

<b>Application No:</b>	<b>Consultees Name:</b>	<b>Consultees Addr:</b>	<b>Received:</b>	<b>Comment:</b>	<b>Response:</b>
2015/3314/P	Smida	21 Netherhall Gardens	31/07/2015 19:05:04	COMMNT	I would like to express my concern re this proposal and I am against to the development which would make the area look more dense, likely would disturb the appearance and design of this street, increase the parking requirements which is now just, just ok-ish. Height of the proposed development is too high and would also affect the privacy of many neighbours around. As I often work from home, the construction process would increase a noise level in the area, increase pollution, building rubbish around, disturb sleeping of little children, reduce the parking spaces during construction process, obstruct the road and pavements, increase traffic with heavy construction vehicles and also affects health and safety of the street, decrease cleanness for substantial period etc. Thank you that I could express my view on this.

---

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2015/3314/P	MIRIAM MADAR	FLAT 4 28 NETHERHALL GARDENS LONDON nw3 5th	06/08/2015 16:13:45	OBJ	<p>We object to the following development proposal of no 26 .</p> <p>We have sought advice from GIA-rights of light specialists .The proposed development goes against camden policy of respecting levels of light received by surrounding neighbours and will cause overshadowing and blocking of light to adjoining properties. It also will affect the quality of life for the adjoining properties by causing darkness in bedrooms,living rooms and hallways which camden seeks to protect.</p> <p>The developers have not liased with the neighbours or visited the adjoining properties and hence parts of their reports are inaccurate -window 62 is not secondary and other windows in the property are not shown. The report also does not include ADF tests which are key to camden policy and NSL reports despite mentioning these in their introduction -thus provides no insight on light in rooms and just the windows.Thus their reports are incomplete.The NSL test can easily be done despite the developers saying not as the room layouts are easily available.</p> <p>re 28 netherhall -window 62 is a breakfast and dining room window and the VSC post the development falls from 32% to 18.6% this is a loss of 41% and breaches the BRE max 20% loss and also the Bre guide of rooms having 27% adequate VSC .The room is a primary habitable room.The VSC for window 61 goes from 24.3% to 8.9% a loss of 63% again breaching the Bre max loss of 20% and the VSC requisite of 27% VSC .</p> <p>re 24s netherhall -the loss of light on 1st floor child bedroom is significant as a result of proposal with a loss of 49% of VSC v the maximum loss required under BRE of 20% and 13.5% light is inadequate for a childs bedroom.</p> <p>The lower ground of 26 ADF results appear questionable at 3% and we would question their methodology on how they achieved this for a basement room.</p> <p>We also object to massive depth of basement plans of 10-15 metres as excessive -27 netherhall was underpinned a few years back -why would we want to destabilise the area even further with a sub basement way beyond the norm for basements.</p> <p>The balcony/terrace in 26 proposals will overlook the gardens of the adjoining properties .</p> <p>The basement proposals at the rear of 26 will infringe/destroy the tree roots of the massive oak tree which belongs to no 28 rear garden .</p> <p>We object to the demolition of 26 building in a conservation area.</p> <p>We are shocked that despite the proposal being refused back in Dec 2014 and the massive number of objections raised back then that the developers have the arrogance to continue pushing practically the same submission and just provide reports to support their justification.</p> <p>They need to totally reconfigure their proposals to respect Camden,Conservation area and their neighbours rather than putting fingers in their ears.</p>
2015/3314/P	MIRIAM MADAR	FLAT 4 28 NETHERHALL GARDENS LONDON nw3 5th	06/08/2015 16:13:44	OBJ	

