

**From:** Ken Howard [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** 24 April 2019 15:26  
**To:** Diver, John [REDACTED]  
**Cc:** Planning [REDACTED]  
**Subject:** Objection to Application 2019/1697/P

Dear Mr Diver,

[I am re-sending this Objection as an email at your suggestion, since my online Objection received an error code and was subsequently posted on the site in an incomplete form]

I wish to object, in the very strongest terms to this pernicious Application. We already fought the previous Application 2015/6218/P to build 3 luxury houses on the adjoining garden sites, which was withdrawn in the face of massive opposition from neighbours and local organisations, and now they are back again with a 2 house Application which will be similarly opposed.

As a close neighbour, and owner of the neighbouring garden who will be adversely affected, my specific objections are;

- The Application to build 2 large new luxury houses *in adjoining gardens in a conservation area* would set an appalling precedent for this already densely populated and polluted area of Hampstead. Arkwright Road has the highest level of air pollution in the Redington/Frognaal area.

The row of fine green gardens stretching down Arkwright Road form a precious antidote to the pollution of congested Finchley Road. To be allowed to build on two of these gardens is nothing short of sacrilege and would conflict with Camden's own Local Conservation Policy. (CC4 8.76) and offend against, RF20, RF35 RF1, D2

- The plans are not for affordable housing but multi million pound luxury homes.
- It would encourage other residents to sell off their gardens for profitable development.
- The pre-Application correspondence between Camden and the Developers appears to offer immunity from contravening Camden's own stated Policy by a financial payment. i.e. both Council and developer profit while the neighbourhood suffers.
- At a time when London Mayor Sadiq Khan is campaigning against air pollution and there are worldwide mass demonstrations for preservation of the environment, it is scandalous to remove precious areas of greenery.
- It would cause destruction of mature trees. Several in the garden of No. 29 have already been recently felled without permission.
- The Plans minimize the impact on wildlife in the gardens, when in fact they are a sanctuary for a multitude of wildlife with (in contradiction to the Plans) two existing ponds in [REDACTED] garden of 27 Arkwright Road and an abundance of ducks, dragonflies, birdlife, owls, bats, foxes squirrels etc. Suggested green house roofs are no substitute.
- The construction of large, ugly bordering houses would ruin the garden views and privacy of all the residents in this location and overlook neighbouring houses and gardens including 25a and 25c Frognaal and 27 Arkwright Road.
- They would block sunlight from 25a Frognaal and their view of the sky.

- The proposed houses are overbearing and dominating, right on the boundary of and a matter of a few feet from neighbouring living rooms and bedrooms.
- There would be increased noise and disturbance, as the outside living space of the proposed houses will invade the privacy of neighbours.
- Heavy construction and pile driving in an enclosed space would create unbearable noise levels and a 52 week major build on a site that has no road access (only a tiny private back lane) would cause traffic chaos.
- It would involve blocking the lane with heavy machinery with no turning place and the only egress into the permanently blocked Frogmal – a hellish prospect for the neighbours and nearby UCS school.
- In the Plans there appear to be no proposed provision for parking, which will only compound parking problems in Frogmal or lead to illegal parking in the lane. It is disingenuous to suggest that the occupants would be car-less.
- The wooden facades of the proposed houses are ugly and completely inappropriate to the character and quality of the Conservation Area.

This Application is totally unsuitable for a residential and vital green area of Camden and represents a classic case of over-planning. I urge you and the Planning Committee to reject it.

Yours sincerely,

Ken Howard

