

<b>Application No:</b>	<b>Consultees Name:</b>	<b>Consultees Addr:</b>	<b>Received:</b>	<b>Comment:</b>	<b>Response:</b>
2016/6566/P	Steven Fisher	8 Jack Straws Castle North End Way London NW3 7ES	05/09/2017 13:02:05	COMMNT	I have been the owner-occupier of No 8 Jack Straws Castle since 2004. It has come to my attention that this application appears to list me as being the beneficiary of the proposed works to remove an existing wall at the rear of the Old Court House. I wish to clarify that I have no interest in the removal of this wall, nor in being able to access a shed that was recently constructed close to this wall. Further, I have never requested such access, nor has it been offered to me. My property is a first floor apartment, with no direct connection to the land in question. I do not know what is the true purpose of these proposed works but I wish to make clear that, if it is being claimed that the application is for my benefit, such a claim is not true.

---

<b>Application No:</b>	<b>Consultees Name:</b>	<b>Consultees Addr:</b>	<b>Received:</b>	<b>Comment:</b>	<b>Response:</b>
2016/7088/P	Odette Kurland	21 George Crescent N10 1AL N10 1AL	04/09/2017 12:55:27	COMMNT	Spiritual centre helping many people on their spiritual path for many years.

---

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2017/2274/P	Meredith Whitten on behalf of the Covent Garden Community Association	Covent Garden Community Association 42 Earlham Street WC2H 9LA	07/09/2017 13:40:52	COMMNT	<p>The CGCA notes that the location of the proposed air-conditioning units are in a sensitive location (e.g. a light well) that could exacerbate noise and disturbance due to a canyon-like effect.</p> <p>Thus, to protect the amenity of nearby residents (CS5) and to ensure that the units do not cause undue noise and disturbance, any permission granted must include conditions that:</p> <p>(1) limit the hours of use to business hours of the premises, to reduce the impact of noise and vibration on residential amenity during evening, late-night and weekend hours (DP28.3) (for precedent, see 2015/5316/P, condition 4; 2016/0131/P, condition 4; and 2016/2471/P, condition 5);</p> <p>(2) restrict the amount of noise (measured in decibels) emitted from the units to within Camden's thresholds (DP28; CPG5 6.9);</p> <p>(3) require the applicant to ensure that equipment is kept working efficiently and is not causing disturbance to nearby residents, as verified through annual maintenance checks performed on all equipment throughout the life of the development (DP28.3);</p> <p>(4) specify that failure to conduct annual maintenance checks and failure to maintain all equipment to levels specified in planning permission is a breach of planning regulations and voids planning permission granted; and</p> <p>(5) require automatic time clocks to be fitted to the equipment approved, prior to commencement of the use of the units, to ensure that the plant/equipment does not operate at any time other than that permitted. The timer equipment shall thereafter be permanently retained and maintained and retained in accordance with the manufacturer's recommendations. (Reason: To safeguard the amenities of the adjoining premises and the area generally in accordance with the requirements of policies CS5 and DP26 and DP28.) (For precedent, see 2015/5148/P, condition 4, &amp; 2014/6130/P, condition 3.) (For further policy basis, see CS5.8; DP28, including DP28.1 &amp; 28.3; DP22.18; CPG5 6.7-6.9; and CPG6 4.7.)</p>

---

<b>Application No:</b>	<b>Consultees Name:</b>	<b>Consultees Addr:</b>	<b>Received:</b>	<b>Comment:</b>	<b>Response:</b>
2017/3007/P	sam markham	56a chalk farm rd 56a chalk farm rd nw1 8an nw1 8an	06/09/2017 11:52:09	OBJ	The smell of cooking meat unbearable at times.

---

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2017/3589/P	Preeti Chowdry	11 Rose Joan Mews	01/09/2017 05:56:03	OBJ	This would directly effect parking and access to the residential parking garage for 10 houses. Not to mention further damage the lane which was already damaged without any input from the council when number 14 was built. It will reduce light to number 3,7 and 9 Rose Joan mews. No discussions or notifications have been given to any of us despite living opposite it.
2017/3589/P	Preeti Chowdry	11 Rose Joan Mews	01/09/2017 05:56:00	OBJ	This would directly effect parking and access to the residential parking garage for 10 houses. Not to mention further damage the lane which was already damaged without any input from the council when number 14 was built. It will reduce light to number 3,7 and 9 Rose Joan mews. No discussions or notifications have been given to any of us despite living opposite it.
2017/3589/P	erdem ultanir	3 rose joan mews	04/09/2017 20:48:28	OBJEMPE R	Hi I am living right next to this property. My concern about the extensions to number 1 and 14 rose joan mews is due to overcrowding in rose joan mews street. This is a one way very narrow street and there is no parking available for these properties. Creating larger units here is just going to cause more problems by people trying to get in here with their cars, and there is no enough space. In addition Rose joan mews is a poorly maintained road. There is issues with clogged gulleys right behind 1 rose joan mews. 4-5, 1 and 2 Rose joan mews are poorly built. Their walls are already very dirty, white paint is not helping and already surface paint near window areas of these buildings is going bad. Instead of trying to extend these poorly build units, they should do proper maintenance.

<b>Application No:</b>	<b>Consultees Name:</b>	<b>Consultees Addr:</b>	<b>Received:</b>	<b>Comment:</b>	<b>Response:</b>
2017/3871/P	Meredith Whitten on behalf of the Covent Garden Community Association	Covent Garden Community Association	07/09/2017 13:42:51	COMMNT	No objection, however a condition or informative should be included that states the applicant should ensure that students and staff do not congregate in the street, such as for smoke breaks, as this would result in an obstruction on the pavement.

---

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2017/3898/P	Ron Aslan	Upper flat 67 and 67A Chetwynd Rd London NW5 1BX	02/09/2017 09:51:31	OBJLETT ER	<p>Dear Sir/Madam,</p> <p>I am the resident long leaseholder of 67A &amp; B(upper flat 67) Chetwynd Rd. 67A is immediately behind the application site at the Village Vets at 65 - 67 Chetwynd Road. 67B is immediately above it. The air conditioning of the application site has been a long standing disturbance of my quiet enjoyment and that of my neighbours, transmitting both noise and vibration and often at unsociable hours. The original installation was illegitimate having neither planning permission nor building regulation approval. No enforcement was taken. Now two of the original external condensing units have been replaced with a single unit and planning approval is being sought retrospectively. I write to object.</p> <p>The units are on the roof of no.65 within 1m of, and on the floor immediately below my living room at no.67A. They are within 3m of, and at head height of my 1st floor roof terrace at no.67B. They are within 5m of, and at head height of my kitchen/living room at no.67B. They are within 5m of, and immediately below my master bedroom at no.67B. Their noise, vibration and ugly appearance is unacceptable in this residential Conservation Area in such proximity and full view of my property and those of my neighbours. The site of the units is only accessible through the flat above no.65 hence some old units and a dismantled acoustic enclosure are an abandoned eyesore complete with their harmful refrigerant gases rather than being decommissioned and cleared away.</p> <p>John Nicholls at Camden Council has been aware of the problems caused by the original units since 2006 since when a makeshift acoustic enclosure of plywood and foam was constructed. This did little to mitigate the disturbance and eventually fell into disrepair (see the applicant's Report of Replacement). Likewise constraints imposed on operating hours were similarly ineffective because they relied on manual operation which were ignored, forgotten or not communicated to new staff. Continual operation and lack of any remedial action led to sleepless nights and increasing frustration.</p> <p>Since it was installed the unit for which planning permission is now sought has also been left on overnight continuously and intermittently despite assurances that its operation would cease at 6pm. This is acknowledged by the applicant's own report which acknowledges (my emphasis):</p> <p>"The new Daikin Ducted Air Conditioning System is supplied complete with a time clock controller which has been programmed in accordance with Village Vet instructions and the times are as follows:</p> <p>Monday through to Friday: On 8:00 - Off 18:00 – SECOND (EXTRA) OFF – 20:00  Saturday: On 9:00 – Off 13:00 – SECOND (EXTRA) OFF 15:00  Sunday: Off all day"</p> <p>A new system may be initially quiet and conform to guidelines but within a short period due to wear and tear the noise and vibration greatly increase. The unit which has been replaced, and some still in use, are over 13 years old (see applicant's report) and should have been replaced a long time ago but have only been replaced when they stop functioning.</p> <p>Airconditioning is not environmentally friendly and is now widely accepted as unnecessary particularly in the UK. In 2014 a wide ranging report by the Committee on Climate Change, chaired by Lord Krebs, which is the government's official climate change advisors included an assessment of hospital wards by Professor Alan Short (Dept. of Architecture) of the Cambridge University Institute of Public Health.</p> <p>Lord Krebs said measures to tackle overheating could include tinted windows, awnings to</p>

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
					<p>prevent sun coming in, painting the outside of buildings white, a range of passive cooling measures and better ventilation.</p> <p>Prof Short and Lord Krebs said they did not advocate installation of air conditioning because it would use large amounts of energy and contribute to climate change.</p> <p>See report here:  <a href="http://www.iph.cam.ac.uk/public-health-policy/case-studies/sustainable-healthcare-buildings/">http://www.iph.cam.ac.uk/public-health-policy/case-studies/sustainable-healthcare-buildings/</a></p> <p><a href="http://www.telegraph.co.uk/news/earth/environment/climatechange/10955143/Hospitals-at-increasing-risk-of-overheating-due-to-climate-change.html">http://www.telegraph.co.uk/news/earth/environment/climatechange/10955143/Hospitals-at-increasing-risk-of-overheating-due-to-climate-change.html</a></p> <p>Should policy for sustainable healthcare buildings not be applied to veterinary practices? Perhaps the vets could invest the same expenditure on some of the suggested measures e.g. heat reducing window film and windows that open (at present none of the frontage windows open) to achieve a similar result in an environmentally friendly manner that doesn't contribute to climate change.</p> <p>My brother is a General Practitioner at Hampstead Group Practice next to the Royal Free Hospital and it manages without aircon as do most GP practices. If a large medical practice serving people doesn't have it surely it is unnecessary for a veterinary practice in a residential area with flats adjoining. If airconditioning must be fitted then external condensers such as proposed by this application are dated technology in the light of more modern air conditioning which completely dispense with external units e.g. by using water cooling.</p> <p><a href="http://www.coolyoudirect.co.uk">http://www.coolyoudirect.co.uk</a></p> <p>Indeed I consulted the applicant's own airconditioning engineer who confirmed it is also perfectly possible to have internal regular units inside the ground floor of no.65 in an acoustic enclosure for which an estimate has been prepared. These seem far better solutions not least if it continues to be manually left on inadvertently.</p> <p>The airconditioning at nos. 65 &amp; 67 has been the cause of increasing distress ever since it was first installed. Its recent renewal causes fresh anxiety. When in 2015 my floor began vibrating whenever the aircon was being used it took five months of innumerable phone calls, emails and texts to the applicant for the applicant's engineer to diagnose it was mounted directly to my floor joists and lacked anti-vibration mounts and a further six months before a remedy was attempted. Meanwhile the vibration caused me unbearable irritation and as a light sleeper, sleepless nights and definite lowered mood. I found myself much more anxious, irritable with my friends and family and generally anti-social without a feeling of my home being a refuge. The incessant nature of such noise pollution/vibration take its toll not least because I am self-employed and work from home. I became unable to concentrate so would escape to other rooms or cafés. I have even agreed to contribute towards the maintenance of the ventilation systems when this was a condition stipulated by the applicant for improvement works to proceed, in order to ensure disturbance was minimised but I simply am not prepared to countenance this any longer. The units must go once and for all!</p> <p>Please refuse this application for planning permission.</p> <p>If you must approve, make it conditional on the automatic cessation of the units outside</p>



**Application No:**    **Consultees Name:**    **Consultees Addr:**    **Received:**    **Comment:**    **Response:**

normal business hours i.e. Mon – Fri 9am – 5pm and 9am to 1pm Sat so some daylight hours can be enjoyed on our only outside spaces without the constant sound and vibration of machinery.  
Yours faithfully,  
Ron Aslan

---

<b>Application No:</b>	<b>Consultees Name:</b>	<b>Consultees Addr:</b>	<b>Received:</b>	<b>Comment:</b>	<b>Response:</b>
2017/4021/P	D. D. Edwards	21 Laurier Road London NW5 1SD	04/09/2017 19:50:37	COMMNT	I live and work diagonally across from 32 Laurier Road and am concerned about the shape and size of the extension, which would block out a large amount of sky and destroy the perspective with the view of the next house and the trees beyond. It would block out the sunlight at certain times of day, making the outlook gloomier on some evenings when there is still sunlight outside, and would have a significant impact on the working environment and living space in the front rooms of this house.
2017/4021/P	D. D. Edwards	21 Laurier Road London NW5 1SD	04/09/2017 19:51:09	COMMNT	I live and work diagonally across from 32 Laurier Road and am concerned about the shape and size of the extension, which would block out a large amount of sky and destroy the perspective with the view of the next house and the trees beyond. It would block out the sunlight at certain times of day, making the outlook gloomier on some evenings when there is still sunlight outside, and would have a significant impact on the working environment and living space in the front rooms of this house.
2017/4021/P	D. D. Edwards	21 Laurier Road London NW5 1SD	04/09/2017 19:50:53	COMMNT	I live and work diagonally across from 32 Laurier Road and am concerned about the shape and size of the extension, which would block out a large amount of sky and destroy the perspective with the view of the next house and the trees beyond. It would block out the sunlight at certain times of day, making the outlook gloomier on some evenings when there is still sunlight outside, and would have a significant impact on the working environment and living space in the front rooms of this house.