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2015/3314/P	MIRIAM MADAR	FLAT 4 28 NETHERHALL GARDENS LONDON nw3 5th	06/08/2015 16:13:22	OBJ	<p>We object to the following development proposal of no 26 .</p> <p>We have sought advice from GIA-rights of light specialists .The proposed development goes against camden policy of respecting levels of light received by surrounding neighbours and will cause overshadowing and blocking of light to adjoining properties. It also will affect the quality of life for the adjoining properties by causing darkness in bedrooms,living rooms and hallways which camden seeks to protect.</p> <p>The developers have not liased with the neighbours or visited the adjoining properties and hence parts of their reports are inaccurate -window 62 is not secondary and other windows in the property are not shown. The report also does not include ADF tests which are key to camden policy and NSL reports despite mentioning these in their introduction -thus provides no insight on light in rooms and just the windows.Thus their reports are incomplete.The NSL test can easily be done despite the developers saying not as the room layouts are easily available.</p> <p>re 28 netherhall -window 62 is a breakfast and dining room window and the VSC post the development falls from 32% to 18.6% this is a loss of 41% and breaches the BRE max 20% loss and also the Bre guide of rooms having 27% adequate VSC .The room is a primary habitable room.The VSC for window 61 goes from 24.3% to 8.9% a loss of 63% again breaching the Bre max loss of 20% and the VSC requisite of 27% VSC .</p> <p>re 24s netherhall -the loss of light on 1st floor child bedroom is significant as a result of proposal with a loss of 49% of VSC v the maximum loss required under BRE of 20% and 13.5% light is inadequate for a childs bedroom.</p> <p>The lower ground of 26 ADF results appear questionable at 3% and we would question their methodology on how they achieved this for a basement room.</p> <p>We also object to massive depth of basement plans of 10-15 metres as excessive -27 netherhall was underpinned a few years back -why would we want to destabilise the area even further with a sub basement way beyond the norm for basements.</p> <p>The balcony/terrace in 26 proposals will overlook the gardens of the adjoining properties .</p> <p>The basement proposals at the rear of 26 will infringe/destroy the tree roots of the massive oak tree which belongs to no 28 rear garden .</p> <p>We object to the demolition of 26 building in a conservation area.</p> <p>We are shocked that despite the proposal being refused back in Dec 2014 and the massive number of objections raised back then that the developers have the arrogance to continue pushing practically the same submission and just provide reports to support their justification.</p> <p>They need to totally reconfigure their proposals to respect Camden,Conservation area and their neighbours rather than putting fingers in their ears.</p>
2015/3314/P	MIRIAM MADAR	FLAT 4 28 NETHERHALL GARDENS LONDON nw3 5th	06/08/2015 16:13:44	OBJ	

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2015/3314/P	Dominic Brett	25 Netherhall Gardens London NW3 5RL	31/07/2015 17:18:26	COMMNT	<p>Again, I must object strongly to this proposal. In terms of the disruption to neighbours, the amendments do nothing to allay earlier concerns and I am surprised Camden has allowed resubmission in this form.</p> <p>The plans would entail the demolition of a perfectly viable building which is in keeping with surrounding houses. The construction of a basement constitutes a direct threat to surrounding houses and the erection of rear and front balconies compromises the privacy of other dwellings.</p> <p>The demolition, excavation and rebuilding would entail many months of dirt, dust and noise. We are already suffering from other building projects, notably South Hampstead School, on Netherhall Gardens and the recent announcement that you are - incredibly - minded to approve the conversion of the Langdorf Hotel on Frognal means that residents on our side of Netherhall Gardens will endure sustained and far-reaching damage to our quality of life. Please do not allow this selfish and needless work. Conversion of the existing property could doubtless provide just as many flats.</p>
2015/3314/P	Frieda Houser	Flat 2 21 Netherhall Gardens Hampstead NW3 5RL	01/08/2015 11:37:44	OBJ	<p>I object again to the demolition of a unique and thus important building for the Netherhall conservation area and to the plans to replace it with a massive new build which will have significant negative impact on both neighbouring trees, including a mature oak, and on neighbouring properties. Of equal concern is the effect of the excavation into the terrace on (a) the underground water flows which will impact on many local properties and (b) on the stability of the terraces which is already under pressure.</p> <p>Also:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Previous applications were refused by Camden because of several fundamental flaws in the proposed plans, these remain in this application, so it should be similarly refused.</li> <li>2. Where is the application to demolish? The authors of the current planning application appear to believe that demolition of the current building, which contributes to the Netherhall conservation area, is a fore-gone conclusion, hence its relegation in the order of events in the application description. Is this a tactical move on their part?</li> <li>3. It can be no coincidence that this application comes at a time when many local residents will be away on holiday. I note that the previous application was also made close to the Christmas holiday period. I appeal to Camden to extend the consultation period when applications are made at such times.</li> </ol>

