

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2019/3093P	Tom Bower	23/07/2019 18:39:39	OBJ	<p>As the owner and occupier of [REDACTED] I oppose this application on numerous grounds based entirely on the council's own policy guidelines as stipulated in the 'Conservation area statement: Fitzjohns/Netherhall' and 'The Camden Plan'.</p> <p>In brief, the proposed building would set an appalling precedent. No other individual house along the north side of Thurlow Road has an annex building at the bottom of its garden. If this application is allowed, then every house along Shepherds Walk will be granted the opportunity to start what in effect would become an urban, ribbon development and the destruction of a well-established leafy environment. Granting unique permission to allow the building of the house in 9 Thurlow Road would set in train the destruction of a century old tree lined passage and vista. The result would not only be wholly unsympathetic to the wonderful atmosphere shared by those walking along Shepherds Walk but also offend the fundamental character of the houses and gardens.</p> <p>The proposed building itself is offensive on many grounds. The proposed materials are cheap, shoddy and do not match the existing Victorian houses.</p> <p>Contrary to the plan, no neighbouring individual house has a flat felt roof, albeit partly disguised by cheap artificial grass which will discolour.</p> <p>The proposed building is an ugly imposition on a conservation area which fails to respect the aesthetic values required by the Council and the public. The matchbox design is a blight and a blot on all the surrounding houses and on Hampstead.</p> <p>Moreover, one of the rules for this type of development states that if the building is within 2 metres of the property boundary, the whole building should not exceed 2.5 metres in height. The proposal, as shown in drawing HD1139/8005 ("proposed rear garden annex outbuilding plan and elevations", submitted with the application), shows a building of 3 meters height, so clearly breaking those rules: https://www.designingbuildings.co.uk/wiki/Outbuildings_definition</p> <p>Most pertinently, the application should be refused on the basis of the Council's own rules and guidelines:</p> <p>Referring to the relevant 'Conservation area statement: Fitzjohns/Netherhall'</p> <p>https://www.camden.gov.uk/documents/20142/7524238/Fitzjohns+and+Netherhall.pdf/fa58aaef-19b5-8ab0-15cb-21c56a5cc5a4</p> <p>On page 31, of the Conservation area statement, the Council states that in its present form, 9 Thurlow Road makes a positive contribution to the special character and appearance of the area.'</p> <p>F/N32 on page 42 of the Statement regarding 'Backlands/rear gardens' states explicitly that 'development within gardens is likely to be unacceptable.'</p> <p>On page 10, the Conservation area statement states: '(Although not always visible from the street, the rear gardens form large blocks of open land making a significant contribution to the character of the area.)' 'The area has an over-riding sense of a quiet leafy suburb.' The proposed development, offends that requirement. The proposed building should be judged as a new development under F/N1, and should be required as on page 38 of the Statement to match the criteria that it provides 'an opportunity to enhance the Conservation Area.' The proposed development, offends that requirement.</p>

Application No: Consultees Name: Received:

Comment: Response:

On page 10 of the Conservation area statement, there is reference to the importance in the conservation area of the 'rear gardens'. In that context, the Statement on page 10 refers to the importance that 'The private landscape often contains significant trees, whether groups or individual specimens, contributing to the character of the area, visible... from surrounding properties.' The proposed development would undermine that requirement.

On page 36, the Plan pertinently provides the reason why the proposed application should be rejected. It states under 'Extensions, Conservatories and Backland' that:
'In an area with large plots with open green land there is also pressure for backland development which can reduce the quality of the visual as well as the ecological environment.' The proposed development matches that description.

Page 37 warns against: 'the use of inappropriate materials' inappropriate bulk having an 'impact upon views'. The proposed building would be a blight on all the views of the neighbouring houses.
Under UDP Policy EN31, the council has undertaken 'to ensure that development...preserves or enhances their special character or appearance, and is of high quality in terms of design, materials and execution.'
The application not only fails on all those counts but also should fail to satisfy the council's requirement on page 38 for the council to positively 'assess' regarding the proposed building 'the potential effect of the proposal on the character or appearance of the conservation area.'
Regarding materials, the proposal offends regulation F/N8 which stipulates that the choice of materials...will be most important.' The proposed materials are cheap and unsightly.
The proposed building offends F/N19 because it 'alters the balance and harmony' of the property and the surrounding 'group of properties', not least because it will be 'widely visible' and 'obtrusive' and offends the council's requirement that any addition should not 'prejudice' the Conservation Area. It also offends the Statement's fundamental prohibition of any development which has a negative 'general effect on neighbouring properties' and does not meet the Statement's requirement for 'suitability'.
To repeat: F/N32 on page 42 regarding 'Backlands/rear gardens' states explicitly that 'development within gardens is likely to be unacceptable.'

The proposed building also fails to meet the requirements of the CAMDEN LOCAL PLAN
<https://www.camden.gov.uk/documents/20142/3912524/Local+Plan+Low+Res.pdf/54bd0f8c-c737-b10d-b140-7568beeae95>

The Council rightly boasts in para 7.39 on page 233 of the Plan regarding 'Camden's heritage' that the borough can be proud of its rich architectural heritage. The proposed building manifestly and repeatedly offends many requirements of that paragraph, not least as stipulated in section 7.1 'Design' on page 224.

In particular, it offends Policy D1 Design and should be refused permission by the council's own stipulation that the Council it will 'resist development of poor design that fails to take the opportunities available for improving the character and quality of an area and the way it functions'

In particular the proposed building:

- 1] fails para a - to respect local context and character
- 2] fails para b - to preserve or enhance the historic environment and heritage assets
- 3] fails para e - to use high quality design and materials

Application No: Consultees Name: Received:

Comment:

Response:

4) fails para k - to incorporate high quality landscape design
5) fails para m - to preserve strategic and local views
The proposed building out rightly transgresses nearly every requirement of paras 7.2 and 7.4: 'Local context and character.'

The proposal offends the requirement to consider:

- 1) 'the character, setting, context and scale of the neighbouring buildings'
- 2) 'the character, setting, context and scale of the existing building'
- 3) 'the prevailing pattern, density and scale of its surroundings'
- 4) 'the impact on existing rhythms, symmetries and uniformities'
- 5) 'the wider historic environment on buildings, spaces and features of local historic value'
- 6) and fails to integrate into its surroundings; [para 7.4]

The proposal completely omits any mention of how the building will 'respond to local context and character'.
The proposal offends para 7.5 because it has paid no 'uniform attention', as required, to the 'prevailing scale, form and proportions' of the building itself and the surrounding gardens.

The proposal offends paras 7.9 and 7.10 'Design and materials'. Instead of proposing as required a building of 'quality of design to create an attractive and interesting building', the proposal is an ugly shed using cheap materials stuck together to offer an insensitive building lacking any architectural features.

Finally, the proposal offends paras 7.19 and 7.20 because it will harm a natural habitat and will have a significant impact upon the amenity and character of the area.

I urge the council to reject this application as opportunistic and damaging.
