

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2019/5348/P		01/12/2019 14:32:24	OBJ	<p>This experimental proposal for a large new house would sit comfortably in San Francisco or Venice Beach. Unfortunately it shouts out in North London. It does not complement but contrasts all other buildings in the area not only because of its colour and its shape. It has distinctly 'sunny disposition' typical of warmer and sunnier climates. The large glazed entrance niche looks more typical of local leisure centres than a family home. Will the house owners, a single family with a private garden and rear terraces which face its garden, really make use of the multiple terraces facing the road? The illustrations show trees on these terraces but imagine the same building without the trees and with its proposed window shutters down. What effect will these large motorised shutters on treeless terraces have on the street? This is an interesting proposal for a wrong location.</p>
2019/5348/P		30/11/2019 11:41:07	OBJ	<p>The proposed development presents some serious concerns</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1) the scale and size of the development is overwhelming relative to the buildings that surround it. The proposal to dig both a basement (which would be highly disruptive) and another floor are out of proportion to the houses next to it and would appear to dominate the street. This plan does not seem to be in keeping with the rigour of a conservation area and the objectives of the Hampstead plan put forward by the Hampstead Neighbourhood forum.</li> <li>2) the visual presentation does not fit with the character and nature of the conservation area. Despite references in the document to surrounding buildings and its architectural language, the visual aesthetic and materials are out of character.</li> <li>3) The building does not use materials that are consistent or sympathetic to the brick facades of the neighbouring buildings and the green colour is overly bold and very out of place. A more natural material would much better suit the visual language of the area.</li> <li>4) The disruption caused by a build of this scale to both the neighbours and the environment would be very significant. The roads approaching it would get extremely congested and would cause environmental damage in both noise pollution and through the lorries and trucks that would be employed.</li> <li>5) The date for objection is too short as the plans have only just gone onto the Camden planning website and most neighbours are not aware of the proposed plan and scale of the build or have had time to consider them.</li> </ol> <p>While we understand the requirement of the proposal, we think that the current plan should be rejected given the disproportionate scale of the build and the lack of Visual sympathy with the Neighbourhood and conservation area.</p>
2019/5348/P		01/12/2019 15:04:11	COMMNT	<p>Sirs</p> <p>I live locally and have inspected the documents in some detail. I find the scale of the proposals rather overwhelming in relation to adjacent buildings. Furthermore it is somewhat out of character with local design of other residential units built in the area. I am aware that the disruption is not an issue, but something less grand would have a much shorter construction period. I should like to have the proposals as they stand refused.</p>

<b>Application No:</b>	<b>Consultees Name:</b>	<b>Received:</b>	<b>Comment:</b>	<b>Response:</b>
2019/5348/P		01/12/2019 10:14:55	OBJ	<p>HCAAC Objects to this application. The proposed replacement building is out of scale and unnecessarily unsympathetic to the adjoining and adjacent buildings. It seems to be 'the finger' at the CA and the immediate setting. The applicant calls in aid examples of design and detailing diversity in the existing buildings generally in Hampstead. This ignores the basis of that original diversity as having been carefully worked out in largely homogenous estate building of the late 19th and early 20th century development. There is also the question of demolition of half of a visible and viable single complex of two semis to be replaced by a deliberately contrasting and out of scale attachment. Examples of new development shown by the applicant also show respect of the heights of adjacent and surrounding buildings as well as of their materials and scale. The lessons seem not to have been learned for this application. This is our initial response which we intend to support with more detailed analysis, time permitting. In the DAS part 1 a new development in Belsize is cited also, apparently unsympathetic to its surroundings although noticeably different as a detached building and whose exact details and setting etc. we may yet explore whether or not already consented.</p>

---