

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2019/5141/P	peyton skipwith	18/11/2019 15:00:15	OBJNOT	<p>A comprehensive document outlining all the objections to this proposal is being submitted by the residents of Willow Cottages. In addition to this I would like to emphasise that the architectural unity and integrity of the Terrace is vitally important.</p> <p>With regard to the proposed garden wall and gateway, I would like to add that when the modernisation of No.40 Willow Road was carried out some thirty plus years ago, the garden wall abutting onto Willow Road was initially built about a foot higher but after protests the owner was obliged by the Council to lower it to its present level. One of the important visual features of the Terrace is its seeming visual openness but at the same time protecting the privacy of the occupants.</p> <p>The 'special' quality and individuality of the cottages is underlined by the numerous passers-by who stop to photograph them on a daily basis. Anything that interferes with that integrity would be a grave impingement on their Grade II listed status as well as their contribution to the amenity of the Conservation Area.</p>
2019/5141/P	Hilary King	20/11/2019 18:54:27	OBJ	<p>I am writing to object to the proposed semi-basement extension to number 33 Willow Rd</p> <p>Camden's local plan (policy D2 Heritage) clearly states: "the council will resist proposals for ..... alterations and extensions to a listed property where this would cause harm to the architectural and historic interest of the building" and "will resist development that would cause harm to the significance of the listed building through its effect on its setting".</p> <p>As Glenn Robinson's detailed analysis of the proposal shows, this project raises many serious concerns and fatally undermines the listed status both of number 33 and of the 9 listed mid 19th century workers' cottages that form its setting.</p> <p>Camden's local plan also states "new basements should respect the original design of the building including its architectural period and style and minimise the loss of garden" This proposal does none of these things. It is difficult therefore to see how a plan that flatly contradicts Camden's planning policy on so many counts could be considered acceptable.</p> <p>But there is another fundamental issue here. When we choose to live in a listed building we are also choosing the limitations and obligations this places on us. And if we find we have outgrown the available space it is time to move on. We are the transitory custodians of a piece of social history and our role is to respect and preserve it.</p>

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2019/5141/P	David Stone	21/11/2019 18:08:54	OBJNOT	<p>I wish to object to the proposal. I agree with the submissions made by Glen Robinson, and also those made by Frances Swain. In addition, I make the following comments:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The proposal is unattractive, and out of keeping with the Grade II listed terrace of houses. As some-one else once said - this is a carbuncle on the face of an old friend.</li> <li>2. It is over-development - these are simple, small houses, part of a terrace.</li> <li>3. The excavation work will be disruptive, and damaging to the row.</li> <li>4. The loss of garden is unacceptable.</li> <li>5. The light pollution is unacceptable.</li> <li>6. The higher, blank, boundary wall and modern gate are unacceptable.</li> <li>7. The wide, deep excavations (including the stairwell that runs the entire depth of the property) will disrupt water flow, and will anchor one end of the terrace in a way in which it is currently not anchored, sitting on shallow foundations. We cannot know what impact that will have on the remaining houses in the row.</li> </ol> <p>The architect seems to admit that the extension is damaging to the Listed Building and to the Conservation Area, but then suggests that that damage is mitigated by other improvements made to the building (paint) and by raising the wall to hide it. The difficulties of that analysis are readily apparent.</p> <p>The application should be rejected in full.</p>

---

2019/5141/P	David Stone	21/11/2019 18:09:27	OBJNOT	<p>I wish to object to the proposal. I agree with the submissions made by Glen Robinson, and also those made by Frances Swain. In addition, I make the following comments:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The proposal is unattractive, and out of keeping with the Grade II listed terrace of houses. As some-one else once said - this is a carbuncle on the face of an old friend.</li> <li>2. It is over-development - these are simple, small houses, part of a terrace.</li> <li>3. The excavation work will be disruptive, and damaging to the row.</li> <li>4. The loss of garden is unacceptable.</li> <li>5. The light pollution is unacceptable.</li> <li>6. The higher, blank, boundary wall and modern gate are unacceptable.</li> <li>7. The wide, deep excavations (including the stairwell that runs the entire depth of the property) will disrupt water flow, and will anchor one end of the terrace in a way in which it is currently not anchored, sitting on shallow foundations. We cannot know what impact that will have on the remaining houses in the row.</li> </ol> <p>The architect seems to admit that the extension is damaging to the Listed Building and to the Conservation Area, but then suggests that that damage is mitigated by other improvements made to the building (paint) and by raising the wall to hide it. The difficulties of that analysis are readily apparent.</p> <p>The application should be rejected in full.</p>
-------------	-------------	---------------------	--------	--

