

Hampstead CAAC objects to the proposal as follows:

1. We query the proposal to substitute for the existing large house one of greater area and scope, bearing in mind the current hesitation in conceiving single houses, especially well over-sized ones, relative to more saleable/viable small buildings of flats. We do not understand the impetus for such development and would need to see evidence of particular client brief and expectation, personal recognition of and contribution to Hampstead and/or the wider world. Hampstead's history is full of prominent persons building houses for their own use and their presence is ingrained in the fabric of local society underpinning recognition of the area's building heritage.
2. The existing house and its setting are positive contributors to the CA, much better than the 'neutral' quoted as in the CAS and the immediate area's character is rooted in this. It is not correct to say it is of 'no architectural merit' as typical developer's reason for consent to demolition. The design of the existing main house was clearly careful, restrained and successful in its relation to the sensitive setting, not over-grand in its main elevation nor over-scaled. The gable end chimney features are a pleasant reflection of local building detail.
3. The existing house is a neat 'pavilion' itself subservient to the landscape setting and its extensions are in their turn subservient to the house, allowing views over to the green environment beyond. Such views are blocked by the proposed front wall. The existing house is by now some 50 years old and an established part of the local environment and history. In architectural design terms and established principles, its '1950s neo-Georgian' tag is a positive, not a negative value judgement.
4. The proposed house almost doubles the amount of accommodation on the site, for which we do not see justification. The proposed new building represents questionable over-development and will not enhance the area as much as the existing house and its setting, which latter the new proposal would destroy.
5. While the applicant's architect has a track record of apparently competent buildings, they appear to be 'standard' fare not evidencing individual commitment to detailed and prolonged development of 'signature' architecture. The proposed building is not convincing as one of character capable of acceptance in the Hampstead context, lacking careful development of interest whether in modelling, massing or elevation detail. Flat-faced developers' architects' design is too common and unacceptable in this context. In any new proposal, the applicant should submit considerable drawn detail to assist assessment of quality of design to be maintained throughout the construction phase.
6. We object to the closing of gaps between adjacent buildings due to the over-development of the proposed house plan. Gap views as well as clear separation of buildings are central to established development of detached and semi-detached houses in all the Hampstead CAs .
7. The coloured perspective in the DAS fails to show the full impact of the main elevation due to its spread and height. The wall height is identical with that of the existing while spreading out to dominate whereas the set back 3<sup>rd</sup> storey of the existing has very little impact on the mass of the whole.
8. The development typically involves considerable garden take-up and it is not acceptable to regard the remaining area as 'a fair amount'. Percentage rules on garden take-up are inappropriate to this and similar schemes and especially in this property's setting.

9. Garden take-up by building also brings hard landscaping in rear terraces, another reason why a detailed site plan is required, albeit for a scheme not taking up any of the existing garden area.
10. There are no clear drawn details of proposed landscaping to replace the long-established gardens, and although a plants list has been submitted, their application to the site is not shown. Again, for any new proposal such should apply to the existing garden area wholly retained.
11. We object to the proposed removal of the existing viable mature lime tree despite its offered replacement by a 'new' oak tree. The tree and its setting are crucial to the character definition of the location, as is the sweep of the existing lawn to the house front.
12. We question the arboricultural report of 'terminal' decay and must insist that landowners maintain their trees to lessen impact of any reported deterioration. There are many buttressing and hollowing trees in Hampstead but which are not at risk of terminal decline, falling etc. Moreover the principle of consent for demolition and replacement should ensure new trees and landscaping greatly in excess (2 for 1) of the existing.
13. We do not agree to the enclosure of the site frontage even with an apparent hedge (which takes many years to establish). The existing lawn sweep is an immediately recognisable traditional landscape component. If enclosure is proposed, the hedge might be taller (up to 2m) and continuous, truly reminiscent of and reinforcing the rural character of the location.
14. We object to the proposed inset parking area as a new intrusion to the frontage and consider the existing garage accommodation and front sweep hardstanding to be sufficient with house management of 'crowded' parking.
15. We agree with the objections raised by PPS, planning consultants for no. 113, whose comments on the massing view-closing and neighbour-domination of the proposal demonstrate aspects of the scheme not immediately seen from the applicants' documents.
16. Heath and Hampstead Society objection is noted and supported by Hampstead CAAC.
17. We note the objections raised by knowledgeable long-term local residents and consider our LPA should respect those views carefully noting the difference between this proposal and established modern buildings in Hampstead. The DAS cites many of these but regrettably the proposal does not rise to their value heights and is a threat to this location and others by precedent.
18. Noting but disagreeing with the two favourable comments on the scheme from residents.