

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2018/1611/P	Brian Jarvis	61 Gayton Road NW31TU	30/04/2018 23:38:07	OBJ	<p>I live directly opposite this property and can confirm that there was no hedge or any green wall planted fronting Gayton Road. The contractors timber hoarding was replaced by the so called Punk Wall which was completed at around the same time as the rest of the work.</p> <p>The design statement with the retrospective application is misleading, poorly informed and contradictory. References to littering experienced by the resident are unfounded. Reference to invasion of privacy is hypocritical; Why would someone concerned with invasion of privacy erect a wall with vision panels installed? Pedestrians stop and peer in; this wall is obviously designed to attract attention.</p> <p>It is right and appropriate that the planted green wall is installed as indicated within the approved plans and that this retrospective application is refused.</p>
2018/1611/P	robin woolfson	12 Gayton Road	30/04/2018 21:47:01	OBJ	<p>As Chair, I write on behalf of Gayton Residents' Association to request that Camden Planning rejects this application for the following reasons:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The original application for this development on the Vine Cottage site increased the built-up footprint on this site at the expense of a pre-existing garden. In those original plans, this was mitigated by the inclusion of a small brick wall and plans for a shrubbery clad fence. In the event, this natural vegetation was been replaced by a substantial distressed metal fence, erected without planning permission. 2. In this retrospective application, the developer states that a shrub-clad fence was tested. However, the photograph of that fence is a photo-shopped image and no residents remember any such hedge. 3. Gayton Road benefits from a generous weekly Camden rubbish collection and regular pavement sweeping, particularly at the Hampstead High Street end. Accumulation of litter in the front gardens of those properties is not an issue. 4. The distressed metal fence which has been built without permission has 2 glass panels which invite intrusion from passers-by and seriously diminish the occupants' privacy. The design of this metal fence has limited aesthetic appeal and unlike other permitted developments, it does not compliment the Conservation Area. The lack of greenery detracts from the amenity of neighbours and the street. <p>Retrospective planning applications usually reflect ignorance of planning procedure or mischief. Gayton Residents' Association requests Camden Planning to reject this application and insist upon re-instatement of a brick wall and shrubbery-clad fence as originally permitted.</p>

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2018/1611/P	Stephanie Dölker	18 Gayton Crescent	29/04/2018 20:43:18	OBJ	<p>I am really really surprised by this application and the reasons given for having this "punk wall". Firstly, I walk down Gaston Road nearly every day and I don't recall ever seeing the hedge. Maybe it was there while we were on holidays at some point, but it would have been up for a very short time.</p> <p>Secondly, the new wall has windows - I regularly see people stopping to take a look through those little windows. I really don't understand how one can argue that they had to replace the hedge to stop people looking in. Surely if the hedge ever existed and if this was a problem, a thicker hedge would solve the problem.</p> <p>I find it hard to believe that people throwing rubbish into the garden was ever a huge problem. We have a front garden with a low gate and I can't recall ever having anything thrown into our garden - on the street, yes, but never in the garden.</p> <p>I also am really, really surprised that the owners believe that this strangely distressed wall has anything in common with a green hedge. I am a huge fan of modern architecture, but this just looks unfinished.</p> <p>The original planning permission was only granted on the condition that the garden would be replaced by greenery - actual greenery not a green/brown metal wall.</p> <p>I urge you to reject this application.</p>

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2018/1611/P	Susan Elkington	47 Gayton rd London NW3 1TU	29/04/2018 23:21:11	OBJ	<p>This application needs to be rejected on a number of important grounds.</p> <p>1. The original application was approved on the basis that a garden was being replaced by "planted greenery".</p> <p>This has not been carried and therefore the planning consent should be withdrawn. This failure alone would have not have resulted in approved permission, therefore it would be a gross error to provide approval now.</p> <p>2) The applicant states that he put up a shrubbery hedge but it was impractical. There is no record or evidence of this.</p> <p>3) It is not correct for an owner with planning consent to adapt conditions for permissions granted unilaterally.</p> <p>4) The owner additionally claimed the hedge was totally inappropriate because rubbish was thrown into the garden. Gayton Road does not receive more rubbish than other areas and a thicker hedge would solve this</p> <p>4) The owner also claimed that the hedge was inappropriate because and people could see through it. Such a hedge would grow extremely thick and provide ample privacy. This is what hedges are used for!</p> <p>The wall in fact has two windows that mean people can see through it which is inconsistent with the privacy point.</p> <p>5) We need more greenery in the Road and there is a wide body of support for more.</p>

