

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2019/2881/P	Hampstead CAAC	08/08/2019 21:58:55	OBJ	<p>HCAAC Objects to the proposal.</p> <p>Our fellow citizens still seem prepared to sacrifice green areas for vehicle accommodation; The aim for the UK is the reduction by 2050 to zero carbon emissions. It is essential that the populace is awakened to the hard work and some sacrifice of convenience needed to achieve such a target.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Camden policy is now not to allow new car accommodation where such is lacking. 2. All properties from and including 46 and 56 Platts Lane had their front gardens and boundary walling considerably adapted or wasted for wide=gash hard-standings and barren walling and the intrusive garages of nos.46 and 50. This was presumably under PD rights then applicable or to consents prior to 2011, there being no recent planning history for any of those properties. At least no. 46 managed to retain substantial planting to the side of their garage. Other mainly lesser planting exists at nos. 48-56 3. No. 44 should not add to the vehicle access accumulation at that point. Nos. 44 and the remainder of 46 front behind the garage retain fully planted front gardens. They continue and necessarily act to terminate the greenery from the Rosecroft Avenue corner as well as softening the brutality of the openings further up the slope. 4. The proposed additional crossover is too close to the road junction at the critical roundabout and split of Heritage (sic) Lane from Platts Lane. It is an undesirable location for a car manoeuvring into and out of the proposed hardstanding close to the roundabout and directly opposite the West Heath Close opening. 5. The very narrow opening shown on the proposed front elevation drawing is unrealistic for such and the applicant would be forced to increase it, further damaging the boundary frontage. There would also be the temptation to enclose the new hardstanding as a carport or garage. 6. The DAS does not mention current Camden policy so does not address this. The plan with no. 46 garage does not show the great existing planting on its north side. 7. Nor does the DAS acknowledge the considerable and unusual care to be exercised, according to the arboricultural report, in any details for the proposed walling and hardstanding and the employment of specialist consultants to oversee such. 8. Moreover, despite possibly best efforts, Tree T001 is clearly at great damage risk, which the report does not seem to find acceptable or avoidable. The pair of trees at that point must be left to grow and be managed for their health. Street trees are indispensable. 9. Any grant of consent for no,44 would set an unwelcome and unnecessary precedent for many a similar development against policy and compromising safety and green areas and features. <p>Hampstead CAAC asks for the proposal to be refused.</p>