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2015/3314/P	Anne Stevens	Flat 1 20 Netherhall Gardens NW3 5TH NW3 5TH NW3 5TH	05/08/2015 13:08:19	OBJ	<p>I wish to object to the proposed redevelopment of the site at 26 Netherhall Gardens on two main grounds. I live three buildings along from the site at 20 Netherhall Gardens. I recognize both that the 1960s extension to the existing building is altogether unsatisfactory from an architectural point of view, and that the currently proposed design for the replacement has taken into account a number of the grounds for the refusal of the previous application – a refusal which I welcomed.</p> <p>However, first, a two storey basement is proposed, to incorporate a plant room and bike store at the lower level. A basement of this depth is not acceptable, and is contrary to Camden’s proposed policy on basements and lightwells (policy A5e). Camden should be reviewing all applications in the light of their compatibility with what will be acceptable in the future. It is by no means clear that, given the extent of underground water movement in this area, where several tributaries of an underground river flow, a basement of this depth will not adversely affect drainage (see draft policy A5i). I note that the applicant alleges that water will simply find its way around the new structure to continue to flow downhill. I think it very likely that this diverted water will damage neighbouring structures and foundations. In no 20 Netherhall Gardens a single storey cellar (built contemporaneously with the house in the 1880s) currently requires a sump pump to evacuate water ingress. I do not think that the applicant has demonstrated that the problems will not be exacerbated during and after construction of so deep a basement in a site rendered unsuitable by water flow in the ground.</p> <p>The basement impact assessment provided by the applicant is thoroughly unsatisfactory. I hope that at the very least Camden will require resubmission of a much more thorough document and then refer it for comprehensive audit. As it stands it merely asserts that a basement that is properly designed and carefully constructed to a high standard would probably not cause problems. The BIA makes no attempt to demonstrate that the applicant’s plans are sufficiently carefully designed, nor that they provide in detail for appropriately high quality construction. Indeed the assessment is so generic as to be of very limited value. Camden should also require certified documentary evidence that the necessary party wall agreements with very stringent measures to protect neighbours against damage or cost are in place before permission is granted. The applicant’s construction statement (at 5.3.2) anticipates damage to Burland Scale 2. Camden should require in advance (and enforce) a detailed construction management plan that will reduce any damage to Burland scale 0 or at most 1. In addition the construction statement notes that surface water run-off is likely to increase and recommends that this be mitigated by rain water harvesting, storage and re-use. Camden should impose a condition that requires that this be incorporated in the plans before approval is granted.</p> <p>Second, the design of the lower ground floor requires lightwells to render the rooms habitable. The lightwells proposed are quite small and deep. They are liable to be dampened by rainfall, and to dry out only slowly or not at all because of a lack of direct sunlight and of overshadowing, as a consequence of their orientation and the presence of neighbouring buildings. The result is likely to be a damp, algal and hard to clean space which will adversely impact the habitability of the rooms they serve. These rooms are in practice likely to require artificial lighting at almost all times of day, thus increasing energy use. The applicant’s daylight and sunlight study suggest that the achievement of acceptable levels of light depends upon mirrored walls, and light coloured internal and external decoration. However, such details can be changed, even in a conservation area, without further planning permission and require considerable maintenance. It is not appropriate to base permission for permanent development upon changeable factors. Bedrooms, especially those used by children and young people are today very often occupied for substantial periods of daytime, and should not require constant</p>

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

artificial light. The proportion of the area bedrooms 1 and 2 for duplex 2 that receive no direct light (sunlight and daylight report Appendix 3) is frankly shocking. I do not think permission should be granted for such a design – see draft policy A.1e and f.  
I hope that this application will be rejected.

