

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2019/5835/P	Anthea Williams	06/07/2020 11:56:23	OBJNOT	<p>Once again, Mr Brearley has submitted plans that are not acceptable. The objections come not just from those who will be directly and permanently affected, but by the associations that aim to preserve the character of the area, and from professionals who judge that the plans are at fault.</p> <p>This letter is in addition to my previous letter, which is within a group of 6 objections uploaded by Camden on 23rd January 2020. I am writing as the daughter of the owner of 4a Hampstead Hill Gardens, which is the dominant house in the semi-detached pair of 4a and 4b. As my prior objections have not been sufficiently addressed in the revised plan, my letters should be read in conjunction.</p>

#### BASEMENT

The basement is too big, the BIA needs to be revised and a new engineers report needs to be written. The structural engineer's report states that 'there is a major flaw in the planning' which will put the adjoining house at 4a at risk, because 'to reduce a solid wall thickness by half over a significant length will inevitably cause damage to the retained portion of the party wall'. He points out that the underpinning proposal is not normal and therefore 'the party wall to 4a will be significantly more susceptible to damage'. In addition, when the new concrete wall is formed, the reduced thickness of the party wall may not withstand the pressures generated 'causing major damage to 4a'. The area is prone to subsidence and 4a will be at increased risk from ground movement as 'this fundamental change in foundation support at one end of the building is likely to cause damage in the long term.' The engineer concludes that these factors are 'likely to result in significant damage to the remainder of the party wall and potential collapse of the roof and floors supported by the party wall and so this scheme should not be allowed to progress'.

The Town Planner's report reveals that the large size of the basement may cause problems with drainage in a road which already has a flood risk and is close to a flood area. In an area with flood risk a water test should have been done as part of the application. In addition, the basement does not comply with supplementary guidance or relevant local policy A5 on basement development.

The letter from the Chair of the Hampstead Hill Gardens Residents' Association explains in detail why the borehole samples used in the BIA are not valid. The samples need to be current (not from over five and a half years ago) and taken over a seasonally adjusted period of time. This is required by the Hampstead Neighbourhood Forum.

The report from Geotechnical Group shows that the BIA is not compliant with policy A5. It is vague and needs more detail, as it has made assumptions about the existing foundations rather than using facts. Again, the point about the basement creating much deeper foundations than at 4a and affecting ground movement is made, as well as concern about the inadequate depth of the borehole tests.

#### DESIGN

This is a four storey building built on the site of a two storey building, which was previously the garage of 4a and originally part of the tennis court of No4. Clearly a case of creeping development. There has been a small reduction in mass but it is still overdevelopment of the site and the design is aggressive and overbearing. The front is still forward of the existing front building line and the height of the roof ridge is increased compared with the parapet wall in the last application (also not acceptable). The large dormer window at the back would provide the applicant with views of St Stephens Church and the copper beech tree. However, these views would be exclusive to the applicant's family, as they will forever be blocked from view from others who currently enjoy them. The large block of building spoils the view of the street and damages the setting of the grade II listed buildings which surround it.

The Heritage statement explains that the 1870s/80s houses should dominate the street, as they do now. Therefore, 4a and 4b, built in 1950s/60s are an addition to the 'grain and fabric' of the area and should remain

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

in context, at the current size. The roof level of 4b must be compared to that of 4a, its adjoining house, not to the roof level of No6 which is a completely different style and 5 metres away. The proposal does not meet the Camden Planning Guidance as it fails to demonstrate excellence in design and fails to consider the context of the surrounding area. The design is non-compliant with the Building Research Establishment criteria as it darkens the neighbouring gardens at No4 and No2, and substantially affects the view from, and light to, the garden of 4a. It creates loss of outlook and daylight from habitable rooms of 4a. The view of St Stephen's church is blocked from the street and private spaces. The plans fail to preserve the setting of the Grade II listed buildings, contrary to S.66 of the Planning (listed buildings and conservation areas) Act 1990 and also fails to preserve and enhance the character and appearance of the Hampstead Conservation Area, contrary to S.72. Another important reason for this to be rejected is on precedent grounds. This type of overdevelopment and unsympathetic architecture could be repeated in other gaps in this street and also in other conservation areas.

#### OTHER CONTRAVENTIONS OF POLICY

This planning application also goes against the policies of:

The Camden Local Plan 2017 (D1, D2, A1, A5)

The London Plan (2.6,3.5,7.4,7.6) and its heritage policies

The National Planning Policy Framework (para 124, para 127, para 192, para 193)

The Hampstead Conservation Area Statement (H21, H22)

The Hampstead Neighbourhood Plan 2018 (DH1, DH2)

This extended campaign by the applicant which has already lasted 18 months, has caused considerable stress and anxiety to the many people affected, as well as a lot of time and money. The Construction Management Plan states a 'high risk' of noise, dust and vibration continuing for many months, and the work will continue for over a year. The mental and physical health risks are likely to have a serious impact on those living next to and near the building site.

The best option is for the house to be refurbished using the existing massing, so please reject this application once and for all.

---