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2017/4062/P	Meredith Whitten on behalf of the Covent Garden Community Association	Covent Garden Community Association	07/09/2017 13:43:35	COMMNT	<p>(1) Whilst the CGCA does not object to the change of use to residential, we are concerned about the impact the proposed extension will have on this already-narrow passageway in terms of lighting and noise and disturbance.</p> <p>(2) Additionally, the CGCA is concerned about the impact of A1/A3 use on existing residents. Gate Street is a narrow passageway that already has a public house, a bar and several cafes. When customers stand outside, the noise and disturbance is exacerbated by a canyon-like effect that reverberates up to noise-sensitive windows.</p> <p>(3) The proposed drawings indicate an openable shopfront at ground level for the A1/A3 use.</p> <p>The CGCA objects to an openable shopfront at this, and any, premises. Camden's planning policy opposes folding and openable shopfronts. See CS7; DP 30, including DP30.8; CPG1 7.12. Folding and openable shopfronts detract from the character of the street and the Conservation Area, as well as the architectural integrity of the building. When open, they erode the appearance of the shopfront, creating a visual void, and can have a negative impact on local amenity, for example in terms of noise and disturbance.</p> <p>According to DP30.8 (p. 137), "Folding/opening shopfronts will not generally be acceptable, as they can create a void at ground level that can harm the appearance of a building, and can also have a negative impact on local amenity, for example in terms of noise and disturbance."</p> <p>Meanwhile, CPG1 7.12 says, "When open, they erode the appearance of the shopfront, creating a visual void, and can increase disturbance to neighbouring properties, particularly in the case of food and drink premises. When closed they appear as a row of doors rather than a shopfront. This creates a heavier appearance than a shopfront mullion and reduces the area of glass in the shopfront" (see p. 67).</p>

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2017/4095/P	Steven Fisher	8 Jack Straws Castle North End Way London NW3 7ES	05/09/2017 12:58:29	OBJ	<p>I wish to object to this planning application. I am the owner-occupier of one of the first-floor residential apartments at Jack Straws Castle, positioned directly above the commercial premises.</p> <p>1. The supporting documentation asserts that: "A gym in this location has not been financially viable due to land Values and Market Rental Costs in this area and as a result will cease to operate on this site." This is a bizarre assertion, which is not borne out in reality. In fact, there is an existing gym already functioning on the premises, and I understand with no plans to cease operations. As other respondents have commented, this gym provides specialist personal training facilities to the local community, a service that differs from the other gyms in the surrounding area. The reference to market rental costs is a strange one: I infer that this means that the applicant (who is also the landlord) could charge a higher rent if the council allows the change of use. This may no doubt be a good result for the applicant, but I doubt that this is a valid objective of local planning policy. On the contrary, if this application is approved, it can only serve to undermine the ongoing viability of this existing business, with the consequent loss of employment for the staff currently working there, and loss of amenity for those local residents who appreciate the service offered.</p> <p>2. In addition, I wish to object more specifically to the detail of the proposed plans for the ground floor of the premises. These plans indicate a door linking the "Open plan office space" and the "Landlords Lobby (sic)". In fact, the space labelled as being the landlord's lobby is the communal hallway leading to the residential apartments on the upper floors of the block. At present, this door is sealed shut, as indicated on the existing ground floor plans accompanying the application. These detailed plans contradict the assertion made elsewhere in the documentation that: "There will be no major internal alterations or any change to the existing access arrangements." It is not clear why the change of use should require the unsealing of this door, but the impact of this layout change is likely to compromise the security of the existing residents. Absent any amendment to the proposed plans to confirm that this door will remain sealed, this provides an additional reason to reject the application.</p> <p>3. I also note that the accompanying documentation proposes that: "There is space available on the rear courtyard to provide 5 cycle spaces." This is not the case. In fact, the use of the rear courtyard is reserved for the use of residents only, and is not available for the commercial premises. This has been guaranteed by the applicant within the terms of the lease that I hold with him.</p> <p>4. I note that the previous change of use approval (ref 2004/2042/P, as amended by 2007/5133/P) incorporated a number of conditions, which were established in order to safeguard the amenities of the adjoining residential premises. These included restrictions on the overnight use of the commercial premises, on the playing of music, and on the maximum number of persons on the premises. In the event that this application is approved (which I would oppose), I request that the same conditions ought to remain in place for the new use as an office. Such conditions ought not to be contentious in the</p>

**Application No:**    **Consultees Name:**    **Consultees Addr:**    **Received:**    **Comment:**    **Response:**

context of the proposed use, but would still be appropriate in order to safeguard the amenity of the adjoining residents.

---

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2017/4096/P	Meredith Whitten on behalf of the Covent Garden Community Association	Covent Garden Community Association 42 Earlham Street WC2H 9LA	07/09/2017 13:40:00	COMMNT	<p>(1) The CGCA objects to the openable sash windows. Camden's planning policy opposes openable shopfronts. See CS7; DP 30, including DP30.8; CPG1 7.12. Openable shopfronts detract from the character of the street and the Conservation Area, as well as the architectural integrity of the building. When open, they erode the appearance of the shopfront, creating a visual void, and can have a negative impact on local amenity, for example in terms of noise and disturbance.</p> <p>Given that residents are directly adjacent to the premises, a condition must be included that specifies that they must be fixed shut and no audible noise, including music, should be heard from the premises.</p> <p>(2) The CGCA objects to the use of the "courtyard," which the applicant mentions on the proposed plans, but does not detail how this will be used. The premises is surrounded by residential flats, including noise-sensitive windows. Given this proximity and the small, confined space, the use of the courtyard would cause excessive noise and disturbance for residents and should not be permitted, particularly given that the applicant has not provided adequate details about the location and use of this space.</p> <p>(3) The applicant should be required to provide more detailed plans – including a noise report – regarding cooking equipment, extract and air-conditioning use. The proposed plans do not provide adequate information. For example, there is no mention of the use of an extraction duct located on the outer wall of Flat B, 44 Shorts Gardens, which would require planning permission, as well as a noise report.</p>

---

<b>Application No:</b>	<b>Consultees Name:</b>	<b>Consultees Addr:</b>	<b>Received:</b>	<b>Comment:</b>	<b>Response:</b>
2017/4098/L	Meredith Whitten on behalf of the Covent Garden Community Association	Covent Garden Community Association 42 Earlham Street WC2H 9LA	03/09/2017 16:40:08	NOBJ	No objection

---

<b>Application No:</b>	<b>Consultees Name:</b>	<b>Consultees Addr:</b>	<b>Received:</b>	<b>Comment:</b>	<b>Response:</b>
2017/4157/P	Mr S MacDonagh	30 Great James Street London WC1N 3EY	31/08/2017 12:48:48	OBJ	The Application site in Emerald Street is interesting architecture which, while not listed has considerable merit. The application site directly borders and overlooks the properties in Great James Street including several listed Grade II*. The proposed development would be detrimental to both the Emerald Street buildings and detrimental to the very special Grade II* buildings in Great James Street and should be refused as a result.

---



<b>Application No:</b>	<b>Consultees Name:</b>	<b>Consultees Addr:</b>	<b>Received:</b>	<b>Comment:</b>	<b>Response:</b>
2017/4197/P	Graeme Caul	42 Grafton Road  London  NW5 3DU	20/08/2017 19:24:01	OBJ	<p>This house was re-designed in circa 2005 with an illegal roof terrace. When it was sold some years later that roof terrace was given retrospective consent. It concerns me as a neighbour to the property that this significant extension with addition of glass where currently there is galvanised steel, will reduce our right to privacy as an adjoining property.</p> <p>Given the raised nature of this space, I also have some concern about how noise may carry as there is little greenery to absorb its impact.</p>

---

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2017/4197/P	Eleanor Kilminster	29a Willes Road London NW5 3DT	02/09/2017 09:38:46	OBJ	I am the owner of the ground floor flat at 29a Willes Road and wish to object to the planning application submitted on behalf of the owners of 31 Willes Road on the basis that the proposals to extend the existing terrace at first floor over the adjacent garage, will materially affect the use of 29a Willes Road in the following ways:

(a) The proposed site of the new terrace (above the garage) is directly adjacent to / above the garden at the rear of 29a Willes Road. As is clearly evident from the plans submitted in support of the application, the users of any new terrace will have a clear view directly into the living space of 29a Willes Road. The distance between the glass-panel garden doors to the living room of 29a, and the mid-point of boundary of the proposed terrace is approximately 3 metres. This will result in a complete loss of privacy within our living room, leaving us with no option but to install and close curtains on the rear doors.

As the applicant has pointed out at section 4 of the Design and Access Statement, CPG[5], paragraph 7.4 requires that "Development should be designed to protect the privacy of both new and existing dwellings to a reasonable degree. Spaces that are overlooked lack privacy".

The current application has no regard to the privacy or interests of the occupier of 29a Willes Road, and this is apparent from the following:

- A series of elevations were submitted with the planning application (a second floor layout plan of 31 Willes Road, an elevation showing the entire structure of 31 Willes Road from Inkerman Road, the rear elevation of 31 Willes Road, and further elevation showing the balustrades proposed from Inkerman Road), but no elevation was submitted showing the impact of the proposed new terrace area and balustrade on 29a Willes Road.

- Calculations have been provided of the proposed new development showing the height of the upper and lower (new) terrace from Inkerman Road, a public highway. No attempt has been to show the height impact at 29a Willes Road, which has a party wall and direct boundary with the applicants.

- The comments at page 5 of the Design and Access Statement suggest that "The only part of the terrace adjacent to the neighbouring property at no. 29 is to the very rear of the garden. Not the garden nearest the house as stated in the guidance above." This is clearly incorrect. As is clear from the applicant's own drawings (see 411.051) the new proposed terrace area is directly adjacent to the garden of 29a, and abuts the boundary of the rear wall (containing the garden doors) of 29a Willes Road. This is clearly in contravention of CPG[5], as the proposed terrace will give the users a direct view into the living room of 29a Willes Road.

- It is noted that both the applicants and CPG[5] acknowledges that the living area in a property is one of the most sensitive areas.

(b) In addition, the users of any new terrace would look straight on to the garden area at

**Application No:**    **Consultees Name:**    **Consultees Addr:**    **Received:**    **Comment:**    **Response:**

29a. Again, this will result in a complete loss of privacy in using the garden at the property. To be clear, the garden area is the only outside space available for use by the residents of 29a Willes Road. We rely upon the points raised above in relation to privacy in the garden area as well (and note in particular, that it will be possible to hear conversations in the garden of 29a clearly from the new proposed terrace).

(c) The issues described at paragraphs (a) and (b) above will not be resolved by installing a balustrade of a height of 1.1m at the boundary between 29a and 31 - a sitting adult (or even a standing child) can easily look over a balustrade of that height.

(d) In addition, any balustrade of a height of 1.1m (or otherwise) is likely to significantly impact upon the daylight and sunlight in the garden and living room at 29a Willes Road (as well as other neighbouring properties), and will cause significant over-shading of the garden and living room. It is noted that the lack of impact on daylight and sunlight, and over-shading to adjoining owners was an important consideration taken into account by the planners when permission for the planters was granted in 2009.

I also wish to make the following points on the application:

1. As the planning history set out at paragraph 1 of the Design and Access Statement confirms, 31 Willes Road previously had the benefit of a large garden but the previous owners elected to extend the property to cover the entire footprint of their property. The owner and successors in title may not now argue that having a smaller amount of outside space than they would like, should be taken into account when determining the current application for additional outside space.
2. It is noted that the use of the roof-area above the existing extension became immune to enforcement in 2010. It should also be noted that the local planning authority did not, in fact, give consent to the use of the roof area as a terrace. Planning consent was given (retrospectively) to the installation of the planters on the roof area, but as can be seen from the relevant planning documents dated 2009, no consent was given to a balustrade at the property. It is noted from the application that the current use of the roof area as a terrace is in breach of Building Regulations, due to the height of the guarding at the property. This is perhaps because consent was never obtained to the use of any of the roof area as a terrace.
3. It is also clear from the 2009 planning documents that consent to the planters was given on the following basis only:
  - a. Design Statement submitted by applicant confirmed: "The 6no. metal planter boxes cause no harm or detriment whatsoever to other properties, or to residential amenity. For example they do not cause overshading, or any loss of daylight or sunlight to any habitable rooms or other buildings, or to 31 Willes Road itself. The lack of harm and lack of detriment are due to the location of the planter boxes relative to other buildings, and the design."

**Application No:**    **Consultees Name:**    **Consultees Addr:**    **Received:**    **Comment:**    **Response:**

b.    The Delegated Report confirmed at the "Neighbour amenity" section – "The planter boxes would not raise any additional amenity issues and is satisfactory."

