

[REDACTED]

From: Caroline Formstone [REDACTED]
Sent: 23 March 2017 22:30
To: Planning
Subject: Re: Comments on 2017/0579/P have been received by the council.

just sent in my objection

> On 23 Mar 2017, at 22:24, planning@camden.gov.uk wrote:
>
> I object to the demolition of number 26 and re-building of an
> unnecessary and over-sized property, which is ill-suited to the
> Netherhall Conservation Area
>
> The new application does not now even outline the plans to demolish number 26.
>
> The footprint of the proposed building is too large, rear terraces invade the privacy of
neighbours. The building will loom over neighbours and does not make a positive contribution to
the conservation area.
>
> The height of the proposed building in the new application has returned to that outlined in a pre-
application, which was not approved by Camden.
>
> How can the Appeal Inspector justify the proposed increase of just 1 flat as a positive reason for
this new building with respect to increasing housing provision? The proposed flats will be
affordable only to a small percentage of potential buyers. This is weighed against the terrible
price paid to the Conservation Area and the neighbouring properties and to the abandonment of
many of Camden Planning Policies.
>
> I object to the demolition of Number 26 to retain the essence and
> vitality of the Netherhall conservation area for future generations
>
> No.26 exemplifies Queen Anne/Arts and Crafts style architecture listed by Camden as making a
positive contribution to the conservation area. We are losing too many original buildings in the
area to Developers. The heritage of Hampstead needs to be conserved for future generations, not
be wiped out.
>
> Notable here is that through the recent development of Otto Schiff house, though planning
permission has retained the main building façade, its once magnificent side aspect has been
ruined because of an unnecessary ground floor extension. This has wiped out the amazing view of
the grand stain glass window on the side aspect as you walk along Netherhall Gardens.
>
> Camden should act now to save this important building, number 26 Netherhall Gardens, and
encourage its owners to re-instate the house to its former glory.
>
>
> I object because of a basement excavation that does not comply with Camden policy which
states 'The Council's preferred approach is therefore for basement development to not extend
beyond the footprint of the original building and be no deeper than one full storey below ground
level (approximately 3 metres in depth). The internal environment should be fit for the intended
purpose, and there should be no impact on any trees on or adjoining the site, or to the water

environment or land stability. Larger schemes, including those consisting of more than one storey in depth or extending beyond the footprint of the above ground building, will be expected to provide appropriate evidence to demonstrate to the Council's satisfaction that the development does not harm the built and natural environment or local amenity'

>

> The Basement Impact Assessment states that the creation of the

> basement "...has the potential to cause some movements in the surrounding ground"

>

>

> Despite two failed applications and a failed appeal the Developers have made no attempt to discuss this new application with the neighbourhood and get views on how best to go forward. This should signal to the local community and to Camden that the Development company does not care and will never care about retaining the heritage of the Netherhall Conservation Area.

>

>

> Comments made by Caroline Formstone of 21 Netherhall Gardens Hampstead

> London NW3 5RL Phone [REDACTED] Email [REDACTED]

> Preferred Method of Contact is Email

>

> Comment Type is Objection