

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2015/4373/P	Janine Griffis	14 Denning Rd NW3 1SU NW3 1SU NW3 1SU	30/09/2015 18:00:39	COMMNT	<p>On behalf of the Pilgrim's to Willoughby Residents Association, I submit the following objections to this proposal:</p> <p>Loss of front garden and damage to the conservation area:</p> <p>The creation of a new cross-over and off-street parking would resulting in the loss of garden and damage the Conservation Area. This proposal is contrary to DP25, Policy T2 of the emerging Draft Local Plan, the Hampstead Conservation Area Statement and the Hampstead Area Design Guide. Emerging Policy T2 will require all new developments in the borough to be car-free with the exception of wheelchair accessible parking. It also will “resist the development of boundary treatments and gardens within existing development to provide off-street parking.”</p> <p>Inadequate BIA:</p> <p>Basement Impact Assessment fails to mention the presence of numerous underground streams in the area or the potential impact on 15 Kemplay Road. There should include a trial bore hole and proper tests for the presence of underground water.</p> <p>Damage to significant trees in a conservation area:</p> <p>Lack of a tree survey. There are two substantial sycamores on the site that contribute greatly to the leafy aspect of Kemplay Road. If these are diseased, then they should both be replaced by substantial specimens. None of the architectural drawings correctly show the trees on the property or on nearby Church property.</p> <p>Damage from proposed basement development: The BIA acknowledges that there are nearby trees but fails to answer Q6 of the Slope Stability Screening Flowchart. It does not mention that the proposed basement excavation would be within a tree protection zone. The second lime tree in the Church yard on the right has an RPZ radius of 6.5m, which seems to us to be within the boundary of the proposed excavation.</p> <p>Poor quality design:</p> <p>The proposed premise, by standing apart, disrupts the flow of the existing terrace. The proposed features are dull and characterless. The appendage to the side appears to be a car port or 1960's garage and in fact, is referred to as the “garage” in the BIA. NPPF 7 – paragraph: 64, states: “Permission should be refused for development of poor design that fails to take the opportunities available for improving the character and quality of an area and the way it functions.”</p> <p>Lightwell:</p> <p>CPG4 states that “In plots where the front garden is quite shallow, a lightwell is likely to consume</p>

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
					<p>much, or all, of the garden area. This will be unacceptable in streets where lightwells are not part of the established character and where the front gardens have an important role in the local townscape.” The proposed lightwell will extend to just 2 metres away from the pavement and will further erode the front garden. The leafy front gardens are features of this particular terrace of modern houses.</p> <p>For these reasons, we urge Camden to refuse this application.</p>
2015/4373/P	Charles	3 Willoughby Road NW3	29/09/2015 16:34:54	COMMEM AIL	I believe there have been far too many building works going on in the area of Willoughby Road, Rudell Crescent, Kemplay Road etc and that the noise, mess/pollution it causes is unacceptable and this application is going to physically and emotionally upset many residents. We need a rest from property development, often, as in the case of 5 Willoughby Road, without planning permission! There is of course the added worry that this application will affect the view of the church as well as the pretty street.
2015/4373/P	Charles	3 Willoughby Road NW3	29/09/2015 16:34:32	COMMEM AIL	
2015/4373/P	Kieron Beal and Isobel Beal	28 Kemplay Road Hampstead London NW3 1SY UK	04/10/2015 11:18:40	OBJ	Regrettably we object to the proposed development. In particular, the proposal for an extensive basement will cause significant disruption to residents for a prolonged period. It is out of keeping with the street. We thought that the Council discouraged very extensive basement constructions in this area. The loss of the trees will impair the attractiveness of the street as a whole. The loss of the offstreet parking space is also highly detrimental, given the very high demand for parking spaces in this street. The Council should furthermore be aware that properties on this street have suffered historically from subsidence. It is unclear whether the construction of a very extensive basement would heighten the risk of further subsidence in the future. Please could you let us know the Committee date.

