

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2019/5449/P	Rachel Thrower	13/01/2020 17:43:31	OBJ	<p>The submitted and validated application is so lacking in adequate supporting information and detail that it should be refused on this basis alone. 31 Grove Place is located within the historic village core within the Hampstead Conservation Area and therefore any proposal requires full supporting information allowing a proper assessment of its impact.</p> <p>We object to the planning application on the following grounds:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Inadequate supporting information: the application does not include a Design and Access Statement (together with photographs and an architect's impression of the proposal in its setting) and adequate, clear and properly scaled layout and elevation plans.</li> <li>2. Provision of Parking space is contrary to Policy T2 - which seeks to promote sustainable transport and requires all new developments in the borough to be car free. Furthermore, this space would be accessed by reversing into it from Grove Place or driving into it by going the wrong way down the one way road. The recent closure of part of New End at peak times has already seen increased traffic flow on Grove Place and any access to/from Grove Place will only serve to increase safety concerns.</li> <li>3. Design - there is no justification provided for a wall of increased height which could be detrimental to the Conservation Area and contrary to Policy DH1 and DH2. No details/images of the design or materials to be used have been provided. Additionally, there are no details provided for the shed and its proposed location. The hand drawn plans are inadequate.</li> <li>4. Policy A3 states that trees and vegetation are integral to the amenity and character of the street scene and seeks retention of trees. Additionally, Grove Place experiences poor surface water drainage with areas of pooling. Policy states that replacing garden areas with hard standing for purposes of providing on site parking will be resisted.</li> </ol> <p>For the reasons above we consider that this application should be refused.</p>
2019/5449/P	The Scotts	12/01/2020 20:04:29	OBJ	<p>Objection to Planning Portal Reference PP-08248404</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Section 4 - It is not clear why the existing fence wall needs to be changed to a brick wall. It is not clear if the proposed wall is to be the same height as the existing fence but there is no obvious need for the height to increase.</li> <li>2. Section 7 states there is no altered pedestrian access but the drawings show a new fence in the proposed brick wall.</li> <li>3. Section 8 - the response contradicts the details in section 7. It should be noted that the existing parking space has been utilised by the convenience store opposite, for many years, to accommodate their van so the existing car parking space should comfortably accommodate a normal sized car.</li> </ol> <p>In summary, the proposals are confusing and the handmade drawings inadequate.</p>