

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2015/4485/P	Jonathan Richard Green	5 Christchurch Hill London NW3 1JY	04/09/2015 16:47:07	OBJ	I must object to this planning application due to fears over the changes to the John Galsworthy extension, attached to the wonderful history that this property retains and must continue to retain. What is being proposed smacks of a massive overdevelopment of the site, no doubt in the name of avarice rather than any care for what is. This is Hampstead in the Borough of Camden and a long way from Beverly Hills. Let us please retain the splendour which we are so fortunate to already have, the owner of this planning application far more than most. Be thankful for what you've got. Regards, J R Green
2015/4485/P	Clive	95 Fitzjohn's Avenue	01/09/2015 12:54:23	OBJLETTE R	This house is historically important and there is no need for its increase in size, nor to make loud/ugly alterations. I would recommend the council takes a utilitarian approach and dismisses the plans, keeping residents and fans of the area happy. We must reverse the trend in the area of making already large houses even larger. The character of Hampstead is its charm and must be preserved at all costs.
2015/4485/P	Elizabeth Davies	12 The Mount Hampstead	02/09/2015 21:41:31	OBJ	<p>I strongly object to this planning Applicataion due to :</p> <p>The scale of the works is grossly out of proportion for this listed building and will significantly alter gen appearance of several elevations.</p> <p>The works will cause major noise and disruption to neighbours due the huge number of HGV movements that will be required for these huge works.</p> <p>He basements of this type are inappropriate for a significant listed building.</p> <p>Ten basement works will significantly affect drainage at ten top of Hampstead to the detriment of neighbouring properties.</p> <p>A public right of way has been infringed and illegally blocked at one end and this application proposes blocking the other end.</p>

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2015/4485/P	Janine Griffis	14 Denning Rd NW3 1SU NW3 1SU NW3 1SU	04/09/2015 16:19:39	OBJ	<p>This plan proposes to construct a new basement both under the listed house and continuing under the garden, contrary to Camden emerging basement policy as outlined in the Draft Local Plan, Policy A5, Basements and Light wells. As explained in paragraph 6.143:</p> <p>"The Council will therefore generally resist proposal for basement development beneath listed buildings, or underneath the garden of a listed building. An exception may be made for gardens on large sites where the basement would not involve extensive modification to the foundation of the listed building by being substantially separate from the listed building."</p> <p>This proposal by necessity would involve extensive work to the listed building's foundations. In line with National Planning Policy Framework, weight should be given to Camden's emerging policies when considering this application (as a note: The Royal Borough of Kensington and Chelsea has similar policies concerning development under listed buildings, which have passed examination and been adopted. There is no reason to assume that Camden's policies would not also pass examination).</p> <p>Furthermore, the proposed basement under the garden, while not exceeding 50% of the existing garden, is massive and considerably larger than most entire gardens in the Hampstead Conservation Area. As proposed, it represents a significant over development.</p> <p>For these reasons, if for no others, I urge Camden to reject this application.</p>
2015/4485/P	S. Wocker	107 Heath Street London NW3 6SS	01/09/2015 12:19:57	OBJJEMPER	I strongly object to this application on this site of historic local significance. There is simply no need for it. It will needlessly destroy a wuiet conservation area and is wholly inappropriate. Common sense would enforce the rules already passed that will take effect next year.
2015/4485/P	Natalia Schiffirin	50 Willow Road	04/09/2015 08:21:45	OBJ	I am opposed to this application as unnecessary and undesirable over development
2015/4485/P	Deborah Norton	3 Upper Terrace NW3 6RH	03/09/2015 16:37:10	OBJ	<p>We would like to object to several aspects of this proposal. Although they have modified the extent of the changes to the east facade, there are no clear drawings showing the entrance porch. It seems inappropriate to modify a classic bit of Hampstead architecture that John Constable thought worth painting.</p> <p>We object to the height of the wall on Lower Terrace being raised. It might be appropriate for a prison yard but it is totally out of character for this corner of Hampstead which has the feel of a country village.</p> <p>We object to the scale of the proposed basement. As Camden is planning to ban basement extensions under Listed buildings in the near future, why should it be considered OK today? They are taking a lovely family home and trying to turn it into a McMansion--the last thing Hampstead needs.</p> <p>We are concerned about the many inconsistencies that John Gardiner has found in this submission.</p>

