

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2019/2964/P	Crispin Williams	16/07/2019 16:23:42	OBJ	Dear Mr Sild,

I am writing to object to the planning application for 4B Hampstead Hill Gardens. I am the son of the owner of 4A, the house connected to 4B. I grew up in Hampstead and my family and I spend several weeks each year with my mother in her house so I am very familiar with the building, its garden, and the surrounding area. I fully endorse the objections by the planning consultant Peter Kyte and those of the architect Bill Risebero, both written on behalf of and in consultation with my mother. In particular, having spent long periods staying at 4A, I would stress the following issues:

Additional height leading to loss of light, overshadowing, and privacy issues:

The proposed structure will add over a storey of height to the main sections of 4B. This will block light to almost all of 4A's main windows which, it should be noted, are mainly on the south and east elevations. In particular, the kitchen/dining area, where much time is spent, will be overshadowed, and light taken from the east-elevation windows, which directly face the west elevation of 4B. The garden will also be oppressively overshadowed by the overbearing additional storey. Similar negative impact, along with privacy intrusion in several cases, will result for the surrounding houses and gardens (as noted in other objection letters).

Conservation area, character and appearance, preservation and enhancement:

The proposed plan is out of keeping with the adjoining house, 4A, to which it was originally the garage, after which it was developed into a modest additional dwelling. Clearly, the design reference for any renovations or rebuilding of 4B should be 4A. But, the proposed structure would dwarf 4A in height and appear completely overbearing from all angles. It would not be in character with 4A or the surrounding houses, and would not enhance the very pleasant Conservation area and townscape. It would also set a dangerous precedent for additional storeys on other one- or two-level houses in the area (for example, to 4A itself by a future owner!).

Basement:

I am very concerned that the proposed excavations and addition of a full basement and external sunken courtyard could lead to damage to 4A, as well as other surrounding houses, both during construction and in the future, and negatively affect drainage and other water-course issues. Subsidence has already been an issue for 4A and a major problem for some neighbouring buildings. As pointed out in Mr Kyte's letter, the basement plan also simply violates Camden's own 50% rule on basement construction, so I would expect it to be rejected on this basis alone. Granting of permission would set a precedent for ignoring these guidelines in future proposals for basement construction, including in the significantly larger houses that make up much of the street.

Massing and over-development:

The proposed plan is an unnecessary over-development that produces unacceptable massing. While I am not keen on the idea of major re-development of 4B, if a revised proposal is submitted, it would clearly be more acceptable if the top storey was removed and the basement limited, and the external features complemented those of 4A.

Application No: **Consultees Name:** **Received:**

Comment: **Response:**

Construction requirements if proposal accepted:

If, despite all the issues raised in this and other objections, the proposal is accepted, I am very concerned about the effects of the long period of construction on neighbours, particularly those most susceptible to the dust, fumes, noise, and vibration. Therefore, in addition to not using heavy or noisy machinery, I would ask that dust, fumes, noise, and vibration be forbidden by Condition, and that working hours be limited to normal weekday hours (Monday to Friday, 8:30am to 6pm) only.

However, I would, as stated, hope that the proposal will be refused.

Yours sincerely,
Crispin Williams