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2015/4373/P	Janine Griffis	14 Denning Rd NW3 1SU NW3 1SU NW3 1SU	30/09/2015 18:00:40	COMMNT	<p>On behalf of the Pilgrim's to Willoughby Residents Association, I submit the following objections to this proposal:</p> <p>Loss of front garden and damage to the conservation area:</p> <p>The creation of a new cross-over and off-street parking would result in the loss of garden and damage the Conservation Area. This proposal is contrary to DP25, Policy T2 of the emerging Draft Local Plan, the Hampstead Conservation Area Statement and the Hampstead Area Design Guide. Emerging Policy T2 will require all new developments in the borough to be car-free with the exception of wheelchair accessible parking. It also will "resist the development of boundary treatments and gardens within existing development to provide off-street parking."</p> <p>Inadequate BIA:</p> <p>Basement Impact Assessment fails to mention the presence of numerous underground streams in the area or the potential impact on 15 Kemplay Road. There should include a trial bore hole and proper tests for the presence of underground water.</p> <p>Damage to significant trees in a conservation area:</p> <p>Lack of a tree survey. There are two substantial sycamores on the site that contribute greatly to the leafy aspect of Kemplay Road. If these are diseased, then they should both be replaced by substantial specimens. None of the architectural drawings correctly show the trees on the property or on nearby Church property.</p> <p>Damage from proposed basement development: The BIA acknowledges that there are nearby trees but fails to answer Q6 of the Slope Stability Screening Flowchart. It does not mention that the proposed basement excavation would be within a tree protection zone. The second lime tree in the Church yard on the right has an RPZ radius of 6.5m, which seems to us to be within the boundary of the proposed excavation.</p> <p>Poor quality design:</p> <p>The proposed premise, by standing apart, disrupts the flow of the existing terrace. The proposed features are dull and characterless. The appendage to the side appears to be a car port or 1960's garage and in fact, is referred to as the "garage" in the BIA. NPPF 7 – paragraph: 64, states: "Permission should be refused for development of poor design that fails to take the opportunities available for improving the character and quality of an area and the way it functions."</p> <p>Lightwell:</p> <p>CPG4 states that "In plots where the front garden is quite shallow, a lightwell is likely to consume</p>

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2015/4373/P	Janine Griffis	14 Denning Rd NW3 1SU NW3 1SU NW3 1SU	30/09/2015 18:00:17	COMMNT	<p>much, or all, of the garden area. This will be unacceptable in streets where lightwells are not part of the established character and where the front gardens have an important role in the local townscape.” The proposed lightwell will extend to just 2 metres away from the pavement and will further erode the front garden. The leafy front gardens are features of this particular terrace of modern houses.</p> <p>For these reasons, we urge Camden to refuse this application.</p>
2015/4373/P	Steven Bobasch	12a Keats Grove	29/09/2015 15:16:25	OBJ	<p>1) This road is not the best in the area and I support a rebuild that will enhance the area. Sadly, this proposal is far from adding anything to the street. It may be an effort to blend in but the result is a boring fake rebuild of unimpressive buildings. I cannot see that the materials uplift this enough. If there are grounds to refuse on the basis that a new build should be better, please consider.</p> <p>2) Parking. The design if further degraded by the awful parking arrangement on the side. It looks out of place and is not reflected elsewhere.</p> <p>Further, the question of whether this house should have new parking space and the impact on the adjacent areas need an answer</p> <p>3) The application refers to 2 trees as being removed because they are already condemned. Is this true?</p> <p>4) The basement study appears to be a desk study dealing with the water table charts and known events. I could see no evidence of any site specific work nor any mention of the impact of the new basement on the area - the drive and house adjacent.</p> <p>Further the basement is played down in the presentation</p> <p>5) There is no mention of the impact on 15. Will they be protected after there wall is effectively removed? How will they be compensated for the loss of insulation and is there not a severe structural risk for which there needs to be an assessment</p> <p>It appears that the developer is a limited company and therefore may not represent an actual occupier. If this is the case, then particular care is needed to ensure all requirements as both clear and enforceable on an eventual occupier.</p> <p>My recommendation would be to send this away with all the suggestions and to aks the developer to come up with something that reflects properly the importance of the site.</p>
2015/4373/P	Jill Bace	21 Keats Grove London	29/09/2015 22:08:27	OBJ	Object, based on damage to surrounding area caused by a basement excavation.

<b>Application No:</b>	<b>Consultees Name:</b>	<b>Consultees Addr:</b>	<b>Received:</b>	<b>Comment:</b>	<b>Response:</b>
2015/4373/P	Edward Bace	21 Keats Grove London	29/09/2015 15:15:05	OBJ	I am against any new basement excavations in Hampstead, just on principle.

---