

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2014/7851/P	Hampstead CAAC	Flat 6 4 Ferncroft Avenue London NW3 7PH	20/03/2015 00:00:24	OBJ	<p>Car parking aiming towards 1:1 provision indicates the likely high value of these homes, which should be in a car free development in the centre of Hampstead, there being good public transport facilities and car club provision in the immediate area.</p> <p>Evident overdevelopment as seen from PA Road east side of Fitzjohns. Any exg fotos to compare ? Tall block reaches too far along PA Rd west.</p> <p>View south along FJA shows the objection – visible sky limit. Closer view shows block too far forward, objectionable dominance of seback tower.</p> <p>View along FJA shoes the same dominance. General design standard for town centre mediocre. Needs basic re-design.</p> <p>Scheme seems afraid of truly modern design but which would greatly improve conflicts in the massing as well as offering better-proportioned elevations.</p> <p>Whatever the calculation of no. of units, 33 or 42, floorspace and massing are likely to remain the same with the resulting over-development. There may be a case for yet more housing for the elderly, but this does not mean a need for over-provision on a tight and modestly-developed site. We would call for a reasonable reduction in the sheer amount of accommodation proposed here.</p> <p>The proposed development ignores the existing relation of the hostel buildings to the houses on Prince Arthur Road (PAR). The lower 3 storeys of the building are already dominant in contrast to the existing hostel buildings and the setting back of the top 2 storeys does nothing to reduce impact, on the contrary exacerbating the dominance.</p> <p>The site, unlike the Bartram hostel site, is not a standalone site with associated major hospital buildings but an important part of central Hampstead with its scale and texture which the proposal's dominance threatens to destroy.</p> <p>Great expanse of the Planning Design and Access Statement is given to describing the history texture and character of central Hampstead with which this scheme has no relation nor respect.</p> <p>This report makes much of the height of existing older houses in the area but ignores their leisurely settings, offering by contrast an unnecessarily complex and excessive block crammed onto a tight site at a busy street junction.</p> <p>The design of the existing is criticised, evidently by a design team proud of its new replacement offering to a high-rolling commercial investment client, but unaware of its own relatively humble status in design and of the mediocrity of much of their output, great in amounts of mass housing, much less so in quality of design. The existing building housed many young people absorbed in their studies and socialising, their occupation and presence in the area well compensating for any supposed deficiencies in the buildings. A new building is not laudable because it is new, nor even because it appears 'lighter' than the existing, certainly not because it is of excessive bulk and of second-rate developer's design.</p> <p>Section 2.5.14-27 of this report discusses the desirability of respect of and relation to local heritage assets and landscaping without offering any proof of this scheme's contribution to that character and history.</p>

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

Buildings in Hampstead benefit the locality by their diverse forms and treatments, even the old mansion blocks quoted by the applicant have more character and less dominance than this proposal.

Landscaping in front gardens, gaps between buildings.....

A sense of enclosure beneath the elevated canopies creates a particular spatial experience within the street. When looking obliquely along a street, buildings are seen in glimpses and fragments between the trees. They diminish the scale and mass of the large villas.

Besides the trees, scale of existing older buildings are humanised by their designed and entertaining elements which the applicant’s proposal can not match.

Immediately opposite the site are some smaller-scale Georgian villas which are atypical of the area, whilst more substantial houses such as no. 3 Prince Arthur Road are the dominant type - elaborate in their detail and varied in their massing.

This does not mean that the smaller villas can be ignored in the applicant’s quest for maximum investment return.

The pre-app conclusion is stated to favour

2.5.14 The delivery of high quality and inclusive developments is seen as being important.

Developments should aim to establish a strong sense of place, should seek to optimise the potential of a particular site, respond to local character and history, and reflect the identity of local surroundings and materials and be visually attractive as a result of good architecture and appropriate landscaping.

2.5.15 The NPPF encourages local authorities in making decisions to not impose architectural styles or particular taste and not stifle innovation, originality or initiative. The NPPF does, however state that it is proper to promote or reinforce local distinctiveness.

Camden’s policy seeks high quality design which may be an imposition too far for this design team.

2.5.19 Local planning authorities should look for opportunities for new development within Conservation Areas and within the settings of heritage assets to enhance or better reveal their significance. This scheme does nothing to enhance or better reveal anything of local heritage assets. It is not in the least concerned with these.

2.5.40 Policy CS14 promotes high quality places and heritage conservation. New buildings should be attractive, safe and easy to use. Development should be of the highest standard of design and should respect local context and character; should preserve and enhance Camden’s rich and diverse heritage assets and their settings; promote high quality landscaping and be inclusive and accessible.

This proposal can not be considered ‘high-quality of design’ being a fig-leaf for unduly high-density development regardless of its siting. The proposal greatly reduces the existing open or green site space and this can not be acceptable.

2.5.45 DP9 states that the Council will support development of housing with shared facilities and student housing provided that the development:

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

**Comment:**    **Response:**

does not create an over-concentration of such a use in the local area or cause harm to residential amenity or the surrounding area.

That this proposal produces a high concentration on a tight site at a busy street junction with the proposed addition of off-street car parking not in character with the locality nor providing essential transport as there is adequate transport locally, also threatening greater traffic due to frequent deliveries to the development in use.

The existing building does not engage with these key characteristics identified within the surrounding urban fabric. There is a meanness and paucity to its fenestration and material use that fails to mediate between the characteristics of a residential institution - consistent floor heights and repeated windows - and the individual compositions of the surrounding villas. Additionally, the building is piecemeal in its massing, without an apparent overall strategy to the way in which its form is manipulated.

The building presents an unbroken elevation to Prince Arthur Road, creating a hard, impermeable face to the street which is uncharacteristic of the locality.

The first photograph which supposedly supports this denigration of the existing building on PAR is that of the main FJA elevation. The PAR elevations are known to be more sympathetic, set down and back, leaving a green boundary, on which there is no commentary from the applicant.

Existing houses and mansion blocks are indeed large but have diverse interesting and scale-reducing features which this proposal lacks. While the older buildings followed fashions in decoration and diversity, the applicant's proposal follows the current fashion for bland characterless heaps of straight brick columns, flat topped and flat-roofed with confused walling and only fenestration to offer any alleviation.

The generous plans of the houses and flats of our forefathers are replaced with mass housing of much less generous proportions no doubt comfortable but aimed at maximum return.

Putting a gap between the two proposed blocks does nothing to help reduce their dominance, especially as the 'gap' is raised off the street level to which it should refer and to be viewed as the applicant knows it should.

As elsewhere in developers' schemes, existing roof ridge lines are taken as the reference points for projections of mass of flat-topped blocks against which this CAAC has written many times.

That mansion blocks may have been short on open and green space does not excuse the excess development of a contemporary development minimising space around only to claim proximity of open spaces 'nearby'.

Regards,  
John Malet-Bates RIBA  
for Hampstead CAAC

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
					Flat 6, 4 Ferncroft Avenue, London, NW3 7PH  DD 020 7368 4153 Mob 07947 744 203
2014/7851/P	Jon McElroy	9 The Bear Pit 14 New Globe Walk London SE1 9DR	19/03/2015 17:21:27	COMMNT	I I am the owner of the plot of land adjoining 1 Ellerdale Road which has planning permission to build a single storey house directly behind this proposed development (Land Registry Title Number ). My permission was limited to a single storey structure for good reason. This development is directly adjacent and does not appear to be subject to the same restrictions. This is highly likely to adversely affect my light and privacy quite dramatically. My main concern is that I haven't been notified about this development and only happened to discover this by a chance conversation with one of my new neighbours this afternoon. Regards