Dear Ben,

HCAAC have had to re-review this application so apologies for delayed comment.

We Object to the proposals on the following grounds:

- 1. Size of the proposed outbuilding above ground is in excess of that permitted by Camden policy.
- 2. As it serves only the existing house, it does not class as 'site maximisation' for additional dwellings envisaged in the Draft New London Plan.
- 3. The proposed basement we consider not to be an allowance under a new outbuilding intended as an allowance in relation to an existing house; it appears to be less in area than that permitted under a garden but excessive nonetheless.
- 4. The BIA would have to be carefully examined in relation to ground slope and proximity to the Belsize tunnel (level correctly shown on section?) for groundwater damming and pressure risk.
- 5. The drawing plans appear inconsistent showing different lengths of garden and relation between the house and the garden end wall. This could result in the new building being even longer than shown in the basement plan. The unwelcome and ground-risky extent of the proposal is more clearly shown in the existing/proposed comparison plan drawing.
- 6. The Belsize tunnel line appears to be drawn in error on the basement plan, the proposed outbuilding basement straddles the tunnel line. Is its depth shown correctly in the section?

Kind regards, John

Regards, John Malet-Bates For Hampstead CAAC