

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2015/2280/P	sarah wilson	17 Broomsleigh Street west hampstead NW6 1QQ NW6 1QQ	01/06/2015 09:08:47	OBJEMAIL	The proposed building, by reason of its inappropriate height, bulk, massing and detailed design fails to relate to the context of the neighbouring buildings, to the detriment of the, history, character and appearance of the surrounding area, contrary to policy CS14 (Promoting high quality places and conserving our heritage) of the London Borough of Camden Local Development Framework Core Strategy and policies DP24 (Securing high quality design) of the London Borough of Camden Local Development Framework Development Policies.
2015/2280/P	sarah wilson	Broomsleigh Street NW6 1QQ NW6 1QQ	30/05/2015 12:40:23	OBJEMAIL	<p>I object to this building remaining in the strongest possible terms. The use of this building as a single family dwelling was refused on the basis that it is not fit for purpose. The construction (if you can call it that) is as a pre fabricated site office and not intended for use as a permanent dwelling. Camden's refusal notes: The height of the building is at odds with the prevalent character of the area and fails to positively enhance the appearance of the street scene contrary to the provisions of Policy CS14 (Promoting high quality places and conserving our heritage) and Policy DP24 (Securing high quality design) of the London Borough of Camden Local Development Framework 2010.</p> <p>Policy CS14 (Promoting high quality places and conserving our heritage) and Policy DP24 (Securing high quality design) sets out quite clearly the legal framework for such developments. The building at no 33c Mill Lane does not and cannot conform to these policies. Mt principal complaint are of materials that are of cheap quality and poor if not nonexistent design. This building is simply a scar on the neighbourhood – allowing this building to remain would make a mockery of local planning and design.</p> <p>The previous planning permission 2014/1164/P talks of retention of a single family dwelling, which this was not. Planning application 2013/0982/P had already refused its use as a single family dwelling so the terminology used in this latest application is yet again at odds with what is the current status of the building. Therefore the subsequent refusals should stand and if the owners wish to have a house, they should build one properly like the rest of the area and respect the quality and design of our environment.</p> <p>In addition to this I note the owners have previously attempted to rent the building as a residential home and whilst they may have succeeded once in the short term I note that the property has predominantly sat empty due to its poor quality and design.</p>