



Thank you David,

Further comments below, with further objections

PREVIOUS MESSAGE

The townscape and visual impact statements confirm my reasons for objecting in my previous email. This is a clear case of overdevelopment.

Separately I should have mentioned that the style of the new build right next to the retained building is acceptable, but that further away it becomes quite bland and detracts from the retained buildings.

SUSTAINABILITY

Section 4.20 of the sustainability statement says that 'all space and water heating will be provided by an electric-led ground-source heat pump, alongside electric cooking', but table 5.19 says that heating and hot water will use gas-fired boilers. I am confused.

SOCIAL DIVERSITY

Housing affordability and social diversity have worsened in Hampstead with the missed opportunities of 29 New End, and Mount Vernon before that.

Social diversity is not mentioned once in any of the design and access statements, nor is housing for key local workers. Camden wants 50% affordable housing (60-40), they offer just 9% intermediate and 0% social, and are really pushing for nothing on site, and some off-site or financial compensation. **I would like to object on both grounds.**

SERVICE CHARGE

In relation with affordability I have a question about the service charge details (affordable housing statement p10).

A 2b4p flat of about 1000-1500sqft has a service charge of £158-237/week => over £10,000 a year in the middle of these ranges.
A 1b2p flat of 500-600sqft has a service charge of £115-172.5/week => £7,500 a year

This points to an extravagant annual total of several hundreds of thousands of pounds. I live in Upper Hampstead Walk, which has over 50 units and zero affordable housing, and our service charge is much lower than this. And I would argue that it could be reduced if people could be bothered.

Do you have any more detail, and if not can you query this?

Regards

Pascal





