

Elizabeth J. Berman
3 Hampstead Hill Gardens
London NW3 2PH

17 July 2019

Attn: Mr. Thomas Sild
Planning Officer
Camden Council
Thomas.sild@camden.gov.uk

RE: Planning Application 2019/2964/P, 4b Hampstead Hill Gardens.

Dear Mr. Sild:

I am writing to you as a longstanding resident of Hampstead Hill Gardens to express my very strong opposition to the proposed plans to radically redevelop 4b Hampstead Hill Gardens (2019/2964/P). I have reviewed this application in detail and it very clearly violates a number of policies enshrined in Camden planning rules, the Hampstead Neighbourhood Plan and the Hampstead Conservation Area Statement. Perhaps most importantly, the proposal violates both common sense and good taste. The area in which the proposed site sits is surrounded by Grade II listed buildings which are and must be protected from this type of overdevelopment. We would not oppose the Applicant updating his home: However, what is proposed is so radical that it would negatively impact the streetscape and the character of the road to the detriment of the Conservation Area. If we cannot protect against this type of radical design and massive overbuilding on such a small site, what would be the purpose of having planning policies and a 50 year old Conservation Area? We need to protect against these McMansions!

The site was originally an open space with a tennis court. It was converted to a home with a garage. Then the garage was converted to a second home. Now that second home wants to expand upwards and downwards to create a much larger home, one that would dwarf the original structure and negatively impact neighbouring properties and gardens. This is simply overdevelopment, doubling the size of the property, and it is in no way consistent with the original site, the space or the road.

And while not strictly a planning matter, you should know that this proposal if allowed would cause great harm to neighbours, many of whom are elderly, and all of whom are suffering tremendous anxiety that this egregious plan will somehow be approved. Neighbouring properties have a history of subsidence, some of which is directly related to prior basement building works, and there is very little doubt that the scale of construction proposed in such a confined, delicate space will cause severe damage and harm. The Applicant's own submission indicates his property at 4b requires updating: You can imagine that the property at 4a which is attached will most certainly suffer damage from what his proposed.

The design of the building is totally out of context and is universally opposed by neighbours on the road. This is not a question of a design being somewhat out of keeping with its surroundings: What is proposed is entirely inconsistent with its attached property but also with a selection of Grade II listed properties which surround it. This is not a question of taste: if everyone agrees that the design and the materials are inappropriate then that should be given great weight in your consideration of this application.

Finally, the proposed works would materially harm the amenity of the road, reducing green space enjoyed by neighbours and the community; reducing sunlight to many near homes; creating a massing effect against the public walkway and borders of the property; compromising the streetscape through a jarring, "pumpkin tooth" roofline; and establishing an awful precedent for significant overbuilding in protected areas.

I urge you to reject this application.

Kind regards,

[Redacted Signature]

Elizabeth J. Berman.