



Dear Mr Tulloch

I write to object to the development proposed in Planning Application 2017/0911/P, Site Address 23 Ravenshaw Street, West Hampstead. I am a resident at 47 Ravenshaw Street.

Nr 23 Ravenshaw Street forms the end of a handsome terrace of Nrs 11 to 23 of 1890's Victorian houses of two full storeys, some with third storey dormers. The houses on this side of the road are all set back from the street and have front gardens. They have rich architectural detailing, including decorative entrance porches shared between houses; with prominent 2 storey canted bay windows many with decorative mullions, and a heavy cornice at eaves level. The houses retain all detailing and decoration and the overall the terraces contribute positively to the character and appearance of the street.

The structural engineers' method statement submitted for the basement excavation does not address the proximity of the high speed railway line running to the rear. Indeed the method statement is only a generic document which describes the process and structural design for a typical basement extension and pays no regard to the long standing ground movement that has taken place over the past twenty years. Each property along this part of Ravenshaw Street has suffered with varying degrees of impact from the vibration of high speed and freight trains and the displacement of such a substantial amount of earth is likely to cause permanent structural issues with the adjoining properties at numbers 25 and 21. There is no precedent for basement extensions on the south side of Ravenshaw Street and this is for good reason. All the properties along the terrace have been built on shallow foundations on clay soil and have been subject to varying degrees of movement from the adjoining railway line over the decades.

The submitted construction management plan proposes to suspend five residents' bays during the demolition phase. The removal of this quantity of bays will create greater parking stresses along the street and neighbouring streets. It should be noted that Ravenshaw, Dornfell and Broomsleigh Streets have no spare parking capacity during evenings. This, coupled with the high volume of traffic during the school drop off and pick up periods at Beckford Primary School, will inevitably lead to considerable congestion and potential danger for residents, schoolchildren and parents.

The proposal to demolish 23 Ravenshaw Street cannot be justified in terms of Camden's policies on sustainable development. When viewed from the street, the existing property presents no evidence of structural problems and its external envelope is in good condition. It can therefore be easily converted to provide good quality residential accommodation for many more decades to come. The embedded CO2 that has been created when the property was first built should be acknowledged. Any proposal for its demolition and replacement with another building will generate thousands of more tons of CO2 by virtue of its new energy intensive building materials, eg metal and concrete, construction process, road

journeys and disposal of the original building materials. This proposal, therefore, does not accord with Camden Policy DP22.

National Planning Policy Framework paragraph 131 advises local planning authorities that when determining planning applications that they “should take account of the positive contribution that a heritage asset can make to sustainable communities”. Number 23 Ravenshaw Street continues to provide such a contribution by virtue of its appearance and its continued viable use.

The scale of the proposed property is not in keeping with the rest of the street. Most of the houses are single dwellings, with a few being split into two flats. There are no single properties on Ravenshaw Street which house more than 2 separate flats and to have 20 new bedrooms created in one new property is over development on such a constrained site.

The architectural design of the new development relates very poorly to the context of the street. The street is characterised with yellow or red facing bricks with slate roofs and rectangular sash windows in portrait proportions. The proposed elevation to the street makes no attempt to acknowledge the context of the local materials by virtue of the elevation being made up of multi-tone glazed bricks slips, metal cladding to window aprons and heads and metal sheeting to the sloping roofs. Moreover, the existing rhythm of the canted window bays of the terrace have been ignored by presenting a uniform flat elevation to the street. The window fenestration again ignores the local context by virtue of the square or long rectangular appearance of the proposed centre pivot windows.

Thus overall, the design of the proposed development would present an incongruous and discordant addition to the street. Therefore, the proposal does not comply with Camden Policy DP24.

When assessed against Para 131 of the National Planning Policy Framework, the new development does not make a positive contribution to the local character and its distinctiveness.

I respectfully request that this current application is refused and the developers invited to reapply for a planning application for a new dwelling to be built on the gap site only. A better integrated, smaller scale development would still prove to be economically viable for the land owner and provide new homes.

Yours sincerely,

Mike McGill

Mike McGill



HOLISTIC
Chartered Surveyors and Historic Building Consultants

5 Blenheim Street
London W1S 1LD

E: mike.mcjill@holistic.uk.com

M: +44 (0)7919 27 27 28

T: +44 (0)207 183 1751