Dear Ian

 I have serious objections to the proposed development at 32 Glenilla Rd. I expressed objections almost a year ago and I am surprised and upset to see —from the resubmitted proposals sent to me—that apart from a basement impact study—the main objections I had and that others have expressed have not been addressed at all in the intervening period –let alone changes to the plans made--and so my original objections remain.

 My main concerns are

1: the tree screen: This currently exists between my property (22 Belsize Park Gardens) which backs onto the proposed development . While the arboreal report proposes its retention (tree protection of about 2metres from the trunk of the beech tree, identified as the tree on my boundary, planned work on the underground and basement levels of the Glenilla project give rise to considerable concern that the trees may in fact be removed altogether. In addition, the Energy Report that is part of the application states that 2 100m boreholes will be made/dug just outside the zone of geothermal use as part of the heating system. I am concerned that, in practice, these very deep boreholes would involve removing the trees in order to dig the boreholes. The tree barrier removal would have a serious impact as I own the two lower floors f the property directly behind and would adversely affect me , both visually and as a sound barrier.

2: My other main point of objection is that the proposed development is simply too big a footprint-really out of scale for the area and would badly affect my outlook. The Belsize Conservation Area statement states that “when any development does not preserve or enhance the character of the conservation area it is generally because of inappropriate scale/bulk/height or massing”. This is clearly the case in this instance.

Also, the planning proposal takes the footprint of the temporary church hall as a basis for the development(something especially significant at the rear of the building, is close to my own property, rather than the accepted front and rear lines of the houses in the area. This would have a damaging effect on me.

Secondly the planning application is misleading when it describes 2-3 bed houses on the current church site. They are in reality more like 4-5 bed houses. Each is 339 square metres. 32A can be seen as a 4-5 bed house while 32B contains a series of work spaces, studies and 3 kitchens—so is n reality more like a live/work space or business arrangement than a domestic dwelling.

3. Furthermore I am not clear (a) whether this is in accordance with the original planning statement guidelines—the existing building was constructed as a church in 1947 on the basis of temporary use and refers to a 1899 covenant that restricts any building on the site to be used only as a private dwelling house or a professional residence. A work/live-in project does not fit this description.

4. Again, the Section on Urban Design in the Design and Access sections states that the impact on surrounding properties will be slight. This is misleading as the demolition of the current building and the construction of a large basement goes to the boundaries of Nos. 30 and 34 Glenilla Rd. Dormer windows intrude on neighbours’ privacy while the front façade is nearly twice as tall as neighbouring buildings(for instance of no. 34 Glenilla Rd).

5. I am also concerned that there be a provision whereby the back part of the house (shown as and described as “intensive green roofs”) and apparently not to be currently used as terraces—i.e. no one is supposed to walk on them or use them should have a clause preventing their future use as roof terraces in the future as this would have a serious impact on the tranquillity (noise etc.) of neighbours (such as myself) and their/our enjoyment of their properties.

I do hope you find my comments helpful and take them into consideration.

Kind regards

Susie Morgan (resident of 22 Belsize Park Gardens)