

25A Frognal  
Hampstead  
London NW3 6AR

---

---



James Clark  
Planning Dept  
London Borough of Camden  
Town Hall  
Judd Street  
London WC1H 8ND

17<sup>th</sup> December 2015

Dear Mr Clark

**Re: Planning Application 29-33 Arkwright Rd -- Ref: 2015/6218/P**

Further to my brief objections to this planning application which objections I submitted on the 10<sup>th</sup> December 2015 (Ref: 20404491) I now set out in greater detail my principal objections and comments.

At the outset I would like to emphasise that I strongly object to this planning application to build three houses in a Conservation area and which will have a terrible impact not only for my property but for many neighbouring properties.

My principal objections are

1. Loss of important visual amenities which will adversely affect not only my wife and me as the owners of 25a Frognal (our house immediately adjoins the plots upon which it is proposed to build these three houses) and will also have a most dreadful impact on so many of our neighbours in the area who have for so long enjoyed this small oasis of greenery in a very densely built up area.
2. This particular part of Hampstead is already densely built up, probably more so than in most areas of Hampstead. An addition of three new houses in these back gardens will aggravate the density of housing and make living conditions for existing residents in the area almost intolerable. Such "in filling" in gardens is most regrettable and the loss of garden spaces is to be deplored.
3. This proposed development will destroy the natural habitat for birds and wildlife. It is in an important conservation area. The development will not preserve or enhance the character or appearance of the area. The proposals appear to be in breach of Camden's own Conservation Statement for this area and do not appear to be in accordance with Camden's Development Policies.
4. The removal of well established trees to facilitate the building of the three houses in this proposed development will be detrimental to the visual amenities of the area for all those living nearby. The developer has tried to justify the removal of trees by pointing out that there is a large Robinia tree in our property on our boundary with Frognal and also a flowering cherry tree on our boundary with the proposed development site. I would comment that the Robinia may not last that much longer as it is already about 40 years old and is beginning to shed some branches. We have been advised it may become dangerous and therefore need to be removed within the next few years. The cherry is notorious in having invasive roots and being so close to our house and conservatory may need to come down at some stage if it is considered to be interfering with our foundations. The removal of these two trees would only be done out of absolute necessity whereas the developer wants to remove mature trees merely to facilitate an unnecessary and invasive housing development. The drawings attached to the planning application seem to me misleading as they show a lot of greenery whereas the reality is that most of the greenery and trees will be removed as a result of this housing development.



5. Traffic congestion. Frognal is already a most difficult traffic road with considerable congestion during the morning and evening rush hours. Any additional housing in this particular part of Frognal will only add to the traffic congestion and pressure for parking spaces. The plans do not indicate adequate parking facilities and of course visitors will have to find parking in Frognal. The private side lane down the side of our house which would be the only means of access to these three new houses is completely inadequate to support increased traffic resulting from three new houses. The flow of cars backwards and forwards down this private lane would greatly increase noise particularly for our house and also for our neighbours.
6. Noise. Houses B & C of the proposed development are right on our boundary and will inevitably result in a considerable increase in noise and thus detract from our enjoyment of our property. The Patio of proposed house C and the French doors leading out of the principal living rooms onto that patio are right on our boundary. That will be the principal outdoor living area for house C and it will be facing directly onto our principal living rooms with only a matter of a few metres between us. That would be intolerable.
7. Privacy. Proposed house C would be right on our boundary with the principal living rooms and patio facing our principal living rooms. There are upstairs windows that would look down on our patio garden and into our principal living rooms, my study and into our conservatory (the roof of which is entirely glass). The windows would also look into two of our bedrooms. We would lose all privacy. The lack of privacy in our conservatory would make us feel as though we are living in a glass bowl over watched by the neighbours in this housing development. At the moment we have complete privacy in our conservatory and principal living rooms.
8. Natural light. Our principal living rooms (and my study) face due West and the only windows into our principal living rooms are West facing. The proposed two houses B and C (and particularly house C) would overshadow our house and result in our losing a great deal of natural light. The planning application papers did not include any scientific diagrams showing the extent of overshadowing. I consider it important that an expert provide details of overshadowing at different times of the day and in particular what would be the worst overshadowing during the peak winter months when the sun is lowest.
9. Ground levels. So far as I'm aware the ground levels in our garden and the garden of 29 Arkwright Rd are more or less the same. The planning application plans seem to indicate that the ground level of 29 Arkwright Rd is lower than our garden ground level. This needs to be checked and we need to know the precise height of the proposed new houses in relation to our house as that is of course relevant when considering issues of privacy and overshadowing and loss of natural light.
10. Precedent. Any housing development of this nature would set a dangerous precedent and should be resisted.
11. Type of housing. I understand Camden are more concerned about increasing the stock of "affordable" housing and that luxury housing as undoubtedly this development is intended to provide is not a priority for Camden.

I consider it important that you (and members of the planning committee) should visit not only the site of the proposed housing development but also visit the adjoining properties. You and the committee will be shocked to see just how adversely my property at 25a Frognal would be affected by such a housing development right on our door step. I feel confident that you and the planning committee will have no doubt at all that this monstrous planning proposal should be rejected in its entirety.

I find it interesting that some years ago the owner of 29 Arkwright Road divided his garden by planting trees across the middle of the garden which I now realise was done to preserve his privacy from a housing development he was probably contemplating. It is also interesting to note that the siting of the development for the three houses is as far away from his own house so that he will suffer very little

25A Frognal  
Hampstead  
London NW3 6AR



---

detriment and but without regard for the detriment that I and many other neighbours will suffer should this housing development go ahead.

Yours sincerely



William Frankel