

**7 Hampstead Hill Gardens  
London NW3 2PH**

**11 July 2019**

**Attention: Mr Thomas Sild  
Planning Officer  
Camden Council**

[Thomas.Sild@camden.gov.uk](mailto:Thomas.Sild@camden.gov.uk)

Dear Mr Sild

Re: Planning Application 2019/2964/P - 4b Hampstead Hill Gardens

We are writing to object to the above planning application recently submitted to Camden Council. We live directly opposite the property, and have lived here since 1984.

Our principal objections to the proposed development are as follows.

Far from preserving and enhancing the Conservation area, it will significantly detract from the unity and coherence of the distinct architectural character of the Rosslyn Hill end of Hampstead Hill Gardens. The proposed building is jarringly out of character with both the surrounding buildings and with the adjoining house.

The adjacent houses, which were built by the distinguished architectural firm of Batterbury and Huxley between 1875-1881, are listed Grade 2. They were built to a high standard in the 'Queen Anne' style, and from the Rosslyn Hill side to the bend, these houses achieve a particular architectural distinction and unity .

The planning application applies to a site that was originally the garden of no.4, in which a low two storey house (4a) was built in the mid 50's, the garage of which was subsequently converted into a smaller separate 4 bedroom residence (4b). The main house (4a) was then sold subject to a covenant restricting any additional height or storey to be added – presumably to retain the unity of scale of adjoining houses, and the relatively discreet interruption of the 19<sup>th</sup> century architecture.

While these low adjoining houses may not share the architectural distinction of the larger 19<sup>th</sup> century Grade 2 houses, their comparatively low-profile structure is unobtrusive and with its mature hornbeam melds in with the street.

By contrast, the proposed four storey structure is obtrusive, jagged, of various materials and clumsy. It is without unity within itself, and does not accord with the surrounding houses. It would also tower over the adjacent 4a, breaking the unity of scale of the two residences.

The proposal pays lip service to echoing some aspects of the adjacent buildings. However, its overall impact will be discordant. In particular the jagged tower effect of the upper storey will be highlighted by the reflective shingles which are at odds with any other wall surface in the street. In addition, the cut out balcony will seriously intrude on the street

and neighbouring buildings. The proposal claims to echo other neighbouring balconies, but these are mainly roofs of bays and not for use as balconies.

In conclusion, we would like to express our strong support for the detailed submission of the Hampstead Hill Resident's Association which contains further objections which relate to other grave deficiencies of the proposed development.

We do hope that the Council will reject this inappropriate proposal.

[REDACTED]

Sir Jeffrey Jowell QC and Lady (Frances) Jowell. [REDACTED]