
From: Hope, Obote
Sent: 06 July 2020 08:49
To: Planning
Subject: FW: 2020/1444/P: Flat 1, 39 Maresfield Gardens

Please log the attached as an objection.

Kind Regards,

Obote Hope
Planner
Regeneration and Planning

The majority of Council staff are now working at home through remote, secure access to our systems.

Where possible please now communicate with us by telephone or email. We have limited staff in our offices to deal with post, but as most staff are homeworking due to the current situation with COVID-19, electronic communications will mean we can respond quickly.

From: John Malet-Bates <[REDACTED]>
Sent: 04 July 2020 20:19
To: Hope, Obote <[REDACTED]>

Subject: 2020/1444/P: Flat 1, 39 Maresfield Gardens

[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 Mr.Hope,
We hope you are well.

HCAAC Objects to the proposals in this application as follows:

1. The mature tree shown on the existing site plan at the north boundary must be retained;
2. Planting along the south boundary is shown to be greatly reduced on the proposed garden plan; note the large hedge seen in one of the photos;
3. Similarly the 5 no. small trees/shrubs at the rear site boundary should be defined and retained - from the aerial view, some at least are substantial mature items;
4. Excessive garden take-up by the proposed outbuilding and extension and by hard landscaping; the proposed terraces are unnecessarily large and excessive relative to garden area;
5. The grass area becomes almost 'token' which reduces if not eliminating biodiversity facility; this is despite the claim of the proposed pond offering (unexplained) biodiversity contribution;

6. Proposed outbuilding though in itself within policy limits is then enlarged by the side extension not envisaged by policy; its full width presentation in both views cannot be welcome; a utility room should be contained within the existing flat.
7. Although the use of the outbuilding is said to be as a gym, the utility attachment and size of the building make it a feasible independent dwelling, especially with the easy side access on the site.
8. While we welcome the proposed introduction of new birch trees, we perceive at least equal loss of existing trees and planting for which the replacements would not compensate.
9. Harm to the CA environmentally is in proliferation of such apparently over-designed schemes with excessive hard landscaping.
10. This scheme threatens practical elimination of existing established bio-diverse activity with uncertain and unconvincing future contribution.

Best regards,
John

John Malet-Bates
For Hampstead CAAC
c/o Flat 6, 4 Ferncroft Avenue, NW3 7PH

