A 1. 4. NT			D · 1	C (Printed on: 16/06/2015 09:05:20
Application No: 2015/2366/P	Consultees Name: David and Julia Hamdorff	Consultees Addr: Flat 4 6 Belsize Square London NW3 4HT	Received: 10/06/2015 23:54:48	Comment: OBJ	 Response: We oppose the planning application no: 2015/2366/P The proposed demolition, construction works, and landscaping would cause tremendous disruption to our local area for a significant period of time whilst the new building would provide no increase in habitable space and no identifiable heritage benefit to the conservation area. The construction period is likely to be lengthy and the disturbance to all local residents and particularly the direct neighbours to each side and to the front and rear would be significant with particular concern as to the impact of construction noise and associated traffic. We would like to see a proper survey on the impact of noise from such a large building project in a quiet residential area. It appears that the current building provides approximately 50-52 beds and as it was used as student accommodation these beds would tend to be let at full occupancy. The proposal is for 15 self-contained dwellings providing 48 beds but these would not necessarily be fully utilised. As a result there is likely to be a reduction in habitation. We note that initial approaches were for 8 dwellings not 15. According to the pre-planning advice, it appears that the design of the building does not make any particular improvement to the heritage value of the property. In terms of the design of the building the proposal is for a larger footprint than the current building and it protudes further to the rear with much larger windows and this will inevitably affect the privacy of the residents directly opposite. We are also concerned as to the impact of excavation works required to create the extra basement floor. We note that the developer has suggested that the Council may apply restrictions on parking- permit; however the previous use of the building for student accommodation was less likely to lead to a demand for parking spaces than the suggested scheme. Given the above, would it not be better and less di