The same cannot be said of the current proposals, as any approval will undoubtedly have a significant impact upon the use and enjoyment of 29a Willes Road.

---

<b>Application No:</b>	<b>Consultees Name:</b>	<b>Consultees Addr:</b>	<b>Received:</b>	<b>Comment:</b>	<b>Response:</b>
2017/4199/A	Caryl Macfarlane	Grange Manor, High Street Adderbury	01/09/2017 17:23:35	COMMNT	As owners of Flat1, 11 Vine Hill, we are very concerned about the proposed illuminated Think sign. Vine Hill is narrow,3 metres wide approx, and no11 is opposite the proposed sign. The risk of light pollution to the amenity of residents of the flats in No 11,particularly at night is great, and also in the day if the sign is too bright. Any proposed sign should be of the minimum brightness to fulfill its function. It should be turned off completely outside office hours. We request that full and serious consideration is given to these concerns and requests and that the restrictions requested above be clearly and strictly stipulated, rigorously enforced, and monitored to protect residents' visual amenity and their exposure to light pollution.

---

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2017/4208/P	Fredericus Rethans	Flat 2 111 Canterbury Road NW6 5SR London	05/09/2017 18:47:14	OBJ	I object on the grounds that at this point, KHR is already very narrow, and allowing tables to extend up to two meters from the shop frontage hinders pedestrians using the pavement. This is even worse for wheel chair and disabled people.
2017/4208/P	A peyser	7 iverson road london NW6 2QT	05/09/2017 17:54:11	OBJ	As a daily user of the Kilburn High I object strongly to this planning application. The site is next to a busy bus stop on a narrow pavement. Granting the placing of chairs and tables on th pavement (2meters from frontage) would significantly impact on use of the pavement for pedestrians at a very busy place, with a bus stop and an overground station. Additionally a recessed frontage would not fit with the 328 development, creating a space for more Antisocial Behaviour at night and outside opening hours. Anti Social Behaviour linked to the pool club and the brondesage pub very near to this location would only be greater. Our pavements are already obstructed and we do not need more obstructions.
2017/4208/P	Sacha	34 Glengall Rd	05/09/2017 18:53:24	OBJ	<p>I have two issues with this request...</p> <p>That they may be doing this to allow their customers to smoke shisha outside. I am against this for so many reasons, and quite simply don't think that Kilburn High rd needs this kind of activity.</p> <p>Second of all that they will take liberties and extend themselves onto the pavement. There is quite simply no room for pedestrians to breath, let alone walk freely without having to dodge various obstacles.</p> <p>I ask you to find out the owners true intentions before allowing any kind of work to go ahead. From now on in, please try to improve our area. There have been too many mistakes from both yourselves and Brent council. We are losing everything positive about Kilburn please try to hold on to some of its identity.</p>

<b>Application No:</b>	<b>Consultees Name:</b>	<b>Consultees Addr:</b>	<b>Received:</b>	<b>Comment:</b>	<b>Response:</b>
2017/4237/P	Vincenzo	5 Chadswell Cromer Street	05/09/2017 09:30:12	COMMNT	There is no need for a restaurant to be turned into a takeaway unit. It depresses the area and down not benefit anyone

---

<b>Application No:</b>	<b>Consultees Name:</b>	<b>Consultees Addr:</b>	<b>Received:</b>	<b>Comment:</b>	<b>Response:</b>
2017/4259/P	Martin & Bernadette AUGER	Flat 9 Burghley Court 18 Ingestre Rd LONDON NW5 1UF	10/09/2017 16:56:30	COMMEM AIL	The large skylights in our 2nd floor flat living area, bathroom and hallway seem to have been overlooked again. They were completely omitted from the original application and seem to have been glossed over in the current plans. It's difficult to believe this is simply an oversight. What exactly are the updated plans for the current 2nd floor flat skylights?

---



Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2017/4274/P	Elisabeth Harris	1 Torriano Cottages Nw5 2ta	06/09/2017 10:44:13	COMMEM PER	<p>I object to this application. The provision of a roof terrace will cause noise nuisance when it is used, and it overlooks neighbours. The property is visible from my house. The full height brick rear extension looks large and unsightly. A mansard type roof would be preferable if any permission is given.</p> <p>This property abuts a conservation area and bit by bit the general and unique look of the area is being degraded by oversized development.</p> <p>As a final point, please would you ensure that any planning permission which is granted requires all building and preparatory work to be carried out from Torriano Avenue. Torriano Cottages is a private road.</p>
2017/4274/P	Ann Sedley	3 Torriano Cottages NW52TA	06/09/2017 17:52:12	COMMEM PER	<p>I live in Torriano Cottages, facing the junction with Torriano Avenue and looking into the rear of 61 Torriano Avenue.</p> <p>My main concern is that Torriano Cottages might be used for access to the rear of 61 Torriano Avenues where there is a passage and a gate through to the Cottages. This end of the Cottages is narrow, has no pavements and there is no room for vehicles to pass. I am worried that it might get blocked if used for construction access. I am also concerned that the proposed roof terrace overlooks numbers 31-33 Torriano Cottages and that the proposed additional storey would dominate Torriano Cottage residents on that side.</p> <p>69 Torriano Avenue is currently undergoing similar work with access from Torriano Avenue. I would ask the Council to attach a condition to any consent given for these works requiring a Constructon Management Plan is submitted confirming that constructon access will only be via Torriano Avenue and not via Torriano Cottages. Thank you.</p>

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2017/4274/P	Gavin Henderson	32 Torriano Cottages London NW52TA	04/09/2017 12:49:02	OBJ	<p>As neighbours, living in the home directly behind 61 Torriano Avenue, we are writing to object to the current application. We are not objecting to development in principle, but to several key aspects of the current scheme.</p> <p>Some features of the application resemble alterations at roof level, and the provision of external roof terraces, which have in the past been carried out to other near-by properties. These alterations are, however, in some cases highly unsympathetic to the character of the original building, or have had significant impact on the amenity of neighbouring properties. Previous examples of harmful development should not justify the repetition of similar features regarding the provision of a roof terrace and treatment of the roof extension at 61 Torriano Avenue.</p> <p><b>Impact on Residential Amenity: Creation of a Second Floor Roof Terrace</b> The proposal creates a large (approx. 4m x 2.75m) roof terrace at second floor level with perimeter railings which provide no screening for noise or privacy. Planning Guidance CPG1 5.23 suggests that roof terraces can provide useful amenity space where this is not available elsewhere for property, although highlighting that they also can create problems in terms of privacy and noise. 61 Torriano Avenue benefits from a large garden and, consequently, does not have a requirement for amenity space, but the proposal does impact on neighbours in terms of noise and privacy.</p> <p>Roof terraces of the scale proposed are more than simple balconies and can accommodate groups of people who, because of the elevated location, create highly intrusive noise for neighbouring properties: this is a significant existing problem with other similarly scaled terraces in the neighbourhood and we are very concerned about the prospect of an increased impact in terms of noise on ourselves and neighbours and the effect this will have on residential amenity.</p> <p>Planning Guidance CPG6 notes that to protect privacy "roof terraces should be carefully designed to avoid overlooking" and adds that the most sensitive areas to overlooking include "the part of the [neighbour's] garden nearest the house." The proposed roof terrace is only 10m away from the garden of 32 Torriano Cottages, a small patio immediately adjacent to the house, and looks down into it from a height of three storeys. Whilst views are currently partly obscured by a tree, this does not provide permanent protection of privacy throughout the year, or in the longer term.</p> <p>We are objecting in principle to the creation of a roof terrace at second floor level due to the impact on residential amenity of noise and overlooking.</p> <p><b>Scale and Visual Prominence: Replacement of Parapet on Rear Elevation with Full Storey Height Brick Façade</b> The property is in the middle of a sequence of three retaining their original butterfly roof valley gutter configuration with a parapet at front and rear. The proposal maintains the parapet at the front of the property, with the addition of a mansard roof, but creates a full additional brick storey at the rear.</p>

**Application No:**    **Consultees Name:**    **Consultees Addr:**    **Received:**    **Comment:**    **Response:**

The proposal eliminates the definition of the roof as a separate storey, undermining the character and proportions of the original property. This approach creates an overbearing presence towards the homes on Torriano Cottages in terms of bulk and design: an approach already visible in the cliff-like character of the extended rear elevations of 65-67 Torriano Avenue which, if replicated, would transform the character of the terrace as a whole. This proposal is not in accordance with CPG1 5.19 which states that for valley or butterfly roofs the parapet should be retained in order to maintain the character of the original building.

In order to create an acceptable massing and impact on the existing building, the parapet should be retained on the rear elevation and any roof extension – if agreed – be consistent with the mansard form adopted on the front elevation.

**Scale and Visual Prominence: Projection of Rear Extension from the Rear Wall of 61 Torriano Avenue**

The footprint of the existing rear extension to 61 Torriano Avenue extends well beyond the adjacent three storey extension on 63 Torriano Avenue. The proposed extension appears to maintain the footprint of the rear extension and would, therefore, project beyond the line of the adjacent buildings up to the proposed three storey height.

To create a reasonable massing, and reduce visual dominance, the rear façade of the proposed extension, above the existing rear extension, should not project further than the contiguous rear extension to 63 Torriano Avenue: this would reflect a similar configuration of 59 Torriano Avenue where the rear extension steps back above lower ground floor level to reduce its massing at high level.

**Construction Access**

The application property has its access and address on Torriano Avenue. However, it also abuts at its rear a passage and gate into Torriano Cottages.

Torriano Cottages is an un-adopted road which is a narrow, mews type street without pavements or room for vehicles to pass. The street is managed by the Torriano Cottages Association. The scale and character of Torriano Cottages makes it unsuitable for construction access which is, therefore, highly disruptive (when essential for the properties on Torriano Cottages itself, access requires careful management and coordination). The gate to the rear of 61 Torriano Avenue is also immediately adjacent to entrances into 32 and 33 Torriano Cottages and two garages, all of which require unobstructed access: use of this gate for construction access would have a particularly high impact on residents of these properties.

Properties on Torriano Avenue – including number 69 which is currently undergoing similar works – gain construction access from Torriano Avenue. We are requesting that a condition should be attached to any consent given for these works requiring that a Construction Management Plan is submitted which confirms that construction access will be via Torriano

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2017/4274/P	Janet and Giles Taylor	7 Torriano Cottages London NW5 2TA	08/09/2017 15:42:51	COMMNT	Avenue and that no access will be made via Torriano Cottages.  This development appears to be yet another intrusion on the privacy of the residents in Torriano Cottages. We would like to see a restriction on any access to the site at the property into Torriano Cottages. This is a very narrow unmade up road which is maintained by the residents. It provides the only access to the houses at that end of the Cottages for emergency vehicles and it is therefore imperative that the road is not blocked in any way. Other properties have been developed in Torriano Avenue without recourse to using Torriano Cottages and we would like to request that if this construction goes ahead it should have a no access to Torriano Cottages clause applied to the work.
2017/4274/P	Ms Torriano Cottages Association	5 Torriano Cottages London NW5 2TA	04/09/2017 10:21:11	COMMNT	The Torriano Cottages Association (TCA), which represents residents of the street, requests that any consent for works at this property include a condition requiring that all construction access to the site be from Torriano Avenue and not from Torriano Cottages. Torriano Cottages is a narrow unadopted road without pavements, maintained by the TCA on behalf of and at the expense of residents. It is used frequently by pedestrians including children from Torriano Primary School. Any use of the road by large delivery or construction vehicles creates obstruction to residents' cars and dangers for pedestrians. The TCA considers that permitting the use of the pedestrian gate from the rear of 59 and 61 Torriano Avenue onto Torriano Cottages for construction access to no 61 would be detrimental to residents. It would create noise and debris as well as preventing residents and their visitors from using the road. Access to nos 32 and 33 Torriano Cottages, and their garages would also be directly obstructed. We believe construction access to no 61 should be from Torriano Avenue, as it is for other properties in the same terrace. Mary Goyder, Chair, TCA

<b>Application No:</b>	<b>Consultees Name:</b>	<b>Consultees Addr:</b>	<b>Received:</b>	<b>Comment:</b>	<b>Response:</b>
2017/4285/P	Bloomsbury Conservation Area Advisory Committee - Hugh Cullumhugh cullum	61b Judd Street	01/09/2017 14:32:56	COMMNT	The committee has no comments on this application

