

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2015/3516/P	Michael Jahn	Flat 8 8 Rosslyn Hill London NW3 1PH	19/08/2015 20:24:54	OBJNOT	<p>As the tenant and subsequently owner of a flat at 8 Rosslyn Hill since 1970, I fully support the objections already made by other local residents, the Heath & Hampstead Society and the Gayton Road Residents' Association to this application.</p> <p>The applicant's own survey shows that there is already adequate on-street parking to meet his needs. The objections made to a similar application rejected seven years ago remain valid. The proposal would involve the destruction of part of the original wall fronting a group of houses that contribute to the character of a conservation area. Conversion of even part of a front garden to parking space without good reason is in principle most undesirable.</p> <p>The proposal creates a potential hazard to pedestrians (including many children) and would detract from the appearance of an unusually wide and uninterrupted stretch of heavily used pavement.</p> <p>I also strongly object to the application because it could create a precedent for similar proposals in future affecting the front gardens of other houses in this visually attractive group.</p>

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2015/3516/P	Charlotte Teeple Salas	Flat 2 8 Rosslyn Hill London NW3 1PH	19/08/2015 19:02:59	OBJ	<p>We object to #10's application and respectfully request that Camden Planning refuse planning permission.</p> <p>1) The loss of two parking spaces in the front bay would be great, especially for the young children and elderly residents residing in #8, #6, #12, and other buildings. Their collective needs should come before those of one person, the owner of #10.</p> <p>2) While an extensive study has been done on parking availability during certain days of the week, in the evenings, the study did not include Sunday when the parking bay is open to the general public and when the Heath is much in demand, it is often difficult, if not impossible, to find parking closer than several streets away. The loss of two spaces would aggravate this problem.</p> <p>3) The driveway would be dangerous. With the schools and nurseries nearby (particularly at Pond street), many children pass/scoot/ride by our terrace on their daily commutes. In fact, between "school run" hours, 7:45-9:15 am, and 3-4:30pm Monday - Friday, upwards of a hundred or more nursery and preschool children will pass by #12 - #2 Rosslyn Hill. As a parent of a child at Hampstead Hill School, we know from the testimony of other parents, that they pass specifically on our side due to the presence of several dangerous driveways on the other side of the street.</p> <p>4) Increased pollution and noise pollution for the residents. We already have a busy street with much passage and exhaust from buses and trucks. The wide sidewalk, walls and plantings provide some buffer from this intrusion. However, if #10 were allowed to install a driveway/parking, we would have no buffer from the noise pollution from the comings and goings at all hours of #10's vehicle, the noise of the automatic gate, plus the increased pollution due to greater proximity to our windows. We would also be viewing an unsightly car park from the side as we enter and exit our house, in addition to above from our windows.</p> <p>5) The character of this historical terrace should be preserved. As others have pointed out, a dangerous precedent would be set if one house were allowed to install a driveway/car park. In addition, #10 makes an argument that the changes would be in keeping with #8's fence, and that it would just be a "widening" of the existing opening. However, to facilitate the extensive 4-5 years" worth of renovation work undertaken by #10, an opening was already cut into #10's wall for the delivery of heavy equipment, soil, mature plantings, etc. So what constitutes the "existing opening"? Surely not the already widened hole, which is currently large enough to drive a small digger through. The second gate of #8, which mirrors #10, is hardly wide enough to admit the recycling bin, let alone a car. This should be the standard of the gate.</p> <p>We object to this application and respectfully request that instead of forever altering the character of our terrace with its car park/driveway, thereby endangering children on their school commute, increasing noise/pollution, and inconveniencing the elder, mobility-impaired residents of Rosslyn Hill, that #10 be required to return the wall to its original state.</p> <p>Thank you for your consideration.</p>