
From: English, Rachel
Sent: 13 July 2020 09:43
To: Planning
Subject: FW: 4B Hampstead Hill Gardens. Planning Application 2019/5835/P

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Completed

Please log

Rachel English
Senior Planner

Telephone: 020 7974 2726



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: Andrew Neale [REDACTED]
Sent: 10 July 2020 14:27
To: English, Rachel <Rachel.English@camden.gov.uk>
Subject: 4B Hampstead Hill Gardens. Planning Application 2019/5835/P

[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 Rachel,

I have noted the recent amendments to the above proposals.
These changes do not address the ‘in principle’ design objections raised in correspondence of 26 Feb 2020 (attached).
On this basis our objection still stands.

Regards

Andrew Neale

Chairman, Downshire Hill Residents Association.

Begin forwarded message:

From: Andrew Neale [REDACTED]
Date: 26 February 2020 at 18:01:36 GMT
To: Rachel English <rachel.english@camden.gov.uk>
Subject: 4B Hampstead Hill Gardens. Planning Application 2019/5835/P

Dear Rachel,

I write to object to the above application.

The proposed design and massing is detrimental to the immediate setting and harmful to the conservation area, and would set an undesirable precedent.

The existing building is constructed on garden land excised from the original garden of No 4, and departs from the original urban form and consistent settlement pattern and grain.

This existing building, of no architectural merit, has already seen its one storey garage area extended upwards, and converted into a house on a yet smaller subdivided plot in further contrast to the scale and grain of the setting.

Despite its lack of design quality the original building with its one storey garage, at least had the merit of a discrete height, maintaining a subservient relationship to its neighbours, acknowledging a cramped site.

Any development on this sub-divided plot should be constrained within its current footprint and height. There is no case for an extension upwards which totally unbalances the relationship of 4A and 4B as seen from both the front and rear views. Resort to complex geometries and elaborate elevational surface treatments do not disguise this anomaly, and actually draw further attention to the massing incongruity in relation to the original host building.

Furthermore there is no case for any extra projection beyond the existing frontage line which again exacerbates an unsatisfactory relationship.

These are the primary reasons for objection, but it should be noted that the attempt to create a 4 bedroom house on this plot also raises a number of qualitative accommodation concerns. Important habitable accommodation, namely the family dining and kitchen area, is in a full basement served only by a rooflight, and as such is heavily compromised and without aspect. The existing garden space is already very confined and disproportionately small for what would become a 4 bedroom family house, and is out of character with the scale and nature of the surrounding gardens. The insertion of a large rooflight impacts the practicality of the limited garden space and may also introduce a light pollution concern (note Camden's guidance on basements).

These further factors reaffirm the overall assessment that this proposal would be an inappropriate overdevelopment in the conservation area.

Regards

Andrew Neale

Chairman, Downshire Hill Residents Association