

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2017/2471/P	Emma and Adrian Vickers	Garden Flat 19 Thurlow Road NW3 5PL NW3 5PL	15/06/2017 12:40:30	OBJ	<p>As residents of 19 Thurlow Road we protest unreservedly against this planning application which comes shortly after a similar development proposal was declined by Camden.</p> <p>A great deal of money has obviously been spent on surveys to prove that a development of this nature and scope will not have a deleterious effect on the site and surrounding properties.</p> <p>But this is not the first time that Camden has received such proposals and it would be very strange if on this occasion it could be proven that such basement development could not cause serious problems for contiguous and nearby dwellings, both in the process of constructing and as a completed structure with long term implications for the substructure of our foundations.</p> <p>The suggested development is grossly out of character and scale to surrounding houses. The basement proposal risks serious disruption and potential harm to the stability of surrounding homes, ours included.</p> <p>Baroness and Mr Serota previous and long time residents of this house, 15 Lyndhurst Terrace, now abandoned and uncared for, understood well the fragile and delicate nature of this area's substructure, Mr Serota himself being a professional civil engineer.</p> <p>They protested all their lives against unsuitable developments which they considered dangerous to the delicate balance of Hampstead's well investigated and but still largely uncertain and unpredictable foundations.</p> <p>Camden itself it seemed at one point to vaunt a no basement policy on environmental grounds.</p> <p>Expensive surveys should not be allowed to sway the evidence that the construction of subterranean basements are not good practice.</p> <p>To repeat we unreservedly protest against this irresponsible and entirely inappropriate proposal.</p>
2017/2471/P	Judith Serota	112 Gilbert House Barbican London EC2Y 8BD	14/06/2017 18:45:22	OBJ	I have submitted an objection by email, with photos, sent 14 June 1718.40pm

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2017/2471/P	john reizenstein	34 heath drive london nw3 7sd	22/06/2017 06:31:11	COMMNT	<p>I am a resident of Heath Drive, in the same neighbourhood as the site, and frequently walk past it. I have often noted how out of place the existing building is and wondered how it ever came to be approved. This ugly-angled 1970s building feels like an irrelevant attempt to infill a space between elegant neighbouring buildings. I can imagine that it is not straightforward to build well on this rather narrow site between grand buildings, and in my view the architects who have designed the replacement building have succeeded in producing a good design. The proposed house fits the site well, does nothing to detract from the neighbouring buildings whilst adding a suitably element of modernity to the street. I can see how the modernity references older architectural styles which are present in the area, and I believe this works well. Personally I'd question the oval window on the front elevation, but this is a detail. I'd also comment on two other issues - the chestnut tree and the fact that the existing house was occupied by Baroness Serota. Regarding the tree, the expert's report clearly demonstrates that the tree is virtually dead, so even if it looked good, (which isn't the case), it would only be a matter of time before it had to be removed. Regarding the connection to Baroness Serota, my view is that a historic figure has to be exceptionally important, and that person's house a key element of the individual history, to require that their house be retained forever. The Freud Museum and Keats House would be examples of that, but in most cases a plaque should be a sufficient memorial.</p>

---

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2017/2471/P	Hampstead CAAC	c/o Flat 6 4 Ferncroft Avenue NW3 7PH	15/06/2017 23:55:02	OBJ	<p>HCAAC objects to this application:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Demolition of a positive contributor to the CA must not be permitted. The degree of harm to the CA potentially created by demolition and the proposed replacement is high and is not compensated by any public benefit.</li> <li>2. The physical presence of a positive contributor building is not the only factor. As important, we think more so, is the social heritage which underpins the character of Hampstead. The existing house was occupied by Sir Nicholas and Baroness Serota the major support base of the arts. 'Development' must not be allowed to obliterate such invaluable local social heritage and value.</li> <li>3. Officers are no doubt forced to review a replacement scheme and although we consider demolition must not be an option we therefore comment on the proposed new building.</li> <li>4. The proposal threatens the large mature tree in the neighbouring property 17 Lyndhurst Terrace, proposing excavation and building within its TPZ, which is unacceptable.</li> <li>5. The proposal closes the gap between buildings and boundary which is damaging to the required visibility between buildings of mature trees. The clinging to the boundaries is an unnecessary, apparently dominating and even greedy threat to the CA.</li> <li>6. The proposed new basement is 70% of the whole site i.e.. 40% over Camden's June 2017 policy's over-generous and inexplicable limit of 50%.</li> <li>7. Local springs (Spring Walk is directly on the application site's western boundary) and neighbours" water ingress are recorded past problems and a tanked and blocking basement will again distort groundwater movement.at the very point at which original water-course(s) can be catastrophically re-directed.</li> <li>8. The proposal demonstrates excessive mass and bulk for the site and streetscape, causing further harm to the area and CA.</li> <li>9. There remains only 15% of the plot area as planting area if the proposed extent of hard landscaping were to be allowed.</li> <li>10. The applicant and his architect contacted HCAAC after submitting the planning application, rather than offering prior consultation. However, it is HCAAC's experience that developers simply use prior consultation as a box-tick, proceeding with their plans unamended and regardless, especially if they sense favourable pre-app support.</li> <li>11. The proposal appears to be to build under the boundary wall of no. 17, causing terminal damage to the Victorian wall of No.17. This would undoubtedly provoke action under the Access to Neighbouring Land Act which should prevent the execution of that particular detail of this scheme. However, retention of the wall should be the priority.</li> <li>12. The proposed basement plan appears as either a confusion or a deliberate attempt to encroach on no. 17's land. The Victorian wall between the properties can apparently be dispensed with to accommodate the unnecessary elbowing of the proposal. The plan shows retaining walls not defined as enclosing contiguous piling or on its own as a diaphragm wall.</li> <li>13. There has emerged clear evidence from the neighbour's deeds that the wall between 15 and 17 is the property of no. 17 as its boundary wall, not a party garden wall.</li> <li>14. The replacement proposal also has clearly excessive height to add to its massing despite an obvious clue to limit to the 1st floors of the neighbouring houses. Such modification, regardless of the erroneously stated height of the existing building having much</li> </ol>

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
					<p>less mass than the proposal, and proper retreat from the plot side boundaries as expected in the CA should be minimum requirements for any consent. The apparent reliance on the garage of no. 17 as alone allowing for view of rear trees is not satisfactory.</p> <p>15. Any proposal requires a more rigorous CMP as well as a BIA scrutinised and answered with reference to the nearby spring(s). The likely impacts of the construction on the tight street area and the site itself</p>

---