---

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2017/4302/P	Richard Morgan and Monica Coombs	24 John Street London WC1N 2BH	04/09/2017 13:05:15	OBJLETT ER	<p>Objection to planning application 2017/4302/P</p> <p>As expanded upon below, we object to this planning application on the basis of three areas of direct concern to us, namely:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Its impact as a basement development in circumstances where the developer's own BIA confirms that the proposal does not satisfy Camden's Policy A5 on Basement Development;</li> <li>2. Its impact on the conservation area in which the properties sit and to which they are currently identified as making a positive contribution, where the proposal is for the substantial demolition of effectively everything other than a part of the front wall and its replacement with a modernist form using new materials, thereby also directly affecting the setting of adjoining listed buildings; and</li> <li>3. Its impact on our amenity in creating substantial new sliding clear glass doors and windows looking directly into the rear of our property and permitting access onto a new proposed grassed roof terrace at first floor level.</li> </ol> <p>1 Basement development Camden Local Plan, Adoption version of June 2017 sets out Policy A5 "Basements" states that:</p> <p>"The Council will require applicants to demonstrate that proposals for basements:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>n. do not harm neighbouring properties, including requiring a Basement Impact Assessment which shows that the scheme poses a risk of damage to neighbouring properties no higher than Burland Scale 1 "very slight"."</li> </ol> <p>The Applicant puts forward a Building Impact Assessment from Chelmer Consultancy Services dated July 2017 ("the BIA"). Paragraph 6.21 of that document confirms that the calculations for the proposed development produce a figure of Burland Category 2 for the structure to the South of the property. Accordingly this application fails to satisfy Camden's policy for basement developments.</p> <p>Further, at paragraph 6.22 the BIA acknowledges that other structures "have not been assessed in detail". This has occurred on the false basis that other "neighbouring structures" are further away. Regrettably the statement that other structures are further away is untrue, and the diagram included in Figure 18 of the BIA is inaccurate. 24 John Street shares a (listed) party wall with 15 John's Mews, and our flank walls extend to that boundary (our South wall is a party wall with active office space to the South in 25 John Street extending almost to 15 John's Mews and our North wall includes the remnants of a huge chimney from a previous single storey extension that used to run almost to our rear wall, where the foundations are but a few metres from the proposed excavations).</p> <p>There are further concerning features of the BIA. First, paragraph 4.4.7 of the BIA refers obliquely to "the Chelmer (2016) Geo-Environmental</p>

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
					<p>Interpretative Report” which “addresses contamination issues, and that report should be noted by the contractors” but the report does not form part of the planning file for this application. However, as a constrained site immediately opposite St George the Martyr Primary School, the complete picture of the contamination present on this site (namely lead and other contaminants) should be explicitly disclosed by the applicant and should appear on the face of the record for this application.</p> <p>Secondly, the BIA is based upon plans that were previously submitted with application 2014/3330/P, yet the figures shown in Table 4 “Summary of predicted heave displacements” within paragraph 5.4.2 of the BIA are now calculated at lower figures than those shown in Table 3 “Summary of predicted heave displacements” within paragraph 10.5.3.3 of the BIA report produced by Chelmer for the previous application. There is no explanation for this discrepancy. All one does find at the end of paragraph 5.4.3 of the current BIA is a statement that “differential displacements experienced by the slab after it has cured will be larger than the difference between the displacements at Stages 3 &amp; 4, and possibly in the order of up to 10 mm.”, an observation that was not included in the BIA produced by Chelmer for the previous application.</p> <p>Thirdly, the current BIA appears substantially less detailed than that produced for 2014/3330/P, where Chelmer went to great lengths to address the complex unstable nature of the soil in which this proposed excavation is to occur and produced detailed plans for the construction in order to address certain of the issues. Such detail should not be allowed to disappear or be assumed to be included: each application needs to have the same level of precision in the construction methodology.</p> <p>Fourthly, the BIA appears to be based upon a structure that is not that for which permission is sought. Paragraph 5.1.3 records that the excavation depths for the basement has been modelled using drawing L14771-11-P2, yet section 4 on that drawing is for the old application (2014/3330/P) where the boundary wall between 13-15 John’s Mews and 23 &amp; 24 John Street was to be buttressed by a concrete floor at ground level. Yet this structural detail is not present in the scheme drawings for the application. It therefore appears that the BIA has not been prepared on the basis of drawings for the scheme that is actually being proposed.</p> <p>2. Heritage Issues</p> <p>13-15 John’s Mews is identified as making a positive contribution to the conservation area in which it sits.</p> <p>Contrary to what is said in the “Planning Statement” prepared by Montagu Evans in support of the application, it is accepted elsewhere that the buildings are original mews houses dating from the 1800’s, with the single storey rear extension to 15 John’s Mews being built in the rear garden to our property, 24 John Street, by no later than 1894 (see paragraph 3.1 of the BIA).</p> <p>13-15 John’s Mews was occupied and in business use until around 2012. It was sold in or around 2013, since when it has been stripped out by the current owner, including the creation of substantial holes in the floor to the ground and first storeys, and allowing the roof to deteriorate, as a result of which it is now said to be incapable of further business letting. As appears from drawing P_07, Demolition and Proposed Rear Elevation, substantially all of the remaining exterior of 13-15 John’s Mews is to be demolished, and the historic form of</p>

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
					<p>the rear of the building is to be lost in its entirety. Indeed, given the extent of the proposed remodelling of the front face and interior, the proposal amounts to the substantial demolition of the properties.</p> <p>Camden Policy D2 Heritage provides that:</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">“The Council will:</p> <p style="padding-left: 80px;">e. require that development within conservation areas preserves or, where possible, enhances the character or appearance of the area;</p> <p style="padding-left: 80px;">f. resist the total or substantial demolition of an unlisted building that makes a positive contribution to the character or appearance of a conservation area;”</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">and</p> <p style="padding-left: 80px;">“k. resist development that would cause harm to significance of a listed building through an effect on its setting.”</p> <p>As set out in paragraph 7.49 of the Camden Local Plan Adoption version of June 2017, there is a presumption in favour of retaining buildings that make a positive contribution to a conservation area and applicants will be required to justify the demolition of such buildings. No such justification is provided for this application, nor indeed does any such justification exist.</p> <p>Further, the profile and appearance of the proposed rear of 13-15 John’s Mews is entirely out of character with its setting, introducing entirely new, alien features (such as a grassed roof terrace and modern full height sliding glass doors at first floor level) and destroying the historic rear profile of the building and altering its relationship with the listed buildings on John Street. It most certainly neither preserves nor enhances the character or appearance of the area.</p> <p>Paragraph 7.60 of the Camden Local Plan Adoption version of June 2017 provides that “the setting of a listed building is of great importance and should not be harmed by unsympathetic neighbouring development. .... The value of a listed building can be greatly diminished if unsympathetic development elsewhere harms its appearance or its harmonious relationship with its surroundings. Applicants will be expected to provide sufficient information about the proposed development and its relationship with its immediate setting, in the form of a design statement.”</p> <p>The application does not provide sufficient information and what is proposed for the rear elevations is unsympathetic, out of character and damaging to the setting of listed buildings. For these reasons the scheme proposed is therefore contrary to Camden’s stated Heritage policy.</p> <p>3. Amenity</p> <p>Camden Policy A1 “Managing the impact of development” states that the Council will seek to ensure that the amenity of neighbours and will in this context consider visual privacy as a factor.</p> <p>CPG 6 sets out factors that might be considered by a developer in relation to mitigating potential overlooking: none seem currently to be adopted. Indeed, the design appears</p>



**Application No:**    **Consultees Name:**    **Consultees Addr:**    **Received:**    **Comment:**    **Response:**

wholly unconstrained by consideration of the extent to which it impinges on our amenity. The applicant proposes new windows at ground floor level overtopping the height of the existing party wall between 15 John's Mews and 24 John Street. The applicant proposes new, clear glazed wide full height sliding doors at first floor level, opening onto a sedum roof, with no suggestion that there will be any impediment to that roof being used as a roof terrace. The applicant proposes new windows in a new mansard development with no suggestion that any of those windows will feature obscure glazing. The creation of windows exceeding the height of the rear party wall is objectionable. The size and nature of the new openings proposed at first floor level is objectionable. They are too large, they must be obscure glazed, and they must not permit egress onto any roof area. The windows in the proposed mansard roof must also be obscure glazed. If the application is permitted in any way, it should be a condition of its grant that at no time in the future will external access be permitted onto roof or other external areas above basement level.

Richard Morgan & Monica Coombs

---

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2017/4306/P	Benoit & Bruno Bertrand-Delfau	Flat 401 36 Tottenham Street	07/09/2017 14:52:47	COMMNT	<p>-The windows of the 8 storey building facing Tottenham Mews have to be sanded which is essential in order to protect our privacy as otherwise the people occupying the building will be looking through those windows at our master bedroom on the 5th floor of Cornerhouse and at our kitchen / dining room and living room of the 4th floor, as well in summer at the terraces of the 5th and 4th floor. this would be an unacceptable intrusion into our family life (we have 3 kids). Besides this sanding will not affect the use of the building as those windows are either only providing light to the staircase of the building or are small side and ancillary windows in the office spaces (the main windows of those spaces overlooking Tottenham Street). This will not either affect the appearance of the building.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>- The works have to be limited to weekdays from 8am to 6pm and noisy works even more limited to narrower time ranges during the day. no works on weekends or public holidays and not work in the evening. this is essential to us as we have young kids (among whom a newborn).</li><li>- All measures have to be taken to avoid dust flying to our building and terrasses.</li><li>- Traffic in Tottenham Street has to be preserved.</li><li>- Access to our bin room in Tottenham Mews for waste collection has to be guaranteed.</li></ul>

---

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2017/4326/P	Jeff Dexter	57 Achilles Road	06/09/2017 15:51:44	OBJ	Ms Kristina Smith Planning Officer Planning Solutions Team London Borough of Camden

5 September 2017

Dear Ms Smith,

Re: Planning Application 2017/4326/P – 63 Hillfield Road LONDON NW6 1QB:  
Erection of new two-storey (plus basement) building fronting Achilles Road

Since my home at 57 Achilles Road is my sanctuary, this application is a most unwelcome invasive attack, a threat to my health and well-being.

The owners of 63 do not live at 63. That house is not their home. They live two doors away at 67 and their application is just another greedy "garden grab" for profit. How can this happen? Gardens are protected by Camden policy.

Why should my tranquillity be ruined by the noise, dirt, and dust of a new construction just yards away from my bedroom, living room and kitchen doors?

My house at 57 shares boundaries with six separate properties with Hillfield Road, plus another on Achilles Road. I've had problematic incidents created by five of those properties in the 32 years since my wife and I purchased 57 as a home.

In order to acquire the property we had to make an offer way above the market value at the time. The reason was the unique setting, with an asset of green open space and virtually complete privacy that has been managed carefully with unique gardening skills.

At the time of purchase we learned from our structural surveyor that the building had certain issues with the surrounding soil. Being the end of the terrace, we were told that the house will be at the mercy of thermal movement - not subsidence as such - and the ground below will be wet most of the time.

The surveyor said, "Not to worry, the building has moved south west just few millimetres in over a hundred years, so if cared for it'll outlast us for another century"

A charming neighbour on Achilles Road had worked with the District Surveyors offices for the Metropolitan Borough of Hampstead. He explained the history of the road's construction and the reason for the gap in the terrace between 57 and 59: the main soil was too unstable to be built on because two river tributaries flow beneath it.

We still live with that problem. My flank wall is always damp, while the small basement, even with the supposedly substantial concrete bolsters of underpinning, there's still

**Application No:**    **Consultees Name:**    **Consultees Addr:**    **Received:**    **Comment:**    **Response:**

movement and damp from all directions. The basement has flooded seriously twice, and three times with just minor trickles. There are two pumps. One very large internal pump works with the tanking, while an external pump takes away the external rising water which breaks through the concrete just below the basement door.

Added to the situation of wetlands, we've had many issues with trees, either overgrown or changes when tress have been lopped, In fact the garden at 65 at one time had even substantial trees. One was removed when became diseased and the actual roots of that went underneath my house foundations. Once that was dealt with there was an improvement but the ground still moved.

Three years ago, the owners of number 65 had a request from me about two overgrown trees which were creating even more damage on my side of the boundary. I politely asked if they'd consider removing them, which they kindly did. But, at the same time, they removed another three substantial trees within the garden, which were no threat at all, and rather looked rather splendid, so there's been a great deal of arborial loss over the years.

More or less the same situation has occurred with other neighbours' gardens. In fact 3 years ago, I lost all the substantial bay trees, and all plants in that flowerbed due to the incorrect way of removing Japanese knotweed from next door's (55 Achilles Rd) garden. My beautiful garden that we had created over many years suffered a great loss. Another incident occurred, also about 3 years ago, with the owners of 67 Hillfield Rd, who had a different kind of growth infestation. The owners dealt with their problem using a chemical treatment, with killed off most of my flowerbed, including a 25 year old jasmine bush.

Also, the owners of 69 Hillfield Rd, decided to level their garden, which at one point was the same level as my garden. They removed 2 feet of soil up to the edge of the fence in my property to level their own. In the process, without using any soil retention techniques whatsoever, the soil washed away from my side of the garden, which contained a pond I'd built 25 years ago.

The rear part of the garden at 63 Hillfield Rd has been left unkempt for several years and the overgrowth has broken down the fencing, particularly the trellis work and in the process, has pushed out the gravel boards at the base of the fencing. When I made efforts to have it repaired, I discovered it had become a byway for hedgehogs, so naturally I didn't have the heart to block them off. Since May 2017 when dep core soil samples were taken from the same garden (63) using heaving pile-driving equipment, I haven't seen a single hedgehog.

It appears to me and many of us that, the entire process of planning applications these days is weighted far more in the interest of developers than it is to residents. That includes the current notification process which is really not fit for purpose. It is anti-social and unjust, considering it's our properties that could be under threat without anybody being made aware of it. The fact that you no longer write to us to inform us of such development proposals is an insulting and inconsiderate policy. In particular, the fact that local residents have only been given from 10th August until 6th September, at peak holiday time, to

Application No:    Consultees Name:    Consultees Addr:    Received:

Comment:    Response:

comment, your timing is even more inconsiderate. Even to this day, neighbours are just becoming aware of this unnecessary and discourteous development.