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2018/1611/P	Richard Meyer	1 Farrows Barn Lidsey Road Chichester West Sussex PO20 3SU	30/04/2018 08:38:43	OBJ	<p>1- The owners of Bosinney (Vine Cottage) have clearly not lived up to the original planning application. At no time have they attempted to plant bushes or any form of vegetation outside the house.</p> <p>2- The current metal cladding is aesthetically appalling and out of place with the street and the neighbourhood. It deliberately aims to look like corroded metal and looks like a temporary hoarding. It is of absolutely no artistic merit.</p> <p>3- Gayton Road has a residents association that looks after ensuring the street is well taken care of, including hanging & maintaining flower pots from the lamp posts. It is important for us that the street stays in keeping with the neighbourhood. Indeed it was recently used as a filming location for the movie "Hampstead". This hideous cladding would clearly make the street unsuitable for such future filming.</p> <p>4- The council needs to enforce common standards: we applied for a roof extension to our house, the only 2 in Gayton road that have NOT had one. This was declined because of one objection from somebody who didn't even live in the street. Nobody in the street objected. The eyesore at Vine Cottage / Bossiney is several orders of magnitude worse than our proposed roof extension and far more damaging to the aesthetics of the street.</p> <p>Note: although not currently residing in Gayton Road, we still own our house there and have a clear stake in maintaining the looks & appearances of our street.</p>

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2018/1611/P	Alistair Summers	59 Gayton Road London NW3 1TU	29/04/2018 19:30:23	COMMEM AIL	I object to the planning application to retrospectively regularise the planning position for the following reasons.

1) THE ORIGINAL PLANNING APPLICATION WAS APPROVED BECAUSE IT REPLACED A GARDEN WITH PLANTED GREENERY. THIS HAS NOT BEEN DISCHARGED.

The original planning application (2009/1622/P) was approved because that applicant wanted to replace the garden at Vine Cottage and to compensate for the loss of greenery they agreed "a planted green boundary wall to mitigate the loss of his garden area..... It is now considered that the green screen creates a well-proportioned modern take on the traditional front garden setting and satisfies part of the reason for refusal." (Para 6.21). This was a condition of the granting of the planning permission and it hasn't been discharged.

2) THE APPLICANTS SAY SHRUBBERY WAS PLANTED BUT PROVED IMPRACTICAL. I AND OTHER RESIDENTS HAVE NO RECOLLECTION OF THIS HAPPENING WHICH RAISES ISSUES OF HONESTY IN THE APPLICATION

The Design Statement 1.3 says that a "green fence was constructed and this implemented through the installation of a small brick wall and shrubbery clad timber fence sited on top of the brickwork". Neither I and nor do any other Gayton Road residents I have contacted have any recollection of any shrubbery being installed.

3) THE APPLICANT SAYS SHRUBBERY WAS NOT SUITABLE FOR STOPPING RUBBISH BUT THERE ARE NOT WIDESPREAD COMPLAINTS BY OTHER GAYTON ROAD RESIDENTS ABOUT UNUSUALLY LARGE AMOUNTS OF LITTER IN THEIR GARDENS

The Design Statement 1.5 says the more secure boundary was required "to combat continual littering of the hedge and regular interruption of the quiet enjoyment of the property by passers-by stopping and staring into the lightwell and through the window of bedroom 1". Litter is a problem in Hampstead but other residents of Gayton Road have never said that large scale littering into front gardens, lightwells or basements is particularly nuisance in Gayton Road. If the shrubbery planted was not suitable for stopping littering, other shrubbery is available that grows thicker that could stop such littering if indeed littering occurs.

4) THE DESIGN STATEMENT SAYS THE "coppered hammered "distressed punk" wall" DOESN'T PROVIDE THE PRIVACY REQUESTED IN THE APPLICATION BUT THE

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
					<p>WALL HAS TWO WINDOWS MEANING REPLACEMENT WITH THE SHRUBBERY WILL LEAD TO NO LESS PRIVACY</p> <p>The Design Statement 1.5 says the more secure boundary was required "to combat continual littering of the hedge and regular interruption of the quiet enjoyment of the property by passers-by stopping and staring into the lightwell and through the window of bedroom 1". The coppered hammered "distressed punk" wall now in place has two windows that mean passers-by are to stop and star "into the lightwell and through the window of bedroom 1"</p> <p>In summary the planning approval was given original because the condition for building Boisiny was the reinstatement of greenery at the top of Gayton Road. There is little enough greenery in Gayton Road, as was recognised in the original approval, and therefore to ensure we do have some living greenery in the Road have the retrospective application should be rejected.</p>
2018/1611/P	Susan Elkington	47 Gayton rd London NW3 1TU	29/04/2018 23:20:55	OBJ	<p>This application needs to be rejected on a number of important grounds.</p> <p>1. The original application was approved on the basis that a garden was being replaced by "planted greenery".</p> <p>This has not been carried and therefore the planning consent should be withdrawn. This failure alone would have not have resulted in approved permission, therefore it would be a gross error to provide approval now.</p> <p>2) The applicant states that he put up a shrubbery hedge but it was impractical. There is no record or evidence of this.</p> <p>3) It is not correct for an owner with planning consent to adapt conditions for permissions granted unilaterally.</p> <p>4) The owner additionally claimed the hedge was totally inappropriate because rubbish was thrown into the garden. Gayton Road does not receive more rubbish than other areas and a thicker hedge would solve this</p> <p>4) The owner also claimed that the hedge was inappropriate because and people could see through it. Such a hedge would grow extremely thick and provide ample privacy. This is what hedges are used for!</p> <p>The wall in fact has two windows that mean people can see through it which is inconsistent with the privacy point.</p> <p>5) We need more greenery in the Road and there is a wide body of support for more.</p>