

From: ANNABEL BACAL [REDACTED]
Sent: 04 April 2017 16:18
To: Peres Da Costa, David; Planning
Subject: Re: 26 netherhall gardens / comments by annabel bacal thank you
Attachments: [26 netherhall camden letter pages](#)

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Flagged

thank you david enclosed my comments in support of our letter from birketts text pasted onto email and attached as document

26 NETHERHALL GARDENS

Dear Sir,

I strongly object to both proposed DEMOLITION and forthwith build of 26 netherhall gardens , NW3

**birketts lawyers have sent you a letter on our behalf outlining our objections
i would also like to add the following:**

CONSERVATION

**I strongly agree with all the pertinent points objecting to this proposal in comments submitted to the camden website, especially those of the local conservation groups who have great expertise, knowledge and authority on preserving the historic neighbourhood of hampstead. the heath and hampstead society, netherhall association,reddington frognal association and the reddington frognal neighbourhood forum
i would trust the council should be attentive to these local conservation groups who care deeply about the neighbourhood and are so well informed
the large houses in netherhall gardens are noted in architectural authorities cherry and pevsner “ the buildings of england, london 4: north.”
no 26 is an excellent example of queen anne/ arts craft style**

i would hope that camden council see themselves as a beacon for preservation and conservation for such assets under their charge, and exercise a duty of care for their residents and future generations

**in the planning inspectorate hearing july 2016 at camden town hall which i attended, squires architects compared kidderpore green development to 26 netherhall gardens
this is plainly ridiculous.
as is a totally different scenario**

**kidderpore green is on the busy and main road (finchley road)
on the border of hampstead if you can call it that. the buildings are actually positioned
on the finchley road
already surrounded by large modern buildings
absolutely no comparison possible
borough of camden covers large areas it is impossible to compare a locally listed
building in a conservation area of a historic neighbourhood
with for example a developed area of euston station
all within the same borough
local sentiment is high
as you can see by number of comments over the last 3 years how many people are
against this development for very valid reasons**

**59 netherhall gardens is an example of a building that was restored not demolished
why cant 26 netherhall gardens be looked after in same way
how would that stretch of netherhall gardens now look if that building had been
demolished?**

LOCAL AMENITY

**we have 4 double sized park benches on one stretch street within 340 steps of each other
it is impossible to name another london street that has this public amenity?
there is also one bench directly outside no 24a and 26
people use these benches to enjoy serenity and beauty of our conservation area
to read a book eat sandwich take a quiet moment
loss of greenery and trees at no 26 will diminish this amenity as well as loss of the
building. often people passing will take photographs on the imposing staircase of no 26
and sit on the bench outside for a moment. this will be impossible to replicate
in the event demolition is granted**

DAYLIGHT

- 1. window 76 outlook privacy will be severely compromised. not enough has been
done in the reviewed design. design of all these terraces unacceptable**
- 2. window 78 vertical sky component**
 - 1. developers call it a "call it a" hall " planning inspector clearly called it a
habitable room (paragraph 40 of his report)**

daylight distribution on BRE light report

window 78

loss of 42% of light 0.22 ratio

unacceptable

TREES

tree report by gifford tree service

sent in by our lawyers birketts published with the comments

kim gifford credentials impeccable

**Kim Gifford served on committees of the Arboricultural Association for 10 years and
became the National Chairman of the Arboricultural**

Association in 2001. Kim Gifford is now an honorary member of the Arboricultural Association.

planning inspector highlighted (paragraph 40 of his report) removal of this group of trees unjustified
not acceptable to remove
also highlighted misrepresentation of tree T2 measurement from basement thus as calculations are wrong cannot assess plans for basement as these are based on distance from this tree
sinclair johnson also highlight that there are "several mature trees within the rear and front gardens" why are we even considering removing "mature trees" in a so called conservation area. unacceptable

BASEMENT

catrien harris at no 24 has written extensively about horrific results for our buildings and environs if basement goes ahead

there is a lot of paperwork to go through concerning the basement but i don't also believe there is a construction management plan

June 1st 2017 new controls to be implemented for building basement
"article 4 direction" in borough of camden
includes

a basement should be 1 storey and not take more than 50% of the garden

this basement plan is clearly larger than 1 basement (because of the slope building will essentially end up with 3 stories below ground level and take more than 50% of the garden space
thus breaching guidelines

sinclair johnson report highlights level of existing water table surface on site is not known. unacceptable

AFFORDABLE HOUSING / DIVERSITY IN OUR NEIGHBOURHOOD

hampstead should not become the preserve of the rich
25 years ago i was a student in london and our student house was in the middle of hampstead above jeroboams wine shop.
this would not be possible today
its vital that camden supports mixed communities in the borough not promote enclaves for the moneyed who can choose where they live

in the recent smith report december 2016
reported

average priced flat in cheapest area of camden need be reduced by 176,000 pounds for it to be affordable, whereas no subsidy needed for lowest cost areas of merton, dagenham barking.
the council needs to address this issue and support housing for everybody regardless of their incomes

new development only furnish 5 flats all in non affordable category will be at least 2.5 million each per unit based on markets value new build in hampstead not acceptable new development only affordable to small minority terrible price to pay for this for conservation area and residents and for future generations hampstead needs more affordable housing to promote thriving community .NW3 needs a diverse group of residents to create thriving communities within the camden borough

BATS

bats roosting in no 26. currently no bat report. understand they are protected

SPACING BETWEEN no 26 and 24a

land registry plan shows original designed spacing between no 26 and no 24 impossible to compare spaces between buildings other side of the street as this block of houses are the mirror image of houses on other side of the street on frognal east side of netherhall gardens spacing of houses designed to be wider

DESIGN

**dreadful design
boring bland unsympathetic
adds nothing to our street
too many windows on facade and too big for the site will swallow up space and overbear no 28 and no 24a visually**

height of proposed building in new application has returned to that outlined in the pre application which was not approved by camden. unacceptable

LOCAL WILDLIFE

development will ensure loss of green space not support biodiversity/ wildlife / huge species of birds in our conservation area. health benefits of street

thank you

sincerely,

- a. bacal**
- b. 24a netherhall gardens NW3**

el,