See key points and observations listed below.

Jeff Dexter  
57 Achilles Road  
London  
NW6 1DZ

1) Overdevelopment

There are serious concerns that what is being proposed would amount to unacceptably high-density of living units.

Should the proposal be accepted, what would once have been a single dwelling and garden would be replaced by six living units.

According to guidelines set out by the GLA and contained within the 'Housing Supplementary Planning Guidance', minimum standards of outside space should be as follows:

Standard 26 - A minimum of 5sqm of private outdoor space should be provided for 1-2 person dwellings and an extra 1sqm should be provided for each additional occupant.

Standard 27 - The minimum depth and width for all balconies and other private external spaces should be 1500mm.

Source: [https://www.london.gov.uk/sites/default/files/housing\\_spg\\_revised.pdf](https://www.london.gov.uk/sites/default/files/housing_spg_revised.pdf)

Flats 2 and 3 have no outside space, while flat 1 would appear to be under the 7 sqm required for a four person dwelling.

Adding extra living units would only compound the issue and lead to a situation of very high density living units, which would be completely out of character with the local development.

2) Inaccuracies of the planning presentation

There are a number of inaccuracies in Vorbild's Planning Presentation that are of major concern.

Firstly, the 'Site Location and Characteristics' section on page 6 states: 'The site borders Nos 61 and 65 Hillfield Road on the southern end, and 59 Achilles Road on the northern side. On the western side, it borders the garden belonging to No 65 Hillfield Road, and on the east the windowless side elevation of No 57 Achilles Road

This is inaccurate – the side elevation of No 57 has windows on the first and second floors

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
					<p>1 and 2 of the 'Scale and Appearance' section, on pages 13 and 14 show completely different designs, making it hard to ascertain precisely what the impact of the proposed design.</p>
					<p>3) Potential damage to surrounding property from the extensive digging planned</p>
					<p>4) Increased pressure on local parking, which is already overcapacity</p>
					<p>5) The digging out of basements on Achilles road could start a precedence for future works</p>
					<p>6) Concerns that such a construction will very likely disturb the delicate water table under the surface of that end of Achilles Road</p>
					<p>7) Achilles Road already suffers from very poor drains and drainage, and such construction can only potentially further damage this infrastructure.</p>
					<p>8) The removal of trees and green space The Arboreal report identifies a number of trees for removal – this, and the fact the proposed landscaping works are predominantly hard landscaping, means that there would be significant loss of trees and outlook to the properties and streets that overlook the development.</p>
					<p>9) Appearance The appearance of the development facing Achilles Road would have a detrimental effect on the locality. The relationship between the front elevation of the new building shown in views 1 and 2 of the 'Scale and Appearance' section on pages 13 and 14 of the Vorbild Planning Presentation and its neighbour is poor – the scale and arrangement of the windows are completely out of keeping with the surrounding buildings.</p>

---

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2017/4326/P	Robert Johnson	Flat 3, 59 Achilles Rd	06/09/2017 22:47:56	OBJ	<p>Having just moved into 59 Achilles road I was quite upset to find I had to immediately object to this development.</p> <p>A smaller development was rejected under 2017/1633/P which the community was greatly pleased about. It would be upsetting for this to then come through with all the previous arguments still valid.</p> <p>The properties surrounding the development undoubtedly be affected, not only in terms of quiet enjoyment, but also in valuation and impact for things such as parking on an already crowded street.</p> <p>Not only that but the property suggested is not keeping in trend with other properties on the road in style, and also risks structural threat to other properties.</p> <p>Finally, as a pesronal resident of 59 Achilles road directly next door, having a property built here (against a detached house) will obviously devalue this property, and impact my daily living.</p> <p>For these reasons, and more as community members suggest, this plan should not be approved.</p>

---

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2017/4326/P	Ian Ronayne & Cecilia Yee	3 Achilles Road London NW6 1DZ	04/09/2017 15:23:34	OBJ	<p>As residents of Achilles Road, we strongly object to the proposed development.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Risk of further subsidence: We are strongly opposed to any basement excavations on Achilles Road as it would have a massive detrimental effect to the ground stability and cause damage to neighbouring properties which already have evidence of subsidence. In the July 2008 planning application of the adjoining No.61 Hillfield property to extend and convert 3 apts into 4 apts, the existing building had to be knocked down and rebuilt as advised by the structural engineer. The rear extension was "severely cracked" which would have been due to subsidence. No.57 Achilles Rd, adjacent to the site, also suffers from significant subsidence and would be further damaged as a result of any major building works. Subsidence has also already had an impact on escalating insurance premiums for Achilles households as a result of building works directly on their own properties or even those of neighbouring works.</li> <li>2. Flooding risk: Houses on Achilles Road who already have large cellars or basements (put in decades earlier) have continuously experienced terrible flooding as a result of the poor drainage system and local topography. The proposed building development not only increases the risk of erosion by altering soil stability and water run-off patterns, but also increases sediment run-off during construction. This is in an area already identified by Camden Council as a "Critical Drainage Area" as well as listing Achilles Road as one of the "Streets at risk of surface water flooding". Thames Water has had to deal with multiple pipe leaks and resurfacing the road at least several times over the last year alone.</li> <li>3. Overdevelopment of the area, and in particular on that corner site: The current owners have already extended and increased capacity of their 4-apartment building at No.61, so to further increase capacity by adding 4 more residential units to an already built-up area will put greater strain on the already over-stretched parking, congestion, and local services in the area.</li> <li>4. Loss of green space: The proposed development will significantly affect the natural biodiversity of the green space by removing soils, plants and trees. The Council's guidelines for protecting invaluable green space was the reason for implementing policies and guidelines for garden developments: "(I)n order to protect the Area's green/open spaces, the development of new dwellings in private gardens should be avoided." This development threatens to detract from the open character and garden amenity of the neighbouring gardens and the wider surrounding area. From the frontage on Achilles Road, where currently residents see lush greenery and green foliage, we could be looking at a modern 2-storey block with oversized windows that do not fit in with the character of all of the other Victorian terraced houses on Achilles Road. As stated in the Camden Planning Guidance 'Design' (CPG1, 6.31) "Planning permission is unlikely to be granted for development whether in the form of extensions, conservatories, garden studios, basements or new development which significantly erode the character of existing garden spaces and their function in providing wildlife habitat".</li> </ol>

We urge the Council to refuse this application for all of the above reasons and also very



Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
					<p>importantly, to not set a precedent for basement excavations on this already fragile road.</p> <p>Sincerely,</p> <p>Ian Ronayne &amp; Cecilia Yee</p>

---

2017/4326/P	Janet Pedder	49 Achilles Road West Hampstead London NW6 1DZ	31/08/2017 15:30:12	COMMEM PER	<p>This project will greatly diminish the garden and mature shrubs and trees will be removed. As Camden says in its Biodiversity Plan 2013 -18 "our green spaces absorb rainfall, preventing local flooding...our trees clean pollution from the air and keep us cool when temperatures rise; and insects such as bees and butterflies pollinate flowers and support local food growing. The plan aims to support and improve these services through land management, the planning process and bespoke projects."</p> <p>Our wildlife nationally is under threat, birds, insects and plants. London has a severe air pollution problem and Achilles Road has a history of problems with flooding. The RHS , Natural England, Dept for the Environment, London Wildlife Trust all highlight the vital role that domestic gardens play in making our cities somewhere we want to live and they support the need to protect existing gardens and ensure their provision in urban expansion. This project is simply about squeezing in as many living spaces into a garden as possible for profit. And I am sure that they will not be affordable housing. This development destroys an urban green lung and cannot be morally correct, reflect current thinking on urban gardens or be in line with Camden's own Bio diversity policy.</p>
-------------	--------------	---	---------------------	---------------	---

---

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2017/4326/P	Daniele Molteni	55 Achilles Road NW6 1DZ	31/08/2017 20:33:02	OBJ	We wish to make you aware of a number of strong objections that we have with regard to the proposed erection of new two storey (plus basement) building fronting Achilles Road, application number referenced above.

As close neighbours to the site of the proposed development, we are of the view that the proposed development is in breach of a number of policies, particularly the policies outlined in the Fortune Green and West Hampstead Neighbourhood Plan, and it will have a serious impact on our standard of living, on the environment and on the residents of Achilles Road, Agamemnon Road and Hillfield Road. Our specific objections are as follows.

**\*\*Non-compliance with garden developments policies \*\***

Per policy A12, in order to protect the Area's green/open spaces, the development of new dwellings in private gardens should be avoided. Therefore, the erection of a new two storey (plus basement) building in the private garden currently fronting Achilles Road is in direct breach of the neighbourhood policy. There is no way around it. The removal of trees and green space is already depleting our urban green lungs.

Also, per policy G1, "The NPPF states as a core planning principle (17) that planning should contribute to conserving and enhancing the natural environment and reducing pollution. It also states that "allocations of land for development should prefer land of lesser environmental value". Erecting a new building on top of a private garden is a direct violation of policy.

Also, quoting policy G12, "The London Plan (7.64) says "trees play an invaluable role in terms of the natural environment, air quality, adapting to and mitigating climate change and contributing to the quality and character of London's environment". The Mayor wants to see "an increase in tree cover with an additional two million trees by 2025". The CCS (Policy 15) commits the Council to "protecting trees and promoting the provision of new trees and vegetation, including additional street trees". Its Tree Strategy (CCS 15.22) "aims to retain trees and provide new trees on Council land" and says "we will resist the loss of trees and groups of trees wherever possible". Trees - both on public and private land - make a hugely valued contribution to the character of the Area, and are widely appreciated and enjoyed by those living and working in the Area". Also, per policy G12, "the loss and removal of trees should be avoided unless in exceptional circumstances". Planning Application 2017/4326/P does not provide ground for any exceptional circumstance that may allow the destruction of trees and garden area for the sole purpose of erecting a new building.

**\*\* Environmental and stability concerns\*\***

Achilles Road already suffers from very poor drains and drainage, and frequent flooding. We have legitimate concerns that such a construction will very likely disturb the delicate water table under the surface of that end of Achilles Road, that has already caused frequent problems to at least 55 Achilles Road and to 57 Achilles Road, in the form of flooding. A new building can only potentially further damage the infrastructure and the nearby buildings already affected by the water table, as well as cause pollution of the underlying waters.

**\*\* Loss of privacy and overlooking \*\***

The proposed site of development is such that the primary amenity area of our garden

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
					<p>would be severely overlooked from the new development, resulting in a serious invasion of our privacy. We believe that the proposed development is a direct contravention of Policy 6.3 ("Protecting amenity is a key part of successfully managing Camden's growth and ensuring its benefits are properly harnessed") and 6.4 ("A development's impact upon visual privacy, outlook and disturbance from artificial light can be influenced by its design and layout. These issues can affect the amenity of existing and future occupiers") of the Camden Local Plan. The proposed development does not afford adequate privacy for the occupants of adjacent residential properties, particularly with regard to their right to the quiet enjoyment of garden amenities.</p> <p><b>** Traffic, congestion and strain on parking and local services **</b></p> <p>Achilles Road, Agamemnon Road and Hillfield Road already suffer from severe strain on parking and local services which are beyond breaking point. More residences will put even more strain on the area. Frequently car jams occur in narrow Achilles Road, and multiple cars are forced to back up for the entire length of the road. I believe that a new building would violate policy D10 ("As a busy urban area, a number of roads in the Area suffer from congestion"), CSS 11.21 ("The demand for movement, deliveries and car parking on Camden's roads already exceeds the space available, meaning that effective management of Camden's road network is essential. The Council will seek to ensure that new development does not cause harm to Camden's road hierarchy, or to the ability of the Council to manage the road network") and 11.25 ("the Council will also seek to ensure that the impact of construction traffic and the servicing of future developments are kept to a minimum").</p> <p><b>** Basement developments **</b></p> <p>We believe the digging out of any basements is not appropriate on Achilles Road and could start a precedence for future works. Per policy A14 and per Camden Planning Guidance CPG4, "the council will only permit basement and underground developments that do not: cause harm to the built and natural environment and local amenity; result in flooding; or lead to ground instability". In the case of Planning Application 2017/4326/P, the water table under the surface of that end of Achilles Road poses an immediate and permanent obstacle to a new building in the first place, and especially to a basement.</p> <p>We would be grateful if the council would take our objections into consideration when deciding this application. We also wish to stress that this planning application should have been given a longer time for residents to respond, while the notifications have been posted at a time when a majority of residents that would possibly be interested and affected by these works are on vacation and are only just becoming aware of the possible impact. Local Councillors that represent us were also away in August. We would welcome the opportunity to meet with a representative of the planning department at our home to illustrate our objections at first hand.</p>

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2017/4326/P	Jessica Ryde	59 Achilles Road West Hampstead nw61dz nw61dz	06/09/2017 23:03:37	OBJ	<p>Absolutely object to this unneighbourly application - given 2017/1633/P was refused for a smaller development, it is unthinkable that this plan be allowed to go ahead.</p> <p>It should not be allowed to be built up to detached house (59) without permission and compensation of the owners.</p> <p>The new design is not be in the spirit of Achilles road terraced houses / conversions and will devalue the surrounding property.</p> <p>The potential structural threat to surrounding buildings is great.</p> <p>The street is already crowded and there will be a further constraint on parking.</p> <p>Also, considering the owners already own 2 other adjoining properties on Hillfield road through their company <a href="http://www.bizdb.co.uk/company/61-hillfield-road-limited-06591976/">http://www.bizdb.co.uk/company/61-hillfield-road-limited-06591976/</a> and the size of the planned buildings / flat numbers I would want confirmation that they are not going to rent this out as short term holiday lets, as this negatively impacts the area, with extra traffic, unknown faces and people not invested in the area as well as meaning the building doesn't contribute to building the local community - a community Achilles is very proud of.</p>

---

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2017/4326/P	Marianne Jones	27 Achilles Road West hampstead London NW6 1DZ	03/09/2017 16:28:50	OBJLETT ER	27 Achilles Road West Hampstead London NW6 1DZ

Dear Sir/Madam

Re: Objection: Planning Application 2017/4326/P: 63 Hillfield Road London NW6 1QB

As a current resident of Achilles Road (27 years), and a former resident of Hillfield Road (7 years) I object to the above planning application for the New Residential Development fronting on to Achilles Road, and the proposed 63 Hillfield Road Residential Conversion with Extension, on the following grounds:

1. Causing Harm to our Natural Environment and Local Amenity

I object to the New Build Development in the private garden of 63 Hillfield Road which fronts Achilles Road, as the trees and large shrubs there are part of the block of gardens enclosed by Achilles Road and Fortune Green that provide a valuable safe habitat for our wildlife and a green lung in our neighbourhood.

