

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2019/5835/P	Oliver Shinder	19/01/2020 19:50:06	OBJ	<p>here are my reasons for objection</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. the settings of the cluster of listed buildings will be harmed 2. your view of St Stephens will be eclipsed 3. the amenity of the neighbours will be harmed and in particular the sky view from 4a 4. the building is out of character with its closeness to the street; its overcrowded appearance and its dominance over its semi detached neighbour that was the dominant building and should remain so. <p>yours sincerely Oliver Shinder</p>
2019/5835/P	nicky	14/01/2020 18:18:36	OBJ	<p>Although I appreciate there is a need for housing to evolve, update and add to the historic housing we are so lucky to be living amongst I would like to point out that in this application our privacy will be compromised as will the authenticity of the landscape.</p> <p>The new building proposed at number 4B closer to the front of our dwelling at number 9 causing some lack of privacy and the proposed balconies encourage the occupants to stand looking directly into the privacy of our home.</p> <p>The proposed 3 storey brickwork competes with the surrounding buildings rather than creating a modern contrast which the existing metal clad structure achieved. The existing low build further complements the surrounding houses allowing space for the church spire and surrounding trees to be seen.</p> <p>The application states the dwelling is outdated and that it has reached the end of its design life. This statement suggests there is a disposability to houses such as these which is in conflict to the idea of maintaining buildings that are listed. Historic buildings deserve to be protected and any additional surrounding building should add to or enhance the buildings that are already there. In my view this does neither.</p>
2019/5835/P	Isabella Shinder	14/01/2020 18:34:18	OBJ	<p>"this is a special part of a CA in Hampstead and needs particular scrutiny. What is being proposed here is out of keeping with the streetscape and will harm the conservation area. Something much smaller and more discreet would be more in tune with the heritage and would enhance rather than detract from the settings. If the floor space on site is being doubled it is hard in itself for the site to look overcrowded. The mansard helps a little but only from directly below the building."</p>

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2019/5835/P	Audrey Mandela	14/01/2020 10:31:50	OBJ	<p>Ref: Planning Application 2019/5835/P 4b Hampstead Hill Gardens, NW3 2PL</p> <p>As owners and residents of 2 Hampstead Hill Gardens we are writing to you with our objections to the above planning application.</p> <p>While we support the Applicants' desire to improve their property, we object this Application for the following reasons:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none">1. the loss of daylight into our garden and those of our neighbours by the addition of a third floor;2. the jarring effect the design will have in a Conservation Area that is mainly make up of Grade II listed buildings; it would be entirely out of keeping with other properties on the road. The massing and overhang created by the proposed move of the front almost to the walkway is also problematic;3. the potential impact of subsidence, which has affected neighbouring properties;4. the potential air pollution that will be generated by the demolition and rebuild of 4b. <p>We ask that the Planning Committee take into consider the large potential impact on neighbours, uphold its own conservation policy, and reject this proposal in its current form.</p> <p>Thank you, Audrey Mandela</p>

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2019/5835/P	Anthea Williams	19/01/2020 21:26:57	OBJNOT	I am writing to object to the planning application for complete demolition and development of the house at 4b Hampstead Hill Gardens.

SETTING/STYLE/CONSERVATION AREA

As 4b has already been developed from a garage to a house, it is clear that this proposal is over development and that the site has reached its maximum potential. This is an example of creeping development as capacity is already reached. No 4a, is currently the dominant property of the pair but the proposed design of 4b fails to be sympathetic to 4a. The towering third storey would destroy the roofline of 4b/4a, and would be completely out of proportion. Not only would a third storey damage the appearance and, therefore, the value of 4a, but it would damage the appearance of the road. These buildings, 4b and 4a, sit in the inside curve of the road and their current size works well in the setting of the surrounded listed buildings. The proposed design is top heavy, over bulky and visually unsympathetic to the style of the listed buildings. It will destroy the rhythm of the view as one comes around the curve from Pond Street and blight the quality of the Conservation Area and the protected views from the Grade II listed buildings. In addition, the proposed projection of a section of the ground floor to the pavement, creates excess massing at the front and the loss of an off-street parking space. I know that Camden wish to avoid areas being affected detrimentally by poor design, of which this proposal on a small site must surely be.

REAR

The proposed design for the back of the house is still overbearing and excessive. The fact is, the existing rear projection at 4b already causes loss of outlook for the owner of 4a. If this application was to go ahead, 4a would lose the view of the sky from the kitchen extension and garden, and the garden would be reduced to a hollow under the shadow of an oppressive and invasive mass of building. This application should be rejected due to loss of outlook and on amenity impact grounds.

BASEMENT

The extent of the over development is also apparent in the proposal of a large basement. The excavation extends into the garden, posing a risk to surrounding buildings, from drainage problems and the related risks to houses from disturbance to mature trees. These issues need to be addressed with consideration to the council's CPG Basement guidelines.

POLICIES

From my discussions with an expert in planning, I know that this design contravenes many areas of Camden's own amenity and design policies. These include the undermining of townscape qualities, design policies, the London Plan and the NPPF. If policies are an essential guide to decision making, surely this proposal must be rejected.

PEOPLE'S HOMES/LIVES

The strength of feeling against this proposal has united many neighbours in their aim to defend their homes and environment against a plan that is unreasonable and inconsiderate. Despite the large number of objections to the first application, this second proposal has been submitted. Although some changes being made, Mr Brearley has chosen to ignore the very substantial and serious impact of his extensive and lengthy project on his direct neighbour at 4a. The Construction Management Plan states a high risk of noise, dust and vibration continuing for many months. In addition, the appearance of the front of 4a, the view from the rear of the house and garden, and use and enjoyment of the garden will be permanently impaired.

Application No: **Consultees Name:** **Received:** **Comment:** **Response:**

Please let me know the committee date.

2019/5835/P Maya Shinder 21/01/2020 10:19:25 OBJ

The development is out of character of a uniform and exceptionally beautiful streetscape in a conservation area. It is understandable that a minor development took place in the 1960s even though it reduced views of St Stephens from the street. The size and mass of this building and the materials used will make it conspicuous from all angles other than directly beneath it (the sole improvement to the application this time compared with last)

It is vexing that my view of St Stephens not only is now entirely removed entirely due to the height of the new building but that this view then becomes taken by the new build and instead I have a modernist balcony facing me. I acknowledge that this is a private view and takes low priority in the decision making but if you take all the zero sums from the neighbours suffering from this development and add them up the benefit of the new space to 4b has to be set against the multiple cost and more importantly the permanent damage to the conservation area.

Less height more acceptance. Ok the existing building is ugly but lets not replace it with something disproportionate.
