The Society examines all Planning Applications relating to Hampstead, and assesses them for their impact on conservation and on the local environment.

To London Borough of Camden, Development Control Team

Planning Ref: 2015/7079/P

Address: 11 Rosslyn Hill, NW3

Description: Basements and other extensions

Case Officer: Rob Tulloch Date 26 January 2016

This is the fourth comment we are compelled to make, on this extraordinarily unacceptable proposal, following those dated 29 April 2015, 25 September 2015 and 7 January 2016. The first two were related to application 2015/2089/P.

We now understand that it has been suggested that objections raised on 2015/2089/P cannot be considered in relation to the second application 2015/7079/P, for technical (i.e. bureaucratic) reasons, despite the two applications being virtually identical in every respect.

We queried what the motive for the second application could be (see our comment dated 7 Jan 16); we now understand: it was to disallow the huge number of objections made to the first proposal. No doubt the applicants think that neither the distinguished list of objectors, nor the 10,000 signatories to the petitions, nor other local objectors, could be persuaded to re-object to an identical proposal whose existence would only be known locally (and then only to those keeping up with notices in the local press)

As we said in our comment of 7 January 2016, the two applications are identical in every respect: layout and architecture; size and location of basements; inadequacy of BIA's; inadequacy of CMP's; absence of response to the legitimate objections of neighbours Air Studios, inadequate consideration to the setting of the Grade 11* listed building Lyndhurst Hall, etc etc.

We ask you to disregard this shameful device, to deflect valid objections away from the second application. All the objections apply equally to both applications.

We urge refusal even more strongly than before