We lack green space in West Hampstead, especially since the development of the Gondar Garden Reservoir was approved. Developments that nibble away at the green space of private gardens cause the destruction of mature trees, reducing our air quality and our quality of life.

The 'space/gap' between 57 and 59 Achilles Road in which the New Build Development is proposed is not nearly as large as it appears in the misleading photographs in the Architects document. The shot on page 5 of the Application Brochure makes it look like a massive space in a curved road, whereas our road is short and straight. The gap between house 57 and 59 small and mostly owned by number 57, not by the developers, so the developers are unable to build a house in keeping with the houses in the rest of Achilles Road.

The 'space/gap' for the building would be created by cutting down mature trees. This is against The London Plan for protecting our natural environment. Camden has a specific policy against cutting down trees and building new developments in the private gardens.

2. Increase in Flood Risk for Neighbours Properties

The basement excavation required for the new development will harm both the built and natural environment by causing increased flooding. I live in one of the few properties in Achilles Road with a large cellar, and this has regularly flooded. I currently have repairs underway to sort out the most recent of the three floods I have had in the last eighteen months. The floods happens each time we have torrential rain, in spite of the cellar being fully tanked and not as deep as the proposed basement for the New Residential Development.

**Application No:**    **Consultees Name:**    **Consultees Addr:**    **Received:**    **Comment:**    **Response:**

My neighbour at number 57 (immediately next door to the proposed new residential development) has a basement and has had flooding even worse than mine over the years. Flooding is a very real issue in Achilles Road, so basements are a very bad idea. Neighbours without basements do not have floods.

We are affected by the action of underground rivers and springs in our immediate vicinity, the height of the water table is high, our old Victorian sewers have cracked and moved out of line due to the heavy clay soil, and Thames Water drains in our road are in poor repair. My sewer pipes at number 27, and several of my neighbours pipes, have had to be sleeved or replaced due to damage from ground movement. Thames Water pipes have burst in our road at least 3 times this year.

The hard surfacing/concreting over formerly green areas in gardens and drives means rain water cannot spread evenly and soak away naturally, but run-off gets concentrated into torrents which cause flooding.

Our local topography adds to the problem. The sloping land carries water down from the north section of Agamemnon Road, down Ulysses, through Achilles and on to Hillfield, results in our over burdened storm gullies overflowing. Water from torrential rain will run into basements or be diverted around a new development, in which case it will cause damage at neighbouring properties. The new residential development fronting onto Achilles Road will exacerbate the likelihood of neighbours getting flooded.

### 3. Increased Subsidence Risk from Increased Ground Instability for Neighbouring Properties in Achilles and Hillfield Road

The basement excavation required for the new development will harm our built environment, increasing ground instability in our already high risk area. Achilles Road and Hillfield Road are both high risk areas for subsidence as defined by buildings insurers. Several houses in Achilles Road have had to have expensive work carried out due to damage from subsidence. My house has had remedial work for subsidence and my immediate neighbours are currently dealing with subsidence. The New Build fronting onto Achilles Road will upset the balance of the clay subsoil and create a hard spot, which will impact on the stability of the neighbouring properties foundations. I therefore object to the creation of a New Build fronting on to Achilles Road as it will increase the risk of subsidence and ground movement for my neighbours, which will impact our insurance premiums.

When I lived in Hillfield Road in 1988, builders bought the adjoining terraced property, dug out a basement and caused massive subsidence. The whole terrace is on a slope and destabilised, and my husband and I and our baby were given 5 minutes to get out. The house had a dangerous structure notice served by Camden's Structural Surveyor. It took 2 years to be rebuilt and habitable. I totally object to any enlargement at basement level for number 63 Hillfield Road, as the slope of the road means risk of damage to neighbours is unacceptably high.

**Application No:**    **Consultees Name:**    **Consultees Addr:**    **Received:**    **Comment:**    **Response:**

In summary, I object completely to the proposed New Build Development in the garden of 63 Hillfield Road and fronting Achilles Road, and to the basement development aspect of the 63 Hillfield Road plan.

Finally, I hope that the Council will take in to account the extremely strong community we have in Achilles Road, many of whom spend hours volunteering in local groups to improve our area (for example Friends of Fortune Green, who keep the Green beautiful for all to enjoy). We are united in our desire to maintain the integrity of our local architecture, and to protect what little green space we have around us. We do not want this kind of development of private gardens, when we also have tower blocks and high-density developments on our other local green spaces.

Thank you for your consideration.

Yours sincerely

Marianne Jones  
Resident  
27 Achilles Road

---

**Application No:** 2017/4326/P  
**Consultees Name:** nick jackson  
**Consultees Addr:** 42 Sarre Road  
 NW2 3SL  
**Received:** 04/09/2017 20:10:40  
**Comment:** OBJ  
**Response:** Planning Application 2017/4326/P  
 63 Hillfield Road NW6

From the Fortune Green and West Hampstead Neighbourhood Development Forum  
 We have reviewed this application and find that it falls short of the principles and policies of the Neighbourhood Plan and on that basis we object to this proposal

Specific areas of concern are:

The loss of private green space:

The development involves building or paving over the entire garden of 63 Hillfield Road, and will cut off access (green corridor) for wild life from the remainder of the gardens behind Hillfield Road. The paving is also hardly compatible with SUDS. The NDP specifically states that in order to protect the Area's green/open spaces, the development of new dwellings in private gardens should be avoided

The extent of the basement development:

The proposed retro-fit basement within 63 Hillfield Road Terrace will involve substantially deeper excavation, and extension of the footprint of the existing cellar for lightwells. We believe the risk to the adjacent houses is substantial.

The excavation for the new build basement flat adjacent to 59 Achilles Road, is large and deep and raise similar concerns of risk to adjacent properties. We foresee substantial disruption for a long period during excavation.

The density of the development:

The development proposes an additional four flats in addition to the two already in 63 Hillfield Road. This comprises 10-12 additional persons on a relatively small site in an already densely populated area.

The accommodation proposed in most cases only just or fails to meet the required minimum gross internal area. See table below.

Floor areas

Flat	Area m2	No.storeys	No. persons	Min gross int area
1	81.7	2	4	79
2	41.9	1	1	39
3	55.3	3	1	55 for 2 storey fail
C	70.0	2	3	70
A	73.5	1	3	61
B	80.0	2	5	93 fail

Quality of development:

The size of the units is of concern as above, as is the amount of daylight that is available to both the basement flats

Other:

We note that it is proposed that the whole development is intended to be car free. We require that LB Camden will implement and enforce this, should planning permission be given for this or a similar scheme

It is suggested that three flats will have wheelchair access but the access gate from Agamemnon Road, as designed, appears narrow and has a step at the entrance.



Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
					<p>Relevant Policies in the NDP</p> <p>A12. Infill developments: any replacement of a house or houses, or addition of a new house, within an existing terrace should be to the same scale as the terrace, including the roofline. It should be similar in form, materials and details. Replication of particular exterior details is strongly recommended where such details are consistent in streets. Houses should be set back from the pavement and match or fit the building lines of existing properties, with front garden areas remaining unpaved. The same principles should apply to vacant sites in streets where there is already a pattern of existing development.</p> <p>A13. Garden developments: in order to protect the Area's green/open spaces, the development of new dwellings in private gardens should be avoided. If any developments are approved, they should maintain a much lower profile than existing housing stock, usually one or two storeys. (Also see Policy 17).</p> <p>A14. Roof extensions and loft conversions: should fit in with existing rooflines and be in keeping with existing development. Such extensions should be in proportion to the existing building and should not block views.</p> <p>A15. Basement developments: there is concern in the Area about the increasing number of such developments. These concerns include the effect on the structural stability of adjacent properties; damage or loss to the character and biodiversity of gardens; the impact on sustainable drainage; and the impact on carbon emissions. Camden Planning Guidance (CPG4) states that the council will only permit basement and underground developments that do not: cause harm to the built and natural environment and local amenity; result in flooding; or lead to ground instability. The NDP fully supports the requirement for full and rigorous Basement Impact Assessments before any such applications are considered. The Guidance cites West Hampstead, South Hampstead and Cricklewood as areas that have been identified as being subject to localised flooding from surface water due to local soil conditions and topography; it also cites a large number of streets in the Area that have been subject to surface water flooding in the past</p> <p>Policy 17</p> <p>Development shall protect and improve, where appropriate, existing green/open space. Development that increases the demand for recreation or amenity shall provide for new green/open space. This shall be achieved by, where appropriate:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i. The protection of existing green/open space - from significant damage, or loss, through development.</li> <li>ii. The appropriate provision (relative to the size of the development) of new green/open space, or contributing towards addressing the open space deficiencies in the Area as identified in the development plan.</li> <li>iii. Appropriate contributions to the maintenance and enhancement of existing and new green/open space, where applicable.</li> <li>iv. The offsetting of any loss of green/open space, ideally within the Area.</li> <li>v. The protection and appropriate provision of green corridors through existing and new streetscapes.</li> <li>vi. The appropriate provision of new small green/open space - such as pocket parks and active green spaces (eg green walls and green roofs) - and their maintenance.</li> <li>vii. The use of Sustainable Drainage Systems in all development, unless there are practical</li> </ol>

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2017/4326/P	Timothy Boole	43 Achilles Road West Hampstead NW6 1DZ	03/09/2017 22:40:49	OBJ	<p>or viability reasons for not doing so.</p> <p>viii. The appropriate provision of outdoor leisure facilities - such as playgrounds, gyms and recreational spaces - and their maintenance, where applicable.</p> <p>ix. Development that has a positive impact on the relationship between urban and natural features.</p>
2017/4326/P	Timothy Boole	43 Achilles Road West Hampstead NW6 1DZ	03/09/2017 22:40:49	OBJ	<p>I would like to lodge a strong objection against the proposed development at 63 Hillfield Road (Ref: 2017/4326/P).</p> <p>The development proposed is inappropriate for the neighbourhood:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- A modern 3 storey building would look out of keeping from the neighbouring buildings and detract from the character of the street.</li> <li>- The construction would impact the view from the rear of my property.</li> <li>- The construction of the proposed basement would pose serious risk to the construction soundness of neighbouring buildings. Given the age of the terraced houses on both Achilles Road and Hillfield Road there is serious risk of subsidence and cracks affecting a number of properties.</li> <li>- Drainage is already a concern for the area - a number of insurance companies refuse to provide buildings cover for this street and this construction will add further strain.</li> <li>- Achilles Road is a narrow roads and therefore unsuitable to support heavy goods traffic and excavation vehicles that will be necessary for the construction.</li> </ul>

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2017/4326/P	Mr Peter Beech	22 Achilles Road West Hampstead NW6 1EA NW6 1EA	02/09/2017 19:39:34	OBJEMPE R	<p>This application is totally inappropriate for this historic ward of NW London.</p> <p>Deep excavations (3m+) and/or the digging out of basements in existing, or adjacent to, existing Victorian terraced houses is not appropriate due to the very shallow foundations of buildings 130 years old. It will set a precedence for future works to also be approved.</p> <p>Achilles Road has very poor drains and surface drainage. The natural slope from NW to SE on Achilles Road leads to surface water run-off down the road towards Agamemnon Road and the localised flooding of any basement development is a real possibility. Thames Water's infrastructure has failed three times in the last 18 months in Achilles Road and needed extensive short-term repairs, and this construction can only potentially further damage this infrastructure.</p> <p>The appearance of this modern building is not in keeping with the existing Victorian terraced houses on Hillfield, Agamemnon or Achilles Roads.</p> <p>The increase from 2x residences to 6x is totally ridiculous and will put more strain on parking when existing residents struggle to park here anyway, despite paying for permits!</p> <p>The removal of trees and green space is totally against the local planning strategy agreed last year.</p> <p>I would refer you to Policy 2 in the Fortune Green &amp; West Hampstead NDP which states the requirements for Housing Design &amp; Character Design of new housing in the ward, most of which is being breached in this application. Were this application to be approved it makes a mockery of having such a document.</p> <p>This is one of the most brazen pieces of opportunistic development witnessed in this area to date.</p> <p>If anything it reinforces the views raised in the local NDP that the Fortune Green ward (and especially the so-called 'Greek Roads') should be designated a new 'Conservation Area' to stop such applications.</p>

