Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Printed on: 08/12/2015 09:05:20 Response:
2015/5894/P	Mrs Wyn Jones	Hampstead Hill Gardens Hampstead NW3 2PJ	06/12/2015 18:13:24	COMMNT	I have no objections to this application because the level of the flat roof as seen on drawing 596 36.1 does not rise above my kitchen/diner and bedroom windows and so does not obscure my light, view and enjoyment of my flat as have previous applications. I have been shown some alternative designs by the developer and architect which have added a further floor onto this proposal to which I would vehemently object as that will remove light, views and enjoyment of being in the 2 rooms previously mentioned. The kitchen/diner is the heart of the flat. If any of the alternative designs are substituted for this present application then I trust that the planning authority will reject it out of hand.
2015/5894/P	E A Grant	Flat 2 23 Hampstead Hill Gardens NW3 2PJ	06/12/2015 22:44:51	COMMEMP ER	The application seeks to modify certain aspects of the proposal submitted earlier this year, which was itself a proposed modification of a 2012 proposed scheme which the Council approved. I have one comment on the latest proposal, which seeks to substitute a flat roof for the previous pitched roof. It is envisaged that access to the roof should be for maintenance only. This needs to be entrenched as an enforceable condition, if approval is eventually given. However, there are also two points which arise on the current proposal which are carried through from the proposal made earlier this year, on which Camden officers prepared a report but which the Council has not yet considered. First, in commenting on the earlier proposal I noted that replacement of a building containing two family flats by a house designed for occupation by one family only flew in the face of planning objectives designed to INCREASE the amount of housing in London. The officers" report simply commented that the principle of allowing 23A to be redeveloped as a single dwelling had already been accepted. I think that the Council needs to take my point more seriously. It is open to the Council to take the view that, while the approval already given to one scheme cannot now be rescinded, it does not follow that it is bound to approve any other scheme involving a net loss of family accommodation. If the previously-approved scheme has turned out to be infeasible, that is the developer's problem and not the Council's. Second, the current proposal also carries through the construction of a "winter garden" or conservatory at the rear. The officers" report rather brushes aside the objection that this would add to the bulk of the building and would in effect be an extra room rather than open space. The conservatory would be bound to increase the bulk of the building; and to argue as the officers" report does that the timber construction would be "small modest and elegantly designed" is wishful thinking.

					Printed on: 08/12/2015 09:05	5:20
Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:	
2015/5894/P	Mrs Wyn Jones	23 Hampstead Hill Gardens Hampstead	06/12/2015 18:13:46	COMMNT	I have no objections to this application because the level of the flat roof as seen on drawing 596 36.1 does not rise above my kitchen/diner and bedroom windows and so does not obscure my light, view and enjoyment of my flat as have previous applications.	
		NW3 2PJ			I have been shown some alternative designs by the developer and architect which have added a further floor onto this proposal to which I would vehemently object as that will remove light, views and enjoyment of being in the 2 rooms previously mentioned. The kitchen/diner is the heart of the flat. If any of the alternative designs are substituted for this present application then I trust that the planning authority will reject it out of hand.	
					I	