

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2018/2415/P	Stephen Williams for and on behalf of the Netherhall Neighbourhood Association	20/07/2018 14:52:13	OBJ	<p>Southwell House, 39 Fitzjohnis Avenue</p> <p>Separation of the Two Original Buildings The separation of the two original buildings by the removal of the later link building is welcomed.</p> <p>Removal of Later Additions The removal of the later buildings which have no visual merit is welcomed.</p> <p>Cars It is welcomed that there is no proposal for parking. Any approval should stipulate that parking permits would not be permitted to be assigned to any residence at the property. We are concerned that the site plan seems to indicate an access retained from the western part of Southwell House which is not directly referred to in the submission. Vehicular access should specifically not be permitted to the rear garden area from the (omitted) western part of Southwell House garden.</p> <p>Submitted Site Area The submitted development excludes half the original garden area of Southwell House and gives no indication of proposals for this western half which borders Maresfield Gardens/Nutley Terrace. The whole property and gardens together with 46 Maresfield Gardens were marketed as one site for development. There is no indication in the application that the western half is in the same ownership as the applicants submitted proposals. The scheme makes no reference to the existing land or proposals for its future. This should form part of any submission to understand the effect of the proposals on the Conservation Area and surrounding land. There is considerable local concern at the effect of cumulative development and development of both halves of the site would constitute such development. In addition, the omission of half the site severely distorts the assessment of the site for any section 106 agreement.</p> <p>Loss of Green Open Space. The submission makes a statement that, 'This private garden provides ample area for a generously proportioned lawn and planted boundaries'. This is clearly not the case. The proposals show the rear of the southern building extending out considerably into the rear garden. In addition, further green space is lost by the introduction at double basement level of a sunken hard-surfaced terrace with 3 descending planting troughs with steps extending further into the garden leaving little and inadequate garden left against the western boundary of the submitted scheme. This remaining green space at the western end of the proposal is, as a result, only a third of the original rear garden of this part of the proposed site. The northern building has been considerably extended to cover all the garden space between the tennis court and the existing rear of the building. The rear of the northern garden is almost completely taken up by the tennis court (sports leisure use) and therefore not usable as a lawn for general leisure use for the enjoyment of the residents of the proposed house.</p> <p>The front courtyard is a largely hard-landscaped area given to vehicular access.</p> <p>As a result, there is a considerable and unacceptable overall loss of green open garden space on this site with the large percentage of the site either covered in buildings or hard impervious surfaces which is alien to the overall character of the Conservation Area.</p>

Application No: Consultees Name: Received:

Comment: Response:

The Fitzjohns and Netherhall Conservation area character is defined by the large gardens and open space at the rear of properties. The loss of garden space with these proposals will severely diminish this Character.

Affordable Accommodation

There are a large number of new dwellings proposed with no provision for affordable accommodation. The applicants claims that the development cannot financially support affordable housing is not acceptable given that the applicant should have made allowances for such costs when purchasing the property. The omission of half the site from the application distorts this assessment.

Increased Building Area

The Proposals constitute over-development of the site. Both the south and north buildings have been considerably increased in area. Original 4513sq m with Proposed 8951sq m. This increase of 4438sq m almost doubles the size of this already large building. The southern building has been increased from a three-storey building to a six-storey building by the insertion of two basements and additional floor space in an extended roof space. In addition, the rear of the building has been considerably extended out, effectively doubling the depth of the building plan. Similarly, the northern building sees the depth doubled and an extra floor in the remodelled roof space.

Basements

The proposals for the southern building on the site have a double basement at the rear and a single basement at the front. This is facilitated by the proposed removal of the large Horse Chestnut tree. The submission cites the reason to remove the tree as the damage the tree has caused to the boundary wall. The true reason is the need to remove this particular tree to allow the construction of the basements as currently shown. The NNA oppose double basements in line with Camden policies on basements.

Boundary Treatments

Reference is made to the boundary wall and fence along Nutley Terrace. This should be clearly described in any application accompanied by drawings. No boundary treatment is shown at the western boundary of the application.

Trees

There are several mature trees lining the boundary to Nutley Terrace which being at the entrance to the neighbourhood contribute considerably to the Character of the Area. Any loss of one of these trees would considerably diminish the Conservation Area. The application requests the removal of a mature Horse Chestnut Tree close to the building (see above comments). The application should clearly demonstrate valid reasons for this particular removal with drawings and photographs.

Removal of Silver Birches is referred to. These should be shown and again valid reasons for removal of this one particular tree clearly stated.

The close proximity of one existing tree at the north-west corner of the extended basement terracing would result in the damage of the roots and eventual loss of the tree or future request for removal.