---

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2019/5141/P	Gemma Sherlock	23/11/2019 20:45:50	SUPC	<p>Whilst we have no objection in principle to the submitted scheme, we feel that the design for the Willow Road facing elevation at lower ground level is weak and requires more thought.</p> <p>We would ask for this basement extension to be redesigned to be more sensitive to the existing Listed terrace. The fenestration is indelicate in its proportion and detracts from the consistency of Willow Cottages. The new wall &amp; gate to the boundary of the property at Willow Road may be an attempt to reduce the visual impact of the new basement however these elements are also out of keeping with the rest of the street vernacular of Willow Cottages.</p>
2019/5141/P	Selina Skipwith and Paul Beatson	21/11/2019 13:07:32	OBJNOT	<p>A comprehensive document outlining all the objections to this proposal has been submitted by the residents of Willow Cottages to which we have already added our names.</p> <p>In addition to all the structural concerns in the document we have sent we would also like to highlight that the 'special' quality and individuality of the cottages is underlined by the numerous passers-by who stop to photograph them on a daily basis. Anything that interferes with that integrity would be a serious impingement on their Grade II listed status as well as their contribution to the amenity of the Conservation Area.</p>
2019/5141/P	The Heath & Hampstead Society	21/11/2019 16:37:00	OBJ	<p><b>OBJECTION</b> from <b>THE HEATH &amp; HAMPSTEAD SOCIETY</b></p> <p>The Objection from The Hampstead Forum spells out all the objections very thoroughly - to which we agree..</p> <p>There are two issues which we wish particularly to comment further on, which are:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1) The large windows to the living room of the side extension are completely out of scale with the small domestic quality of these listed cottages.</li> <li>2) The circular roof lights to the side extension will be seen from the street. They are of a large incongruous circular shape not relating to the 19th century cottages . Roof lights could be incorporated that are not seen from the street.</li> </ol> <p>Please Refuse.</p>

<b>Application No:</b>	<b>Consultees Name:</b>	<b>Received:</b>	<b>Comment:</b>	<b>Response:</b>
2019/5141/P	The Heath & Hampstead Society	21/11/2019 16:37:17	OBJ	OBJECTION from THE HEATH & HAMPSTEAD SOCIETY

The Objection from The Hampstead Forum spells out all the objections very thoroughly - to which we agree..

There are two issues which we wish particularly to comment further on, which are:

1) The large windows to the living room of the side extension are completely out of scale with the small domestic quality of these listed cottages.

2) The circular roof lights to the side extension will be seen from the street.

They are of a large incongruous circular shape not relating to the 19th century cottages .  
Roof lights could be incorporated that are not seen from the street.

Please Refuse.

---

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2019/5141/P	Farideh Bromfield	18/11/2019 17:17:02	OBJ	<p>Objection to the planning application for 33 Willow Road PA2019/5141/P &amp; 2019/5140/L</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1- Over development <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. Excessive expansion to this workers' cottage- nearly 40% increase.</li> <li>b. The construction of a misshapen, inappropriate and poorly designed kitchen/diner is a crude manifestation of the overdevelopment.</li> <li>c. The proposed plan for a third access gate is excessive.</li> </ol> </li> <li>2- Erosion of garden and amenity space <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. Replacement of the garden with a vehicular forecourt</li> <li>b. Car parking in the front garden detracts the façade of the cottages</li> <li>c. I could not find any publicly available evidence of planning permission to use the front for car parking.</li> </ol> </li> <li>3- Aesthetic &amp; Design proposal <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. The proposed side extension for kitchen diner as an addendum to the terrace, uneven conical roof lights, dubious high railings/wall and hard landscaping for a car forecourt are gravely harmful to listed Willow Cottages as a whole and as a heritage asset. The cottages' chief merit is their unity, long front gardens and visual openness.</li> </ol> </li> <li>4- Heritage statement <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. The expert's view of the balance of harm is overwhelmingly subjective. It provides no justification and appears largely contrary to general opinion.</li> <li>b. It provides no justification why the proposed triangular extension with conical roof lights is better than the existing bookend of the unified row of 9 cottages.</li> <li>c. It makes no comment about the proposed hard landscaping.</li> <li>d. It makes no comment about the significance of viewing the terrace as a whole and its special three quarter view looking up Willow Road.</li> </ol> </li> <li>5- Erroneous assumption and inconsistencies of the BIA study <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. Little effort appears to have been made to research the existing facts. This has led to numerous erroneous statements. For instance failure to acknowledge that there is a well at No.38.</li> <li>b. The period of investigation for encroachment of underground water is too short and not representative. Based on publicly available MetOffice data and increasing concerns about climate change/extreme weather events, the very limited scope of the trial pits does not provide a sufficiently robust evidence based conclusion. This renders the study invalid.</li> </ol> </li> </ol>