---

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2015/3314/P	Mark Amery	Flat 1 27 Netherhall Gardens London	08/08/2015 21:58:01	OBJEMAIL	<p>Dear Mr Peres De Costa,</p> <p>I strongly object to the proposed development at No. 26 Netherhall Gardens for the following reasons:</p> <p>1 - I'm very concerned about the adverse impact the development will have on the look and character of the neighbourhood. The building that is proposed will be substantially bigger in scale and occupy a larger footprint than the existing structure.</p> <p>It is claimed in the Heritage Statement that "The Proposed Development will positively address Netherhall Gardens, with a well considered elevational design, filling in the current uncharacteristic 'gap' on Site; conforming to the prevailing ridge height of development along this part of the street; and providing an enhanced relationship between the building on Site and the street. The Proposed Development will enhance the quality of the townscape of the area and the character and appearance and significance of the Fitzjohn's Netherhall Conservation Area."</p> <p>I strongly disagree with this claim. In fact I believe the contrary is true if the existing building is demolished and this "uncharacteristic gap" is allowed to be filled by the proposed development, as it would cause substantial harm to the significance of the designated heritage asset, the Fitzjohn's Netherhall Conservation Area. The area has a diverse and eclectic mix of buildings of a variety of designs, styles and ages. The non uniformity of structures is a major contributor to the area's charm, character and uniqueness. Moreover it is one of the main reasons I chose to live in this area. It is a pleasure to live in such an attractive residential area where there are so many diverse types of architecture in the neighbourhood. It is this diversity which makes the area so attractive and unique and is much more preferable than having bland rows of houses, of the same design. The Heritage statement makes unfounded and subjective claims that No. 26 Netherhall Gardens is a building of mediocre architectural quality that has an unsatisfactory relationship with its surroundings today.</p> <p>This to my mind seems to be architectural "snobbery" of the worst kind and quite an outlandish thing to claim. On the contrary the "uncharacteristic gap" and piecemeal nature of the existing building are attractive attributes that make a very positive contribution to the existing townscape. If the proposed development goes ahead the area will lose a unique building which provides a strong contrast to other neighbouring buildings and makes a significant contribution to the wide variety of architectural designs in the area. It adds considerably to the areas unique character and charm as there is no other building quite like it in the street. Allowing the new structure would significantly reduce the diverse and eclectic mix of buildings that make up this neighbourhoods unique look, charm and history. It will not enhance the townscape benefits as purported in the Heritage statement but will in fact do significant harm to the quality of existing townscape of the area.</p> <p>2 – As part of the proposed development, a new basement storey will be constructed along with a fully subterranean (sub basement) storey which will house plant and storage space. I'm very concerned the new and large evacuation works required as part of the new subterranean development could compromise the structural stability of other homes in the area. I'm not convinced by the claims that engineers can mitigate such risks. The area has suffered subsidence in the past and is prone to such</p>

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

**Comment:**    **Response:**

problems. Allowing this new subterranean development is likely to create further subsidence and exacerbate any existing problems. Moreover such a subterranean development may also cause significant root damage to the roots of trees in the vicinity and lead the death of the trees.

3 – Its very clear from the plans the development with it's much larger footprint and scale, and the new addition of raised terraces and balconies at the back and side, will have a significant negative impact on the light and privacy of the neighbours in Netherhall Gardens either side of the development, No. 24A and No. 28. Furthermore other neighbours across the street from the development, including myself, will also suffer a loss of privacy and light. The floor to ceiling windows, the windows being much larger than those of neighbouring properties, at the front of the property and the large external front balconies where none currently exist will "rob" the houses across the street of much of their privacy as they will be directly looked into and overlooked by these balconies and windows. Moreover closing the "uncharacteristic gap" will also reduce the amount of light these properties enjoy particularly in the morning hours as the houses across the street face east.

4- The development allows for only three parking spaces on site. This is of concern as the five proposed dwellings are 2 and 3 bed and will no doubt be aimed at fairly affluent buyers/renters. Given these circumstances it is highly likely there will be more than one car per dwelling and therefore not enough spaces to park all the cars on the site. There are already an insufficient number of resident parking bays in the street and this development is very likely to exacerbate the situation.

Yours sincerely,

Mark Amery

---



Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2015/3314/P	Yasmeen Ali	flat 3 heathwood house 28 netherhall gardens nw3 5th	04/08/2015 13:17:27	OBJEMAIL	<p>Hi,</p> <p>I strongly object to this planning permission,</p> <p>1) the 2 metre build out at the rear of 26 beyond its original line will infringe the tree roots of the big listed oak tree which belongs to no 28 -the developers have misrepresented details in their agricultural impact assessment plan showing their 2nd floor plans rather than their basement floor plans next to pictures of the oak tree . The basement floor plans are bigger and if this was shown it would show the impact on tree roots being destroyed as a result of this project . The tree is also way bigger than what they show in their architectural plans .</p> <p>2) 57 maresfield sub basement has been repeatedly rejected -why shouldn't this be given it runs 10-15 metres deep beyond what is normal 3metre basement plans.</p> <p>3) the rear balcony of proposal would substantially overlook 24 and 28 gardens .</p> <p>4) the rear build out of 26 is beyond its original line and would create blocked daylight and outlook for 24a window 76 completely .window 76 would stare into a blank concrete wall. window 61 and 62 of number 28 netherhall would be in darkness -thus we would have breakfast, lunch and dinner in darkness and they say its not significant and unavoidable -they call them secondary windows and they are primary.</p>

---