



# *The Heath & Hampstead Society*

P.O. BOX 38214 LONDON NW3 1XD

The Society examines all Planning Applications relating to Hampstead, and assesses them for their impact on conservation and on the local environment.

## **To London Borough of Camden, Development Control Team**

Planning Ref: 2015/2229/P

Address: 6 Nutley Terrace NW3

Description: Demolition; new block of 6 flats

Case Officer: Olivier Nelson

Date 19 May 2015

Note that this application is misleadingly described in the Applications List. The new block of flats is 5 not 4 floors in height, and is in addition to a double basement.

We do not object in principle to the demolition of the existing house.

We do object strongly to the proposed block of flats, on these grounds:

### 1. Size and bulk.

The new building would be grossly larger than the existing house, or any adjacent houses. It would not only be much higher, at 5 floors, but also wider, occupying the full width of the site, and significantly deeper, due to the use of part of the garden of Nos.40/42 Fitzjohns Avenue. It would be a building on a completely new and dominating scale, destroying the domestic character of Nutley Terrace. This is quite unjustified, and contrary to the low-height area character described in the Conservation Area Statement.

### 2. Balconies on Southern elevation

The South elevation of the flats is entirely taken up with expansive balconies and roof terraces over its whole width and height; i.e at every floor level. All of these, but particularly that at 5<sup>th</sup> floor level, would overlook adjoining properties and gardens, leading to very significant loss of privacy, and noise pollution, on a large scale. The size of most of the balconies would enable many people to congregate, with evening parties causing widespread noise nuisance and disturbance. They are plainly planned to accommodate large groups of people, as a feature of the design. This is totally unacceptable to very many neighbours. LDF Policy DP26.

3. The on-site car-parking provisions are excessive, contradicting Camden policies on discouragement of car use and air quality. This is especially so in this case, where it is all located in an otherwise totally unnecessary sub-basement. The carbon footprint of the building and its construction must be appalling.

Access to the parking by car lift is also unacceptable; noise caused to neighbours, especially at night, would be unwelcome.

#### 4. Basement standards of light/ventilation

The 2 flats at basement level would receive sub-standard levels of light and ventilation. This applies especially to the 2 bedrooms served only by tiny, deep, lightwells. Such Dickensian standards are unacceptable in the 21<sup>st</sup> century.

#### 5 .Basement Impact

A lengthy structural engineering report is presented, but no Basement Impact Assessment. This is both surprising and unacceptable. There are houses closely adjoining the site; their structural safety must be assured, particularly with a double basement excavation on their boundaries. The application should not have been validated without a BIA.

#### 6. Architecture

The street elevation is marred by the metal-clad top floor construction, presumably differently clad to disguise the building's excessive height. It fails to do this, and is obtrusively ugly. The Southern elevation, all-glass with glass balcony balustrading, is without architectural merit and reads like a glass manufactures' advertisement. This really is not good enough for our Conservation Area. This is well-described in the CA Statement (P.10); plainly the applicants have only contempt for its virtues.

#### 7. Trees

The arboricultural report makes some play on the absence of tree removal. That would be admirable, but we doubt whether at least one major tree, on an adjoining site, would survive the 7 metre-deep basement excavation cutting into its roots. Trees are an essential feature in the CA, and none must be lost. This alone could be a valid reason for refusal.

A most unsatisfactory proposal; please refuse.