<b>Application No:</b>	<b>Consultees Name:</b>	<b>Received:</b>	<b>Comment:</b>	<b>Response:</b>
2019/5141/P	glen robinson	18/11/2019 17:51:17	OBJ	<p>Please see my objections listed below to the Planning and Listed Building Application 2019/5141/P i.e.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"><li>1. The Heritage document analysis 'Balance of Damage' concept is reductionist and piecemeal. It is flawed as it disregards the collective Heritage Asset of the listed terrace 'Willow Cottages'.</li><li>2. The submitted design proposal is architecturally poor, out of character and detrimental to the collective Heritage Asset.</li><li>3. The proposed side basement extension is over development [approx. 23% additional space] that contradicts the underlying ethos of the small scale listed Early Victorian Workers' cottage.</li><li>4. There is a real loss of amenity space and soft landscape [over 37%] that diminishes the symbolism and significance of the front garden as a compositional layered interface that underpins the listed terrace as a Heritage Asset.</li><li>5. The vehicular egress is potentially dangerous to both oncoming cars and pedestrians, of which many are young school children and parents. There also seems to be no record of planning permission for the current vehicular forecourt usage and demise of soft landscaped front garden.</li><li>6. The proposed new boundary wall is harsh, alienating and out of character with both the conservation area and the listed terrace. The proposed new boundary wall and solid gates are used to mask the poor design of the new side basement extension.</li><li>7. The BIA document is seriously flawed in both methodology and use of non-representative data that in turn miscalculates the potential real damage from the proposed works. The monitoring period of seven weeks is non-representative.</li><li>8. The structural solution submitted is caveated as being only indicative, incomplete and over-optimistic regarding the real impacts of each of the 4 stages of construction.</li><li>9. The architect's drawings are incomplete and contradictory. As such they are misleading, without necessary detail design and therefore indicative merely of 'intent'. A complete scheme is required.</li><li>10. The circular rooflights are excessive, intrusive, out of character. They undermine the Heritage Asset.</li><li>11. The application is wrong to cover both the side basement extension proposal and the outstanding maintenance and repair works to 33 Willow Road. There should be two separate applications.</li><li>12. The over-large and flawed design fails to protect or enhance the heritage asset and the Hampstead Conservation Area and therefore is contrary to Policies DH1 and DH2 of the Hampstead Neighbourhood Plan.</li></ol>

---

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2019/5141/P	Frances Swain	14/11/2019 16:35:39	COMMNT	<p>1 No side extension should be allowed. This is the end cottage in a simple terrace of pretty stuccoed mid-Victorian cottages, characteristic of an early period of Hampstead's development and reflected in its conservation status. This end of the terrace is particularly visible as it is also on the corner of Willoughby Road.</p> <p>Any side extension would detract from both the character of the building and the terrace.</p> <p>2 The proposed extension is visible - it is only partly below ground level at the front. The roof is over a meter (about 1.3m) above ground level and the top of the hood around the roof lighting is probably 2.00m above ground level.</p> <p>3 There are many incongruous features which jar with the mid Victorian architecture, due to an attempt to use a 'St Ives and Barbara Hepworth style'. These include the obliquely-cut cylindrical roof-window hoods, the textured cast iron cladding around the hoods and over the terrace doors and the railings. Although I can see the attraction of this style of architecture in its place, this is not an appropriate setting.</p> <p>4 Loss of garden. The proposed plan shows that approximately one third of the current garden will be lost. This will detract from the neighbourhood (a conservation area) and reduce the area available for rainfall absorption.</p> <p>5 View of listed property from the street. It is a characteristic feature of this terrace that the houses and their front gardens can be seen from the street and enjoyed by everyone.</p> <p>Boundary wall too high. In an attempt to reduce the visibility of this style of extension a boundary wall, 10cm higher than the piers of the existing wall, is proposed. It is high, featureless and oppressive. The existing wall needs repair, but nevertheless has some attractive features. The piers break up the monotony of the wall, whereas the lower stretches of wall between with wooden trellises allow creepers to growing through softening the effect and allow glimpses through.</p> <p>Double gates modern an</p>

---