



From: Lesley Gould [mailto:]
Sent: 18 February 2018 11:14
To: Keen, Alyce <Alyce.Keen@camden.gov.uk>
Subject: 13a Pond Street consultation

Dear Alyce,

13a Pond Street: pre-submission consultations

I am writing on behalf of Eleanor Engle, director of 33 Hampstead Hill Gardens, and of all the other residents of this house, and would be grateful if you could append this letter to other comments from this address.

In my first letter about the above application I noted that plans had reached an advanced stage without any consultation with those most likely to be adversely affected by the proposals. However when we met you told me that Spencer Baylin had made efforts to contact neighbours but they had shown little interest.

It seems the applicant made direct approaches to the Roebuck public house, the ground floor resident at 13 Pond Street (apparently already known to him through professional circles), and perhaps a few others in Pond Street. The manager of the Roebuck recalls a general conversation about access to the site, but not about the extent of demolition/rebuilding. The online response by the Roebuck's Estate Manager suggests that they had no prior awareness of the details of the plans, e.g. increases in size and height or the construction management plan.

As far as 33 HHG is concerned, I personally received no pre-submission letter. Our front door makes it clear that there are seven separate flats in our large house, but it appears that only one letter was delivered, with no named recipient (typical of most junk mail, which is often recycled without reading). Fortunately this single letter was retained by the person who found it.

The letter, dated 6 October 2017, says that after '*working with the Local Authority*' the planning application was now at the point of **finalisation** and would be submitted '*by the end of the month*', and that the owner is '*therefore writing to inform you of this and to offer, if it would be of interest, to walk you through the drawing and the project with me and my architect*'.

The sole recipient of the letter did not follow up on this invitation. Firstly, she felt that with the plans finalised and **about to be submitted**, it was a pointless exercise, and that it would be better to wait until

plans were available for inspection. Secondly, the letter appeared to her to be an attempt to **persuade** rather than **inform**, relying on emotive statements such as his desire for a '*sympathetic scheme for the house to suit my young family*', and his having '*been a Hampstead resident for over 30 years, man and boy*'. Thirdly, the letter gave **absolutely no information** about the intended changes, and there was nothing in it to suggest that the proposals involved anything more than the renovation of the building, which could reasonably be expected to have little impact on 33 HHG because it would take place behind the two-storey boundary wall.

This single approach to those facing the main negative impact of the proposed changes **does not constitute prior consultation**.

1. It was sent far too late to have any effect on a 'finalised' design about to be submitted
2. It contained no suggestion that changes involved demolition and rebuilding of the coach house
3. It was an attempt to persuade rather than inform

Proper consultation

Would have informed those who would be directly and adversely affected by the major changes planned

Would have put before them concrete plans on which to take an informed view.

Would have given them a genuine opportunity to influence the final outcome.

The letter was sent out at this late stage simply to tick another box and ensure that the plans met with minimal objections and would be nodded through by the planning committee.

Lesley Gould
Eleanor Engle
on behalf of all other residents of 33 HHG