The applicant refers to replacement trees, but these are not defined, quantified and located. Any replacement

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
				<p>trees should be standards or larger. Any new planting should be accompanied by a watering system. Trees and planting at Otto Schiff House have died due to lack of such watering system and inadequate control to enforce replacement by Camden</p> <p>Summary In Summary, although the architectural approach to the redevelopment of the site is in keeping with the area, the NNA cannot support the excessive increase in area and massing, the loss of green space, addition of a double basement and loss of trees. The NNA believe the application cannot be satisfactorily determined with half the Southwell site omitted from the application. The NNA therefore opposes the application as it is presently shown.</p> <p>Stephen Williams RIBA For and on behalf of Netherhall Neighbourhood Association</p>
2018/2415/3		22/07/2018 21:56:43	OBJ	<p>The proposals for the redevelopment of this site are showing a 100% increase in the size of the property with a reduction by half of the site area, thus in effect quadrupling the site coverage. This massively reduces the green open space associated with this building. It also shows a double basement. I therefore object to the huge additional massing of the proposals for this property.</p> <p>The application does not mention the rear half of the site - presumably this will come later - but it is impossible to judge the front half without knowing what will eventually be proposed for the rest of the block fronting Maresfield Gardens and Nutley Terrace. There should be a planning condition that the proposals for the whole block should be considered at the same time and not piecemeal.</p>

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2018/2415/P	Hampstead CAAC	23/07/2018 00:00:43	OBJ	<p>HCAAC welcomes the separation of the two original buildings which promises reduction in visible scale of the development. Similarly removal of the later non-descript buildings aims at good visual quality of the final development.</p> <p>Lack of car parking is noted and applauded as the PTAL rating must be 4-5 or better here. As elsewhere, (Barratt, Mount Anvil developments), this should be reinforced by no street permits for the new residents which would otherwise be to the disadvantage of others in the area. The current vehicle accesses and front area must therefore be kept free for delivery and emergency vehicles etc.</p> <p>We note the amount of garden take-up, while not apparently excessive in relation to current policy and the Draft New London Plan, involves tree loss without proposals for replacements. We also object to any tree loss simply to provide development space.</p> <p>We also object to the provision of condser units, especially in the proposed lightwell (noise) and in general as the deveopment should be planned to maximise natural ventilation.</p> <p>HCAAC notes the comments of the Netherhall Neighbourhood Association and agrees with the following elements:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Site areas ownership and proposed uses should be clarified so as to anticipate the effects of any likely separate developments. The comment about possible vehicular access to the western site is particularly concerning. 2. The Council (and reference the Draft New London Plan), will want to ensure that the development includes affordable units if the number of units v. proposed floor space allocation so indicates. This bearing in mind a recent Appeal Decision in the adjacent area to secure provision where the developer proposed too few units out of floor area clearly indicating feasibility of more units. 3. If the current proposals suggest over-development which it is difficult, in the present climate, to evidentially verify, the Council will wish to review this in relation also to the 'maximisation of site use' proposed by the London Mayor. 4. Proposed double basements appear unnecessary, unwelcome, contrary to policy. 5. Boundary treatemnts are important, as universally in Hampstead and drawings should be submitted. 6. HCAAC considers this site of great importance given the various unresolved aspects of this proposal and considers more time is needed for proper review of the proposals by officers. HCAAC reserves the right to comment further especially where detailed revisions are requested, trees loss to be minimised and only permitted in exceptional circumstances to be closely scrutinised.

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2018/2415/P	Hampstead CAAC	23/07/2018 00:00:54	OBJ	<p>HCAAC welcomes the separation of the two original buildings which promises reduction in visible scale of the development. Similarly removal of the later non-descript buildings aims at good visual quality of the final development.</p> <p>Lack of car parking is noted and applauded as the PTAL rating must be 4-5 or better here. As elsewhere, (Barratt, Mount Anvil developments), this should be reinforced by no street permits for the new residents which would otherwise be to the disadvantage of others in the area. The current vehicle accesses and front area must therefore be kept free for delivery and emergency vehicles etc.</p> <p>We note the amount of garden take-up, while not apparently excessive in relation to current policy and the Draft New London Plan, involves tree loss without proposals for replacements. We also object to any tree loss simply to provide development space.</p> <p>We also object to the provision of condser units, especially in the proposed lightwell (noise) and in general as the deveopment should be planned to maximise natural ventilation.</p> <p>HCAAC notes the comments of the Netherhall Neighbourhood Association and agrees with the following elements:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none">1. Site areas ownership and proposed uses should be clarified so as to anticipate the effects of any likely separate developments. The comment about possible vehicular access to the western site is particularly concerning.2. The Council (and reference the Draft New London Plan), will want to ensure that the development includes affordable units if the number of units v. proposed floor space allocation so indicates. This bearing in mind a recent Appeal Decision in the adjacent area to secure provision where the developer proposed too few units out of floor area clearly indicating feasibility of more units.3. If the current proposals suggest over-development which it is difficult, in the present climate, to evidentially verify, the Council will wish to review this in relation also to the 'maximisation of site use' proposed by the London Mayor.4. Proposed double basements appear unnecessary, unwelcome, contrary to policy.5. Boundary treatemnts are important, as universally in Hampstead and drawings should be submitted.6. HCAAC considers this site of great importance given the various unresolved aspects of this proposal and considers more time is needed for proper review of the proposals by officers. HCAAC reserves the right to comment further especially where detailed revisions are requested, trees loss to be minimised and only permitted in exceptional circumstances to be closely scrutinised.