

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2017/3214/P	Antonio Galvez	Ground Floor Ginsberg Yard Back Lane NW3 1EW	11/07/2017 13:30:01	OBJLETTE R	11th July 2017

For the attention of Mr Robert Lester, case officer.

Dear Sir,

Re: Planning application No 2017/3214/P - Flat A 15 Well Walk London NW3 1BY

I write on behalf of the owner of the adjoining property 17 D Well Walk in response to the Planning Application referred above, my comments and objections are as shown below:

i - Firstly, it is worth to mention that after a scrutiny of the submitted documents attached to this application certain flaws were found which do not allow to accurately estimate the magnitude of the impact of such development such as:

- i.i - no daylight and sunlight report according to BRE guidance. The sunlight study attached from an unknown source does not reflect faithfully the site conditions and neighbouring properties. Windows are missing and the tree shown seems oversized at a first sight.
- i.ii - the references stated on submitted plans/drawings/statements from the application form point 1.1 do not correspond with the references of the submitted documents, e.g. JL2011-1009 rev D01 instead of rev D02, ...

ii - The proposed development will have an adverse effect on the residential amenity of the neighbours, particularly the adjoining flat at 17 D Well Walk, by directly overlooking from the proposed bay window and terrace with the subsequent loss of privacy.

iii – The proposed development will cause a negative visual impact as it would be seen from Well Walk passage. In addition, the design related to detailing and materials (aluminium) is out of character in terms of its appearance compared with existing developments in the vicinity and the character and appearance of the Conservation Area.

iv – The proposed development requires excavating the ground and expose the party wall which might compromise the stability of the property. No details are found showing a methodology and sequence in what the ground would be excavated and retained.

The mentioned points appear to be adverse to Camden Local Plan policies, particularly those policies regarding protecting amenities (policies A1 Managing the impact of development, A5 Basements) and design and heritage (policies D1 Design, D2 Heritage).

Taking this into consideration, I wish to log my objection to the proposed development.

Yours Sincerely,

Antonio Galvez

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2017/3214/P	Philippa Quinton	17a Well Walk	18/07/2017 16:38:28	OBJ	<p>Whilst I note some of the excavation works have been scaled back, I am still concerned that what is proposed will have an erosive effect on the environment with less soil to serve the trees and changing the water course. My reservations remain that the size and materials to the 3m bay window extension are not inkeeping with the existing building or Hampstead conservation area, so whilst the council may consider this not so visible to the public, it would be very visible from my property and garden and from other neighbours too. I am also still concerned that light and privacy will be taken from both flat A and B at 17 Well Walk next door, and that the computer generated solar study on the longest day of the year with most sunlight is not a fair representation of this. It is most inconsiderate, unfair and frankly ridiculous that this proposal which has already been hanging over us since February 2012 should be considered again, causing the neighbours huge concerns over problems with tenancies, noise, disturbance and risks to their properties throughout this process, again, for at least another three years, whilst the owners decide whether they may or may not go ahead with the works.</p>
2017/3214/P	Madjide Khalik	17a Well Walk	18/07/2017 17:47:25	OBJ	<p>My concerns are twofold.</p> <p>Firstly, the houses of 15 & 17 well walk are built over a river. I have seen nothing that answers my concern that building into the deep foundations will cause structural problems for both buildings long term should the foundations be interfered with.</p> <p>Secondly, the works are downright grotesque. Should this work be carried out in the back streets of Milton Keynes I would forgive the said council. However we are in Hampstead. Tourists who do the Hampstead tourist walks, walk down Well Passage & will have a clear view of this monstrosity. Neighbours in Well Walk & Well Road will have to view this mess.</p> <p>The council should also take into account that the owners of 15 Well Walk have hardly ever lived at the residence in question. This planning application follows others at the same address which have been a blight on Well Walk for 5 years. Do the owners care, well as they are out of the U.K. for all of the five years & will almost certainly never ever set foot in the property in the future should be considered. This is a planning application to increase the building size to increase the value of the property so that the owners can sell for a larger profit. Local people are being priced out of the area by wealthy owners building grotesque oversized eyesores to make money. They do not care that it could damage the foundations, that it will affect the light & privacy of the owners of 17 Well Walk or that tourists walking around the area will have to view such a mess, as long as the owners can make money. So I urge the council to understand the role of the council. Whether the council works for the local residents or rich overseas owners out to make a profit at everyone else's expense. Owners who do not nor have ever cared about what mess they are willing to leave behind for real residents, for people who love Hampstead, people who pride themselves on living in a nice, clean & friendly area.</p>