable that Netley Cottage will renew its application for its “subterranean leisure centre” with a further eighteen months to two years build. We would then be looking at continuous construction/demolition operations over approximately six years.

We have asked a separate consultant to comment on the Applicants listed building representations and we, in consequence, may wish to add further grounds to the above. If anyone wishes to telephone us or comment by e-mail we should be pleased to respond.

Yours sincerely,

John and Pascal Gardiner

Dike, Darlene

From: John Gardiner [REDACTED]
Sent: 13 March 2015 18:42
To: Planning
Subject: Further Objection to Planning Applications
Attachments: Drawings and photo.zip

Further Objection to Planning Applications 2015/0886/P and 2015/1032/L Grove Lodge, Admirals Walk

I have tried getting in touch with the case officer for this matter – Gideon Whittingham on the telephone over the past several days but with no success on my return from abroad. I have listened a very long time to pipe music but initially did manage to leave a message but have never had a reply.

To summarise we consider that there are a number of serious objections to the above proposals as follows:

1. The destruction of the historic rationale of the listed building (Grove Lodge). We have submitted a separate objection on that ground and, in all probability will submit a separate expert's report.
2. The basement Impact Assessment put in by the Applicants is defective. By Camden's Planning Guidance "Basements and Lightwells" and other published documents, any consultants producing such a report are supposed to consult neighbours (which they haven't) and by Figure 1 Question 2 page 17, the 1st stage, they have to consider whether they are "within 100 metres of a watercourse, well (used or disused) or potential spring". The applicant's consultants answer this question no but in fact Grove Lodge is within 10 centimetres of a well in the basement of Admirals House from which one can see that there is a stream/spring in all directions (believed to be the source of the River Westbourne). The evaluation should therefore have proceeded to stages 2–5 which it has not and is therefore defective. The consultants may not have known of this well but they made no enquiries of us (the owners of Admirals House) and had they done so and inevitably, because of the existence of the well, they needed to go on to stages 2–5 which they have not done. Therefore their report is defective and there is no satisfactory basis for the underground basement development. The applicants had been made aware of the existence of the well many months ago.
3. The Applicant's arboriculturist report says that the lime trees on the bank of Admirals Walk are not protected by TPO's. This is simply wrong. They are: see Town and Country Planning Act 1947, The County of London (Hampstead No 9) Tree Preservation Order 1956, G. 2 and G. 3. There is no basis for destroying this perfectly healthy and non dangerous tree. Indeed Camden itself rightly objected to such a proposal some four years ago and nothing of substance has changed.
1. The applicants propose to stop up a public path being that between their garage and the fence on Admirals Walk. This must be a public path because it is the continuation of the same, insisted on by Camden and registered at the Land Registry over the forecourt in front of both Admirals House and Grove Lodge. This would be a criminal offence under section 137 of the Highways Act and it is the duty of Camden to preserve such public paths.

I have been trying to speak to Mr. Whittingham, as the case officer, for this application on the basis that he might well wish to discuss with other departments of the Council relevant to the above

matters (e.g. 3 – the legal department and highways who were responsible for the resolution of the right of way; the Applicant is of the view that there is no right of way but that is incorrect). Also, in my view, it would obviously be advisable for someone to come and see the well.

[REDACTED]

Yours faithfully,

John Gardiner
(Admirals House)