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2017/4327/P	Neil Macdonald of MACDONALD Planning Consultancy	Cognita Schools Ltd Owners of North Bridge House Senior School, 65 Rosslyn Hill Hampstead London NW3 5UD	06/09/2017 07:41:14	OBJEMAI L	<p>Partial Objection By Cognita Schools Ltd, Owners of North Bridge House Senior School, 65 Rosslyn Hill, Hampstead NW3 5UD</p> <p>Regarding: Application 2017/4327/P</p> <p>For: Creation of basement level including front and rear lightwell and relandscaping to front and rear gardens Location: 4 Vane Close, London NW3 5UW</p> <p>On behalf of Cognita Schools Ltd, the owners of North Bridge House Senior School, which is a neighbouring use located at 65 Rosslyn Hill, we would like to advise we have absolutely no objection to our neighbor at No. 4 Vane Close extending their property.</p> <p>However, having reviewed the construction and management plan for the proposal it is clear the applicant wishes to place a skip and undertake other construction works within the highway leading to the school.</p> <p>Our client has reviewed the legal position with the road and advises:</p> <p>Owner of 4 Vane Close (Jimeet Patel) has the following rights over Vane Close contained within a transfer dated 27 January 2003:-</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. To pass with or without vehicles over Vane Close</li> <li>2. To use, on foot, the pedestrian ways of Vane Close</li> <li>3. The right in common to use the grassed and planted areas for recreational purposes, subject to the Regulations</li> </ol> <p>Regulations include:-</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Not to permit in or upon the Property or any part thereof any act which may become a nuisance or may grow or lead to damage or disturbance of the transferor or their tenants or the occupiers of other premises on the estate.</li> <li>2. Not to erect any advertisement placard signboard or notice of any description on the Property</li> </ol> <p>The construction proposals and in particular the skip, there is a concern for both student welfare and access to the school along Vane Close should this element of the proposal be allowed and it would pose an unacceptable impact and threat. The construction management proposals and timings should be reviewed and considered afresh to see how to ameliorate this.</p> <p>Our opinion is that the applicant and the planning authority should take into account and seek to resolve this matter to allow this objection to be lifted.</p>

Kind regards

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
					Yours faithfully Neil Macdonald
2017/4327/P	Broomer/Gatoff	8 Vane Close London NW3 5UN	31/08/2017 09:18:57	OBJ	<p>I write with regard to the above planning application. We live at no 8 Vane Close. I do not believe this application should be granted for the following reasons:</p> <p>These are a row of 1960s terrace build town houses built on a "shared load".</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. We believe the structure of our row of 10 houses would be greatly affected as we "share" foundation throughout the row. If building works begin this shared load puts all of our homes at risk.</li> <li>2. Many of the amenities are shared. This is a small quiet development. We share front lawn with number 4 and the garden is communal. We share water supply all services and electricity.</li> <li>3. The houses are built on a slope with water passing beneath. This project would put all of our homes at great risk.</li> <li>4. We share communal parking facilities at the back of the house. If building on this scale commences this will be greatly affected. As I am disabled I will not be able to park anywhere near my own home. The road running to the back of our house is small and narrow leading only to Northbridge House School.</li> <li>4. The above school will no longer have emergency access...i.e ambulance and fire vehicles will have no way to reach the school. These works are estimated to take up to a year to complete. The children attending this school have no choice but to enter school via this access road climbing over the many trucks and rubble in order to attend school. Emergency vehicles will have no access what so ever.</li> <li>5. These houses are thin walled and not well built. We do not believe they will stand up to this project.</li> <li>6. We believe the constant noise, dirt, vibrations and disruption will greatly affect the lives of the other residents. There are only 10 houses in our terrace row.</li> <li>7. The owner of the property is not currently living in Vane Close. I must say this is not a personal vendetta against Jim Patel. We are simply concerned about the safety of our homes and the lives of our residents. We understand Mr Patel is a property developer with much property in the area. He will not be living here during the works (Mr Patel has assured us he is however I do not believe this to be the case) however we will be living here.</li> <li>8. The volume of basement works being undertaken my property developers like Mr Patel is understandable and it seems inevitable but surely some houses are just not cut out for this type of development.</li> </ol>

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2017/4327/P	Sally platt	15 Vane Close	03/09/2017 16:44:41	INT	<p>Although my house will not be directly effected by this planned excavation as it is some distance away, but indirectly the noise, disruption and problems of access to the road leading into the Close would be sure to effect me. More important however is that if permission is granted it will set a precedent for future applications. This could lead to big problems for many of the 20 residents who live on the Close. The houses are very closely interlinked with connecting walls of very thin construction. I can hear people coughing and talking in loud voices through the walls so any major construction would become a nightmare.</p> <p>This is totally different from the usual Victorian solidly built houses that get permission to do this type of conversion. Please think again.</p>

---

<b>Application No:</b>	<b>Consultees Name:</b>	<b>Consultees Addr:</b>	<b>Received:</b>	<b>Comment:</b>	<b>Response:</b>
2017/4342/P	Benjamin Gibb	Flat 2 55 Falkland Road NW5 2XB	04/09/2017 18:23:16	OBJ	<p>I have lived in the first floor flat at 55 Falkland Road for around 30 years. Firstly a couple of points.</p> <p>I am confused as to whether this is a three storey extension as described in the application form of 31 July, or a ground and first floor extension as described on the application proposal. I have assumed the latter.</p> <p>Secondly the plans show there is currently a flat roof at the rear of the property beyond the one slope roof. This does not exist. Does this mean the current back extension is in reality smaller than the plans suggest?</p> <p>I am very concerned about the proposed extension as it will be adjacent to the main bedroom of my flat. An extension including a first floor will adversely affect both the view and the natural light in the bedroom. There is also the concern that my bedroom will be overlooked.</p> <p>Even if the plan is reduced to just the ground floor, I am concerned the new 'infill' area where there would be a new lounge area with a skylight will lead to both artificial light and noise pollution at night. Having a quiet aspect at the back of my flat was an important requirement when I bought the property.</p>

---

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2017/4346/P	Mrs Vale of Health Society	1 ATHENAEUM HALL VALE OF HEALTH nw31ap nw31ap	01/09/2017 10:36:00	COMMNT	This objection is made by Ellen Solomons, Chair of the Vale of Health Society. I was notified of the application by email alert on 12.8.17 . There were clearly legal issues involved and the committee of the VOHS wished to obtain Counsel's advice. Because of his holiday commitments Counsel was unable to consider the matter until after the Bank holiday. We have now been advised by him that the proposed development would amount to a material change of use and that the Certificate requested by the applicants should be refused. We have therefore, in conjunction with the Heath & Hampstead Society,instructed him to prepare a written advice which we will submit as soon as it is to hand. Members of the Society will also wish to object to the Certificate requested and we formally ask for an extension of time to lodge objections to 16.9.17. We will also wish to submit further evidence. Ellen Solomons on behalf of the VOHS
2017/4346/P	Mrs Vale of Health Society	1 ATHENAEUM HALL VALE OF HEALTH nw31ap nw31ap	01/09/2017 10:35:45	COMMNT	This objection is made by Ellen Solomons, Chair of the Vale of Health Society. I was notified of the application by email alert on 12.8.17 . There were clearly legal issues involved and the committee of the VOHS wished to obtain Counsel's advice. Because of his holiday commitments Counsel was unable to consider the matter until after the Bank holiday. We have now been advised by him that the proposed development would amount to a material change of use and that the Certificate requested by the applicants should be refused. We have therefore, in conjunction with the Heath & Hampstead Society,instructed him to prepare a written advice which we will submit as soon as it is to hand. Members of the Society will also wish to object to the Certificate requested and we formally ask for an extension of time to lodge objections to 16.9.17. We will also wish to submit further evidence. Ellen Solomons on behalf of the VOHS



<b>Application No:</b>	<b>Consultees Name:</b>	<b>Consultees Addr:</b>	<b>Received:</b>	<b>Comment:</b>	<b>Response:</b>
2017/4375/P	Sanya Polescuk on behalf of Belsize Residents Association	8a Belsize Court Garages NW35AJ	06/09/2017 08:49:54	OBJ	The proposal for the flat roof dormer states slate as a finishing external material. It is impossible to use slate for flat roofs. The size dormer cheeks is unlikely to allow for suitable slate cladding. The dormer should be finished in lead as a traditionally used material suitable for dormers. The proportion of the dormer window is unsuitable for horizontally sliding sashes and should instead be a casement window or two, narrower horizontal sliding sashes.

---

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2017/4379/P	P Andrews on behalf of Mr R Isaacs	Elmwood High Park Avenue East Horsley Surrey KT24 5DD	05/09/2017 13:21:47	COMMNT	<p>This representation is made on behalf of the adjacent neighbour, Mr R Isaacs, at no 91 Hillway. The request is made to provide annotated dimensions on the plans for the size of the proposed rear dormer.</p> <p>It is noted that each plan provided by the architect is annotated in bold as: 'DO NOT SCALE FROM THE DRAWINGS' and further that: 'All dimensions shown are indicative'.</p> <p>Please then can the request be made for the architect to provide these appropriate annotations on each plan in order to more accurately consider the proposals.</p>

---

<b>Application No:</b>	<b>Consultees Name:</b>	<b>Consultees Addr:</b>	<b>Received:</b>	<b>Comment:</b>	<b>Response:</b>
2017/4390/P	Nick Jackson	West Hampstead and Fortune Green NDF 42 Sarr NW2 3SL NW2 3SL	02/09/2017 17:50:05	COMMNT	There are "no public documents available". as at 17:44 Saturday 2 Sept. How can I see them urgently, please? The end of consultation is given as 13 Sept on the street notice and 7 Sept online. The West Hampstead and Fortune Green NDF has concerns about the possible height of the development, and will need adequate time to assess the proposal once documents are available. Thanks

---

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2017/4422/P	Rochester conservation area	--	06/09/2017 18:19:15	OBJ	<p>It is a pity the application form does not state that there is a large mature plane tree "within falling distance" and that the site is visible from the Camden Road.</p> <p>Camden's planning files give no information on previous applications for this site. No 160 has had a roof extension and dormer window at some time in the past. There appears also to be separation into multiple occupation.</p> <p>There is no Design and Access statement or recognition that the property is within Camden Square conservation area. Moreover, the elevation plans do not show adjacent properties as required in Camden's procedures.</p> <p>No 160 is one of the classic double-villas, with ground leases from the Camden Estate taken by individual builders within the overall plan set by the estate manager, Mr Joseph Kay (Lord Camden's architect/surveyor a founder member of the RIBA). They were built early in the development of Camden Road north of St Pancras Way in the 1840s, with full gardens leading to a service mews behind (before Camden Square was built). Although the west side of the road has been badly damaged by twentieth century re-building, Nos 99-105, opposite the applicant site, are intact and the row uphill on the east side of Camden Road (higher 'even' nos.) also remain as important evidence of the original development. (Some are hidden behind garden trees – no 160 shares a fine plane with no 158.)</p> <p>The existing front roof extension window appears not to follow Camden's guidance: it is too wide (compared with those on the houses either side), and the ?metal frames used surround casement windows which are wrong for the period.</p> <p>The wide-eved hipped roofs of these villas, over three front windows, are a strong aspect of design, in contrast with opposite 99-101 (shallow valley roofs and front pediments) or 103-105 (narrower 2-windowed front). The public view from the road across the side of the roof is a feature which would be seriously affected by the proposed additional dormer. Slates on the walls of the dormer would be out of character.</p>

<b>Application No:</b>	<b>Consultees Name:</b>	<b>Consultees Addr:</b>	<b>Received:</b>	<b>Comment:</b>	<b>Response:</b>
2017/4454/P	Sanya Polescuk on behalf of Belsize Residents Association	8a Belsize Court Garages NW3 5AJ	06/09/2017 08:31:08	OBJ	The proposal creates a rather impenetrable and forbidding frontage, atypical for the period of the building it encloses. In order to reduce the impact of the solid timber gates proposed to replace the gates constructed from slim metal bars set wide apart, the height of the new timber gates should be limited to no more than 1400 measured from the lowest associated ground level.