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2015/4485/P	A H C Voaden	Old Forge House 16 The Mount Square London NW3 6SX	01/09/2015 10:01:30	OBJ	The Grade II listed building forms part of this architecturally and environmentally sensitive part of the London Borough of Camden in which development should be undertaken only with the greatest of care. Neither of the two applications currently before the Council take properly in to account these and other aspects of the Grove Lodge present significant contribution to the locality's heritage. Should a public enquiry be held?
2015/4485/P	Tim Watson	11 Holly Mount	02/09/2015 11:51:14	OBJ	I OBJECT to this proposal on the grounds that it is a massive over-development of the site and will put adjacent structures at risk.
2015/4485/P	Mrs Sarah Wingate	10 Hampstead Square	04/09/2015 14:23:06	OBJ	<p>Grove Lodge is listed Grade II. The farmhouse & Galsworthy extension are historically significant & critical to G.Lodge's listing.</p> <p>The new proposal is false as the original character of the old farmhouse will be lost because :-</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1.The rear wall has to be broken open to join the proposed new extension. 2.The farmhouse front door porch will be demolished & the wall brought forward therefore the original character of the old farmhouse will be lost and the new front door will change the aesthetics completely. The purpose of listing is to preserve heritage not destroy them. <p>The "basement" proposal is objectionable for a number of reasons:-</p> <p>The works will take 1,462 vehicle movements over an eighteen to twenty four month period through narrow lanes around Grove Lodge.</p> <p>Iconic Admirals House (six storeys, built in 1700 without foundations) and Terrace Lodge, an eighteenth century villa are next door!! The watercourses are near to the source of the River Westbourne. Any Hampstead local worth their salt knows and respects the watercourses EXCEPT the consultants responsible for this proposal. They are the same consultants who worked on the previous application. Clearly they do not respect the geology of NW3.</p> <p>A.House has an open well in its semi basement next to G.Lodge from where any human being with eyes can see the entry of water at different levels. Those acting for G.Lodge must be tripping as they've chosen to IGNORE this significant evidence of water location & depth. It is actual data, WHY did the owners of G.Lodge allow their consultants to state in writing that no wells existed within 100m of G.Lodge? Shouldn't they be fined for lying?</p> <p>Camden put out for consultation new proposals (section A5) which it wishes to adopt relating inter alia to basement developments. The consultation period is over but the proposals are not to be formally adopted as policy until 2016. They propose, for good reasons, that permission should not be given to development involving excavation under listed buildings and in their gardens. In accordance with the National Planning Policy Framework(paragraph 216/Annex 1) it is appropriate in this application to take the prosed policy into account & having regard to the developments proposed size & the fact that it's not to be implemented until at the earliest 2017 permission should NOT be granted.</p> <p>Hampstead Village needs urgent protection on listed houses especially in areas near Whitestone Pond where the watercourses are rife and basement digs seem to be rifer. Please stop this application being approved. If owners require more space they need to sell and move to homes that have larger spaces NOT live in homes of significant historical importance.</p> <p>Please do the right thing.</p> <p>Many thanks, Mrs. Sarah Wingate</p>

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2015/4485/P	Nicola Beauman	35 Christchurch Hill	04/09/2015 15:29:04	COMMNT	Dear Sir, we would like to object to this appalling application. Grove Lodge is listed Grade 2 and has an incredible history. If someone buys it and wants to live in a bigger property - then they should buy a bigger property and not try and destroy part of Hampstead's heritage. Please reject this planning application. Yours faithfully Chris and Nicola Beauman 35 Christchurch Hill NW3 1LA
2015/4485/P	Jean Dieter Buhr	5 Hampstead Hill Mansions Downshire Hill London NW3 1NY	04/09/2015 20:56:12	OBJ	I must continue to oppose the new planning application for Grove Lodge in Hampstead a listed building with artistic and literary history to be commemorated. As a listed building within a conservation area, the attempts to modify the design of the area is both legally and morally a failure to apply proper standards to the intent of the statutes for protecting cultural resources. In addition, the physical location of Grove House does not lend itself to such modification. The street corner where the house is sited is a blind corner with traffic avoiding the Whitestone Pond circulation and with pedestrians walking to and from Hampstead Heath through the historic conservation district where the National Trust Fenton House is also located nearby. The geology with underground river sources and wells is not appropriate for basement excavation. Once again we have the case of a new owner with no sense of community value disrupting the lives of long time residents with plans that will definitely infringe on the comfort of the neighbours and will possibly damage their property. Hampstead is becoming a community where a new owner is no longer welcomed, but dreaded for the monetary and psychological costs their demands will require.

