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: 2016/2499/P

Address: 3 Kidderpore Avenue NW3

Description: Demolition. New house including double basement
Case Officer: James Clark Date 9 July 2016

Note: this application was examined following information received locally, and NOT from your Applications List, which is today already 3 weeks out-of-date; we have no knowledge of the consultation expiry date.

This site is locally notorious, having a history of several applications for basement redevelopment. We have a note of the following:

2010/3422/P, making reference to at least one previous proposal, in 2009, of which we have no record. Refused. Refusal overturned on Appeal

2012/5358/P No basement Permitted

2014/5471/P Basement again. Withdrawn

There may have been others.

We object to the application on these grounds:

1. Demolition of the existing house.

It is to be noted that it is locally listed (i.e. it is listed in the CA Statement as contributing to CA character); we agree with this, and oppose its demolition, especially in view of the dreadfully amateur nature of the replacement house proposed. It fits well into the character of this part of Kidderpore Avenue, and we see no justification for its demolition. Application 2012/5358/P above showed an extended house of considerable size, in scale with others in the area, and we see no reason why this should not provide an agreeable and satisfactory house.

Demolition of houses in our Conservation Areas, *especially those which are locally listed*, is against your policies on CA character, and can only be justified in the most exceptional circumstances, including replacement by designs of exceptional architectural merit. This design most decidedly, with its monstrous basement, does not meet those criteria

2 Basement

Regarding the basement development here proposed it seems, since the basement areas are not delineated in plan (although they are in section), that the applicants may rely on the permission they received in 2010 on Appeal, and believe they don't need to detail them on their drawings. They clearly are too ashamed to show these on plan now, perhaps in view of their grossly excessive boundary-to-boundary plan extent, their double-depth---or is it triple-depth?-- and the total lack of garden landscaping, trees or other alleviating features.

Whatever may have been permitted on Appeal, it will by now in 2016 have expired. The proposals must now therefore be considered on their merits, shown in full, and justified in terms of current Planning policies. These prohibit boundary-to-boundary excavations, all basements deeper than one level (or 3 metres), all front garden excavation, and no more than 50% of rear garden excavation. They also call for setbacks from boundaries to permit landscaping and tree planting at least around perimeters, and a minimum depth of soil over basement construction to permit sustainable grass and flower planting.

This proposal contravenes every one of these prohibitions.

No Basement Impact Assessment has been submitted, and neighbouring properties would be put at instant risk of damage if the excavations were to proceed. This is in direct contravention of policies DP23 and DP27.

No Construction Management Plan has been submitted. This would be essential even if this were the only major construction project in the area. In view of the other current major redevelopments in Kidderpore Avenue it is imperative.

The proposals not only flout current LDF policies, but also the draft Local Plan policies now close to ratification. We understand that there is precedent for applying draft policies if the importance of the proposals is sufficiently great, and in the public interest. Refusal of this profoundly unacceptable application would most clearly be in the public interest.

3 Replacement house

This seems to have been conceived as a traditional proposal in keeping with others in Kidderpore Avenue, but is poorly designed, in scale, proportions and detail. Its general style is "developers' Georgian", but the roof is all wrong, the windows are wrong, the proportions and details not authentic. The boundary walls and gates are dreadfully tasteless and conspicuous.

It just does'nt add up as a design of architectural merit in our Conservation Area.

Please refuse.