---

<b>Application No:</b>	<b>Consultees Name:</b>	<b>Consultees Addr:</b>	<b>Received:</b>	<b>Comment:</b>	<b>Response:</b>
2017/4516/P	Bloomsbury Conservation Area Advisory Committee - Hugh Cullumhugh cullum	61b Judd Street	01/09/2017 14:38:54	COMMNT	The committe have no comments on this application

---

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2017/4524/T	Dr Dr Vicki Harding	Garden Flat 19 Froggnal Lane London NW3 7DB	06/09/2017 22:38:26	OBJ	<p>I am writing to object to the felling of this tree.</p> <p>The Notice of Intent to fell it 'as close to ground level as possible and treat with glyphosate to prevent regrowth, tree is in decline with possible cambium death present at base' does not give diagnostic information or a reason for felling.</p> <p>Looking at the front garden that is now a car parking lot for one car rather than the garden with merely a path diagonally across it as was drawn on past applications for planning consent, one is drawn to assume that the owners plan to park several cars here rather than just the one, and so would like to see the tree removed.</p> <p>If professional diagnostic evidence indicates that felling is appropriate then please include in your consent a condition that it be replaced with a large beech tree to match the beech tree across the road. While climate change is thought to mean that beech trees will find it hard to survive in the future, this is not the case for Hampstead. The considerable flowing ground water - here related to the waters flowing into the Shepherd Stream that runs between Daleham Gardens and Fitzjohn's Avenue - means that these wonderful surface rooting trees will be able to survive well here.</p> <p>Daleham Gardens needs all the tall water-loving trees it can possibly retain.</p> <p>Vicki Harding, Tree Officer Heath &amp; Hampstead Society</p>

---

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2017/4528/P	varsha shah	8 Gladstone Court Fairfax Road NW6 4EP NW6 4EP	02/09/2017 14:40:26	OBJ	I strongly object to this application on the grounds that the premises has already been granted permission to stay open only until 9pm on two previous planning applications; the latest of which stated the following reasons for a 9pm closing (see planning ref: 2015/3916/P)

“Reason: To safeguard the amenities of the adjoining premises and the area generally in accordance with the requirements of policies CS5 and CS7 of the London Borough of Camden Local Development Framework Core Strategy and policy DP26, DP28 and DP12 of the London Borough of Camden Local Development Framework Development Policies.”

The owner of the premises was well aware of the restrictions on the premises when he took on the lease and there has been no material change so would expect the Council to adhere to the original decision and protect residents.

You should know that the premises has recently been subject to various enforcement and breach of conditions notices one of which is for staying open well past 9pm (which has since been breached).

---



<b>Application No:</b>	<b>Consultees Name:</b>	<b>Consultees Addr:</b>	<b>Received:</b>	<b>Comment:</b>	<b>Response:</b>
2017/4554/P	Michael Way	8 Twisden Road NW5 1DN NW5 1DN	07/09/2017 19:36:00	NOBJ	As next door neighbours, we have no objection to this planning application  Olga and Michael Way

---

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2017/4645/P	C. Cheung	Flat 24 O'Donnell Court Brunswick Centre WC1N1NZ	08/09/2017 00:12:07	SUPC	<p>The proposed hours of opening pose a significant threat to the fragile silence that exists at present for the surrounding residential properties. Opening and closing times for this property, where the entrance is inside the Brunswick Centre, would attract an increased footfall at hours where residents are likely to be in a state of rest. The increased footfall, may well comprise of gym goers who commute via bike. The chaining of bikes and other associated mechanical noises would be very distinct around the proposed times of opening. The boxed in nature of the centre reflects noise towards the flats above, and at a time where normal ambient environmental noise is at a minimal, any noise disturbances would be pronounced. Therefore opening times should be limited to a more suitable hour to preserve what little sanctity remains at present, if any. An opening time of no earlier than 8AM should be considered for every day of the week. A closing time of no later than 8PM Monday to Friday should be considered to ensure that customers have good time to vacate the area and the staff are able to do the same therefore reducing the environmental impact to residents from a noise point of view. Proposed closing times for Saturday and Sunday are acceptable.</p> <p>The addition of a juice bar is not needed given the proliferation of healthy eating and other food premises within the centre at present. Such an addition, may eventually lead to external furniture, given the constant noise pollution from other premises that are a disturbance to myself and other residents I have spoken to, this would only lead to more issues.</p>

---

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2017/4654/P	Sanya Polescuk for Belsize Residents Association	8a Belsize Court Garages NW35AJ	11/09/2017 08:39:44	OBJ	<p>This proposal is objectionable on a number of points, to name a few:</p> <p>Re: NPPF, section 49 - claims sustainability without evidence - for instance the building and maintenance of an indoor swimming pool, billiard room, cinema room - to name just a few are all example of highly energy-demanding and unsustainable developments.</p> <p>Section 63 - claims high quality and innovative design - exact opposite has been presented in a form of a basic, formulaic historicism lacking quality necessary for Conservation Area or innovation stipulated by NPPF.</p> <p>Section 187 - improving economic, social and environmental grounds - no evidence offered to support the type of maglomaniac development.</p> <p>A quote mistakenly repeated that this development delivers "...much needed residential accomodation" is entirely inappropriate - not only is it not increasing number of much needed residential units in London, but is creating an overbearing, architecturally substandard and spatially unsustainable single family dwelling inappropriate for the conservation area.</p>

---

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2017/4690/P	Diane May	5 Eton Villas London NW3 4SX	06/09/2017 11:45:09	OBJ	2 PROVOST ROAD, LONDON NW3 REF: 2017/4690/P, 2017/4702/L

I object strongly to the above proposals for 2 Provost Road for the following reasons:

1. The proposed dormers are unacceptable. The case for symmetry with the oversized dormers at No 1 Provost Road is no argument for unacceptable development which will harm the integrity of the existing roofline and the building as a whole; the group value of the listed buildings on Provost Road and cause an unacceptable intrusion into the conservation area. The projection forward of the proposed dormers will make them appear oversized in the street scene; dominate the roof line and invade the privacy of the occupiers of No.3 Provost Road.

2. Internal alterations: These do not appear to be minor alterations as stated in the Heritage Statement, particularly at first and 2nd floor level where they will significantly alter the internal floor plan; the external character of the listed building and remove original fabric. The cumulative impact of the proposals will have a harmful impact on the integrity of the listed building.

The proposals are contrary to the guidelines established in the Eton Conservation Area Appraisal; the Council's Design Guidelines set out in CPG 1 and policies of the Development Plan.

1. The proposed dormers are unacceptable

The applicant's Heritage Statement identifies the proposed dormer windows as a 'key change' to the property, involving 'a change to the historic roof arrangement' to match that of No.1 and 'will return the symmetry that was originally part of the design of the pair of villas and will preserve, if not enhance, the appearance of the building as a whole'.

This is a specious argument and very poor justification for the proposed dormers at No 2 Provost Road. It is one that is used frequently to justify oversized dormers on Provost Road, particularly in recent years, as applicants new to the area are unaware of, or choose to ignore, the planning history of properties on Provost Road and the key principles of the area's conservation status.

The buildings on Provost Road (1-14) were listed in 1974 primarily for their group value. Their symmetry lies in the architecture of the semi detached Victorian villas; the roof line with modest dormers that exist in the street scene and the gaps between the buildings which allow glimpses through to the rear.

The planning records show that the dormer windows at No.1 Provost Road were approved in April 1966. This pre-dates the listing of the properties on Provost Road and the designation of the Eton Conservation Area in 1973. Indeed the dormer windows at No 1 predate Camden's Development Plans, Policies and Guidelines which are a material consideration in the control of development. These have consistently aimed to 'preserve

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
					<p>and enhance' the character and appearance of conservation areas (Policy DP25 b) [Conserving Camden's Heritage] and ensure that in respect of listed buildings 'only grant consent for ....alterations and extensions where it is considered this would not cause harm to the special interest of the building' (Policy DP 25 f).</p> <p>In the past the Council has regarded the roofline of properties on Provost Road as being of 'special interest'. In respect of No 2, the Council has recognised that this is one of the few remaining un- interrupted rooflines on Provost Road. In 1995 the Council refused planning and listed building consent for '2 new dormers in the side roof' at 2 Provost Road on the grounds that 'the proposed dormers would have an adverse effect on the character and appearance of the listed building.' This was upheld at appeal and a decision to refuse the application was issued on 21st August 1995.</p> <p>It is quite clear that the proposed dormer windows will be considerably larger than those of its neighbours in Provost Road and undermine their listing for group value. Few, if any of the dormers on Provost Road are symmetrical; they are however generally modest in appearance and sit politely in the slope of the roof without projecting intrusively into the street view. The proposed dormers at No.2 Provost Road face into the conservation area and will be intrusive in the street scene and harmful to the character and appearance of the conservation area. Their size also means that they will project forward dominating the roof line and causing a degree of loss of privacy for the occupiers of No.3 Provost Road. This has been recognised by officers elsewhere on Provost Road in similar circumstances.</p> <p>2. Internal alterations:</p> <p>As indicated above, these do not appear to be 'minor alterations' as stated in the applicant's Heritage Statement. The proposed dormer windows will radically alter the roofline of the property, remove original fabric and alter its plan form at second floor level. Similarly at first floor level significant alteration to the floor plan is proposed with re-arrangement of original features.</p> <p>The cumulative impact of the proposed alterations, extensions and additions - internally and externally – and the removal of original fabric will have a harmful impact on the integrity of the listed building.</p> <p>Conclusion:</p> <p>The proposals for 2 Provost Road will have a harmful impact on the integrity of the listed building and the character and appearance of the Conservation Area contrary to the guidance in</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The Eton Conservation Area Appraisal: Alterations and Extensions to Existing Buildings;</li> <li>• Key messages contained in CPG 1 Design (para 5.11) and</li> <li>• Camden's Development Policies DP25 b)-Conserving Camden's Heritage; DP 25 f) with regard to 'harm to the special interest of the building' and DP 26 a) concerning 'visual</li> </ul>

**Application No:**    **Consultees Name:**    **Consultees Addr:**    **Received:**    **Comment:**    **Response:**

privacy and overlooking'.

For the reasons set out above the submitted application for proposed alterations at No 2 Provost Road should be rejected.

---

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2017/4690/P	Eton CAAC	5 Eton Villas NW3 4SX NW3 4SX	04/09/2017 18:26:55	OBJ	Eton Conservation Area Advisory Committee

Advice from Eton Conservation Area Advisory Committee: 04.09.2017

Re 2 Provost Road: 2017/4690/P, 2017/4702/L

This is a second application relating to 2 Provost Road. The first, registered in January 2017 (2017/0080/P, 2017/0198/L), was for the erection of a lower ground extension and a garden building to the rear of the existing dwelling house plus internal alterations. This was refused in March 2017 on the following grounds:

"The proposed outbuilding by reason of its location, size and scale would detract from the general openness of the rear garden area, would be overly dominant and appear as an incongruous form of development, furthermore it would harm the setting of the listed building and result in harm to the character and appearance of the surrounding conservation area."

This refusal was appealed in July 2017 and, as far as we can ascertain, remains outstanding at the time of writing.

In relation to the first application we concluded that the proposed extension to No 2 Provost Road was "quiet" and unobtrusive, and appropriate to the simplicity of the house. We have no objection, therefore. Regarding this further application, there is no objection to the spiral staircase at the rear. We agree that in considering both houses as a whole, the addition of the staircase contributes an element of symmetry to the overall elevation.

But the argument for symmetry ceases to be convincing when applied to the big, long dormer. In this case, it becomes an argument that seeks to justify copying the size of the dormers on No.1, which are clumsily large in relation to the architectural style of these houses and predate the conservation area (dating from 1966 whereas this part of the Eton Conservation Area was created in December 1973). We cite Camden Planning Guidance - Design...5.11 (b): "Full-length dormers ... will be discouraged to minimise the prominence of these structures."

Where the rear extension is nicely judged, and where the spiral staircase makes a well argued contribution, the dormer proposes repeating the mistakes of the past. Far from it being discreet, as dormers are generally required to be, it is overly prominent and weighty for the house. As the side elevation shows, it takes up too much of the roof.

As we have stated in relation to previous applications, we are concerned that this part of the Conservation Area is under threat from a recent spate of applications to materially alter the external appearance of the houses in Provost Road which are listed primarily for their group value. For example, the owners of 12 Provost Road are currently having to rectify the unauthorised scale of the dormers which were erected following the original permission in October 2012 by reducing them in size. Similarly, 11 Provost Road was recently subject to enforcement action to reinstate its external and internal fabric following the unauthorised

**Application No:**    **Consultees Name:**    **Consultees Addr:**    **Received:**    **Comment:**    **Response:**

removal of its roof and internal floors. This reinstatement work has recently been completed. We would like to see it as a form of "template" for future alterations to the houses in Provost Road, particularly in relation to the size of dormers.

Eton  
CAAC

---



<b>Application No:</b>	<b>Consultees Name:</b>	<b>Consultees Addr:</b>	<b>Received:</b>	<b>Comment:</b>	<b>Response:</b>
2017/4773/T	Alexander Bartfeld	151B King Henrys Road NW3 3RD NW3 3RD	10/09/2017 10:39:01	OBJEMAI L	There doesn't appear to be any investigation or consideration regarding the significant possibility of subsidence that this may cause to the neighbouring buildings. I would like to see any independent engineering assessment before any approval is given.

---

**Total: 39**