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2015/4485/P	Richard Harrison	3 Mansfield Place Hampstead London	02/09/2015 00:07:11	OBJ	<p>I strongly object to this Planning Application for the following reasons:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) Grove Lodge is a historically significant Hampstead House. The demolition of the existing porch, the building of a new front entrance and the creation of a new window in the original “Galsworthy” extension will detrimentally alter the appearance of the house and remove the historic connection to the paintings of John Constable. Such an application shows arrogant disregard to the historic nature of this property, which once fundamentally altered is irrecoverable to future generations in the community, as well as to historians and artists. The destruction of historically significant buildings by one set of people to suit their own bland modern taste, which will likely be quickly dated, should be rejected. 2) Hampstead Conservation Area Design Guide Advice indicates that: “Adding a new porch or altering existing porches or porticos on front elevations (or side elevations where this fronts the street) now needs planning permission and will be resisted”. Given that Grove Lodge is listed Grade II, the application to demolish the existing porch should be rejected. 3) The proposed new basement is excessive and will cause significant disruption and inconvenience to local residents for up to two years. 4) The building of such a large basement risks causing significant structural damage both to Grove Lodge itself and to other historically significant houses adjacent to Grove Lodge (e.g. Admirals House and Terrace Lodge) by altering the underground water courses. Any displaced water needs to go somewhere and it is not within the control of the person undertaking the development as to where that will be. The water table also rises and falls with the seasons. Once a water course has been altered there is no knowing what damage to other properties may result. Given the high incidence of underground water courses throughout the Hampstead area (and the resulting problems caused when basements are built without thought to the impact on the underground water courses) basement developments of this type should be rejected as both risky and not in keeping with the historic nature of the buildings and area concerned. In this regard I would draw your attention to the example the Artists studio in New End which literally ended up with a swimming pool in the basement which no amount of pumping could solve. It eventually had to be filled in. <p>NOTE: PLEASE DO NOT PUBLISH MY NAME OR PERSONAL DETAILS ON ANY PUBLIC DATABASE.</p>

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2015/4485/P	Miss C E Simmons	123 Heath Street Hampstead NW3 6SS	04/09/2015 10:20:22	OBJ	<p>I would like to formally object to this application. Grove Lodge has enormous historical significance in the area and the farmhouse and Galsworthy extension are critical to the Lodge's Grade II listing, among other things.</p> <p>The initial opposition to the demolition of the Galsworthy extension led to the proposal being abandoned, however, the new proposal also leaves this significantly altered and includes the demolition of the farmhouse porch, going against The Hampstead Conservation Area Design Guide Advice: Article 4(1) Direction (2010) para 2.</p> <p>The substantial works to construct and excavate the proposed basement will result in major disruption and road closures for considerable time, not to mention the site vehicle movements, considerably inconveniencing local residents. In addition the work poses a significant risk to the two adjacent listed buildings, Admiral's House and Terrace Lodge, also of historical significance. It is also well known that the underground water courses also mean that the work could indeed be dangerous.</p> <p>Furthermore, the plans show the illegal blockage of a public footpath to the North of Admiral's Walk. This is our heritage, of which Hampstead residents are very proud, so the loss of this, along with the massive disruption caused to residents over a very long period, would be a tragedy.</p>
2015/4485/P	James Hartop	9 Holly Place	04/09/2015 19:55:16	COMMNT	<p>Whilst there have been some amendments to the proposed re-development of Grove Lodge the revised plan still raise a number of serious concerns for those in the surrounding area including loss of character through a number of aspects of the development (blocking up front porch), new front door in extension etc. and in particular the risks involved in creating a basement of such disproportionate scale relative to the building. This is setting aside the considerable disruption caused during the development process given that it would be transitory.</p>
2015/4485/P	Tom Conti	66 Redington Rd London NW3 7RS	04/09/2015 15:37:55	COMMEM AIL	<p>I emphatically oppose this proposal. I refer you to the comments of Jessica Learmond Criqui that accurately expose the true details of the plan.</p> <p>Why on earth buy a historic building and immediately set about changing it - to the detriment of a very special neighbourhood. If they wanted a bigger house why didn't they buy one? In addition, the noise, continual truck movements etc. are a breach of the neighbours' right to enjoy their homes in peace.</p>