

## **Request amelioration to the scheme and to the building plan.**

I understand that this site will be built on but request consideration be given to ameliorating the proposal in a number of aspects, which I detail below.

This scheme would be improved by reducing the mass of the proposed development. The proposal is significantly larger than both the consented scheme and the existing buildings.

I support that this will be a residential scheme rather than a holiday rental apartment and note the consultation by the developers.

I note that those writing in support of the scheme are not its immediate neighbours.

## **Light loss**

I live in 21 New Court, the ground floor flat that is below the proposed development.

I talk here about the loss of light to my flat but I note that the flats on Streatley Place are also affected as is the communal garden in New Court. This is the only area of the garden that gets sunlight after about 9 o'clock in the morning and is used by residents who don't have gardens to sit out. Some of these residents have health problems. There is no assessment of the light loss to this garden.

### **1. Loss of light to 21 New Court, Streatley Place and the communal gardens of New Court**

Light loss will be significant for me and is increased on the consented development.

My flat is dark. The daylight assessment provided by the developer shows that my flat already has levels of light which are 'very difficult' and in places 'often impossible' in relation to recommended light levels. Any loss will make this worse. We are below the site and close to a retaining wall. We frequently have to have lights on during the day. The percentage reduction proposed shows as red on the survey (as I understand this means not within accepted legal levels) – and this is when the trees are factored in.

Only one window in my flat appears to have been formally assessed but I have two windows and two doors facing the development. My flat will be affected along the length of the communal living area.

The new development stretches the full length of the site whereas the consented development had an area where there was no building and therefore no light loss. If you look at figure 8 you will see that the readings for light loss are now red right along the length of my building.

The proposed ground floor plans show the rooms facing the development as 'assumed kitchen' and 'assumed bedroom'. The developer has not visited my flat although he has been invited and I have explained that these rooms are our living space – they are the kitchen and living room areas of the flat. I work from home and spend my days in these rooms working. The flat has been designed as social family housing – children currently live there and any new tenants would also be a family. Children spend significant amount of daylight time at home.

The daylight assessment has been done "factoring in the presence of trees". I think this is unfair and wonder what the legal basis for this is. The trees have been pruned in the past making a significant difference to light levels in the flat. It will not be possible to prune a building. In addition the trees

provide varying light levels. The trees are deciduous. There is significantly more light in winter when there are no leaves. In the summer the trees afford a dappled shifting light which casts shadows and leaf patterns on the floors and walls. This is significantly different than just obstruction by a wall and loss of light.

The report is persuasive on light but I would like to question it.

The preamble to the daylight report states: "As the development involves the removal of a number of large trees, further studies were undertaken to show that if we were to take this into account there is in fact a minor gain of 1.7%. The levels retained are in fact higher than those consented in 2015 and so this can be considered an improvement."

However the only window of my flat that has any specific assessment shows a loss of 14.0 as opposed to 13.8. No other windows have been assessed but my flat shows red on the survey – so that means that all my windows have a loss in breach of guidelines.

The report also states: The window identified as being impacted the greatest is the western-most ground floor window. Further assessment has shown a VSC loss (without the trees being considered) of 22%, which is only slightly in breach of guidance.

This is my kitchen window. The other windows in my flat have not been assessed. I suggest that any amount in breach of guidance will be significant for a flat which is already dark.

I note also that the current plans include the planting of trees. I support this as trees are an important part of the Hampstead environment and significant for human health and for wildlife. However, to then remove trees for the light assessment is somewhat contradictory.

## **2. Disturbance to birds.**

This area has been derelict for many years and has become sanctuary for wildlife, most notably birds. There are many birds' nests. I have jays, various tits, a wren, a dunnock, blackbirds and robins visiting my garden.

I spoke with the RSPB about how to retain these birds, some of which are quite rare, and they said it was important to retain not only trees but also low lying shrubs as this is the habitat for wrens and dunnocks.

With the area being almost entirely built on it is hard to see how this can be accommodated. There seems to have been no assessment of the impact of the development on bird life. The consented scheme was substantially smaller in volume and left areas not built on.

There has been no planning for the building works and whether anything can be done to minimise the impact of the work on the birds.

## **3. The increased volume of the development compared to the existing buildings and the consented scheme.**

The development has significantly increased in volume to the consented scheme. This will impact in a number of ways on the matters raised elsewhere in this submission. Fitting four flats into this very small area will create a much more densely filled site.

Building four flats will significantly increase the amount of building materials that need to be brought into a landlocked site and the amount that will need to be removed due to foundation setting.

The impact on light, wildlife etc. will also be exacerbated by filling the site.

#### **4. Overlooking**

The new buildings will overlook my flat and other flats in New Court. I understand that the windows overlooking my home will be louvered but I don't understand whether this will entirely obstruct the view into my flat.

My flat is on the ground floor with a communal garden which is used as a through way for residents and persons using the school. As a result of that the only windows in my house that are not shaded by privacy blinds are the windows on the side facing the development. If I am overlooked by the new development all areas of my flat will have to be shaded by privacy blinds. This of course will also make the flat even more gloomy and dark. The flat currently has a view of trees and birds and the garden from that side.

#### **5. Height of the development**

New Court on the ground floor is significantly lower (at least one storey) than the site. The development is much higher than the existing buildings and will dominate the view from my windows.

#### **6. Management of the development**

##### **i) Delivery/ access / storage**

I remain concerned that the lockable compound is to be situated on Boades Mews and that deliveries are to be made via New End.

I understand that the school is objecting and as a local resident who has had children at both the school and the nursery I wish to support these objections. New End and Boades Mews are used by children to access the school at all times of day. In addition New End has parking on both sides and is single lane. Trucks containing for example large amounts of concrete etc. cannot safely stop there, turn, reverse, etc. Large amounts of material will be passing in and out of the site throughout the construction period. A lockable site further away would mean that access by road would be safer and more direct. The delivery of materials might be more difficult for the developers as the distance would be slightly increased but the prevention of a hazardous bottle neck in New End would significantly compensate this.

##### **ii) Water at the site**

I am concerned about water at the site and wish this to be recorded. This area of land holds significant amounts of water and the soil is clay based. The river Fleet is close to the buildings.

We have had significant problems with water moving beneath the surface on Streatley Place and in New Court. During the refurbishment of New Court one buyer excavated their basement leading to emergency remedial work to secure the building. At another time the hospital chimney and the cottage at the end of Streatley place had to be underpinned as an emergency.

New Court has no foundations. The wall that divides the site from New Court retains a significant weight of earth. The listed retaining wall is wet and the mortar is flaking limestone.

The buildings will add significantly to the weight of the sight and a ground floor slab is proposed with foundations driven into the earth. I am very concerned that the site will slip, as has happened elsewhere within the vicinity.

**iii) Streatley Place Paving**

The paving of Streatley Place needs to be protected during the work. When New Court was refurbished a protective roadway was constructed so that the old original paving would not be damaged. One of the characteristics of Streatley Place, that has made it the subject of photo shoots and filming, is its original distinctive paving.