

Hazelton, Laura

From: John Malet-Bates [mailto:john.malet-bates@camden.gov.uk]
Sent: 05 May 2020 12:09
To: Hazelton, Laura
Cc: [redacted]
Subject: FW: 2020/1025/P: Boncara 35 Templewood Avenue

[EXTERNAL EMAIL] Beware – This email originated outside Camden Council and may be malicious Please take extra care with any links, attachments, requests to take action or for you to verify your password etc. Please note there have been reports of emails purporting to be about Covid 19 being used as cover for scams so extra vigilance is required.

Dear Laura,
We hope you and your's are safe and well – a communal concern in the present climate.

The above application.
HCAAC Objects to the proposal in this application as follows:

1. We note the preference of the Redington Froggnal (Rf) Neighbourhood Plan (RfNP) is in principle against demolition of heritage and other buildings of similar character or stature. HCAAC shares their concern given the high value of the CA's heritage as social background, buildings and settings.
2. A question we should raise for many applications applies to this proposal – should we encourage wanton development where satisfaction of housing need is not advanced and where the NPPF is proven to be simply a 'builders' charter'.
3. In the context of climate concerns, everyone must consider any apparently needless activity adding to carbon generation
4. We will state our view that the proposed replacement is unacceptable both in itself and relative to the existing Schreiber house adjacent and local setting.
5. While the CA appraisal is ongoing to reinforce respect for local character, the existing document and Camden policies offer sufficient guidance to acceptable development scale and respect of setting to which this proposal does not refer.
6. The planning history shows the care with which Camden have with the community regarded and treated even this slightly detached corner of the Redfrog neighbourhood which is not to be undone by unsuitable and unnecessary development.
7. There is a desire and actual need relative to the CA physical and social character to discourage excessive and characterless development whether for investment or status affirmation.
8. The proposal site is immediately adjacent to the West Heath and would intrude on enjoyment of that area, notwithstanding the high traffic activity of West Heath Road.
9. The proposal site is immediately adjacent to the edge of the Hampstead CA such that the Hampstead NP has a direct interest in Camden's control of development viewed from and impacting on that CA.
10. Such proposed development demonstrates the often unfortunate and perhaps unintended consequences of original site parcelling which in this case has produced in the existing building a constrained neighbour to the Schreiber House. A bad example of any attempt to follow the NPPF and London Plan aims of 'optimising site use'.
11. HCAAC and neighbourhood colleagues are interested in any prospect of policy offering prior warning of the limitations of consent for development of annexed land portions. Such might productively figure in legal searches relating to a proposed site division and sale.

HCAAC will continue notes in Objection to this application as soon as possible. The application requires longer consideration.

We dare hope that a so-called 'design review panel' is not parachuted from wherever to be careless of local setting and character and to somehow decide it is in line with current architectural theory and development aims.

Best regards,
John

Regards,
John Malet-Bates
For Hampstead CAAC

