From: Guy Wingate
Sent: 21 June 2019 15:47

To: Planning

Cc: Fieldsend, Sofie

Subject: Objection to Planning Application 2019/3015/P

I am writing to object to planning application 2019/3015/P.

This application is a minor variation of a previously submitted scheme, 2018/1022/P, which was refused by the Council on 11 June 2018.

From studying the two applications, it would appear that the only difference in the new proposal is with the material used for the hardstanding outside of the double property.

Since the previous application was refused work has proceeded without permission. Whilst this is distinctly unhelpful in causing cost to the Council to presumably pursue as an enforcement issue, it does quite visibly support the reasons for refusal previously handed down. Not only does the design not fit with either local policy or Hampstead Conservation Area strategies, the ceramic tiles are clearly impermeable and do not comply with Camden's policy on sustainable urban drainage systems in areas greater than 5 square metres. CPG1 clearly sets out that no more than 50% of any frontage are should be comprised of hard surfaces alone.

The scheme further contravenes Council policy D2 which only permits development that might be considered to enhance a conservation area to which Wildwood Terrace, in this case, is noted as making a positive contribution. It would also appear to go against the spirit of the Hampstead Conservation Area Appraisal and Management Strategy (Hampstead Conservation Area Statement 2002) and Heath Fringe policy 3 which "seeks to control development along roads leading to the Heath and in the gardens and trees adjacent to the Heath so as to safeguard their present contribution to the setting of the Heath."

Since the date of the previously refused application, a local referendum on 21 June 2018 passed the Neighbourhood Plan proposed by the Hampstead Neighbourhood Forum under the 2011 Localism Act. This Plan and the policies contained within are now in force. Of relevance to this scheme are policies DH1 and DH2 in respect of both design and the conservation area.

The loss of soft landscaping and planting is detrimental to this Victorian terrace particularly as the proposed (and completed) development spans the width of two of the historic houses that line this highly attractive street. That two other properties in the street had previously been allowed to get away with similar schemes lends no support to the same being permitted again.

It is evident that this application should be refused and highly regrettable that development has taken place despite a previously near-identical application having been turned down. Not only should this scheme also be refused, the Council must seek to subsequently enforce the reversal of the non-permitted works.

Yours faithfully,

Guy Wingate FRSA