

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2020/1671/P	David Morgan	28/10/2020 22:13:19	OBJ	<p>Unlike the 2008 plan, the 2020 proposal is not in keeping with the rest of the street's charismatic houses. The 2nd floor at the front, where a pitched roof approved in the 2008 plan has been replaced by terraces, is overbearing in my opinion.</p> <p>I have concerns that the two floors in the roof would constitute overdevelopment of the building, and set a dangerous precedent for the rest of the street. Whilst my privacy isn't infringed upon by this proposal, it would be if other houses were permitted to follow suit.</p>

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2020/1671/P	Sofia De Cristofaro	25/10/2020 19:36:13	OBJ	<p>We strongly object to this application for the following reasons:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. This is just the latest change of plan for the site since we have moved into our house seven years ago, from which time number 2 has been nothing but a building site and eyesore as well as environmental hazard. We have heard all sorts of plans for the works that were being planned since the heavy construction has started, including a family house with a swimming pool. Now that the same developer is re-doing a house across the road, it is clear they are just seeking to create as many flats as possible for profit, and misleading us local residents about the plans. 2. The sheer length of time and scale of the works (including a huge excavation at the back planned for a swimming pool/basement now clearly designed to create more flats) has been extremely disruptive and a severe nuisance for us who live nearby. 3. For years now there have been parking suspensions, large trucks blocking access, use of heavy machinery and ground works which have created dirt, noise and pollution and damage to our and the adjacent houses as well as disruption to our ability to walk, make use of the front garden or park our cars in front of our house. The builders themselves have not been an issue or difficult, but the nature of the works means this disruption has been inevitable and constant. We have had no offer to remediate these issues or even apology or contact from the owner and developer. 4. We have also noticed damage and cracks to the pavement and front garden and cracks on our own walls since the latest episode of works and the heavy trucks moving in and out in front of our house and the excavation of a large amount of ground just a few doors up. This causes us a lot of concern about the stability of the ground under and around our house. The issues many London buildings have with subsidence are well known, and this part of the West Hampstead is not spared from them, as shown amongst other things by the fact that our own house had an episode of subsidence about 20 years ago, which still makes it very hard for us to get home insurance, and that the house next to ours, across the road, No. 6, has iron beams installed across the floors to give it more stability. We are greatly worried about the medium-term consequences that the excavation of two underground floors on, essentially, a slope, will cause to the stability of all our homes, forcing expensive structural works on many residents. We wonder if an adequate structural analysis and assessment has been carried out and what guarantees can be given to us residents that any damage caused will be monitored and restored. 5. It does not appear to us that there has been adequate supervision or consultation by the owners, developers or council of the works at all up to this date (lasting at least seven years, and we understand even longer). We simply do not understand how long these works and the building site have been, and will be, allowed to continue in this form without any consideration of us residents directly affected. 6. In respect of the latest plans to create a large number of flats, we are astonished this would be considered by the council, given other proposed developments in the area and objections to those. The further drain on local resources, the environment, utilities and car parking spaces, all of which are already under strain in a densely populated area, will be significant and we have not seen or heard of any proposals to address concerns in these areas. 7. The plans we have seen also seem to us to create a large building completely out of proportion and character with our neighboring terraced houses at this end of Hillfield Road, and indicate to us that there is going to be a lot more heavy building work, disruption and damage to our houses and environment. We urge the council to reject this new application and compel the developer and owner to complete the works in a satisfactory fashion in keeping with the existing landscape and environment as soon as possible, and to also look into the damage and disturbance caused to date. It is intolerable that the plans keep on changing, causing further delay and for us local residents, further disturbance and damage to our homes.

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2020/1671/P	Linda Sluys	23/10/2020 11:38:54	OBJ	<p>I object strongly to the proposed development.</p> <p>It will be an overdevelopment of a very small corner of the area. The proposed double basement (loss of garden green space), three storey extension contravenes many of the Policies in the Neighbourhood Development Plan and indeed appears to breach many of Camden's own regulations. There is no affordable housing. The cycle spaces are inadequate. Parking is at a premium on this corner but there is no mention of car free units. Safety in crossing the road is already compromised by the coming and going of construction vehicles and will be more so with the additional high density housing. It is not in keeping with the area. This corner is often used by teachers taking children from the nearby school in a 'crocodile' walk.</p> <p>Furthermore, as construction has been going on here for about 9 years, with mounds of earth having been extracted, how has this application only just been applied for. I would suggest that the owner developer of the properties has been derelict in duty by not applying until now. He has shown no regard for local residents until now and sadly feel that his contempt will continue.</p>

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2020/1671/P	Eleanor Naughten	26/10/2020 08:34:11	OBJNOT	<p>We wish to object in the strongest possible terms to the proposal for development of this property on the following grounds:</p> <p>Factual inaccuracy Application “seeks to regularise a number of recently approved planning applications” is entirely fictitious in a number of ways and demonstrates that this is a site which has been poorly managed for many many years and should be given an immediate order of completion for the existing approved planning permission, not given permission for an even bigger development which will likely take a further 15-20 years to complete based on current progress. Firstly the approved planning permissions are in no way recent. They date from 2007 (2007/2689/P, 2007/6306/P and 2008/1472/P – the original permission to develop two flats into two vertical dwelling houses and a basement for a swimming pool, and 2015 (2015/6120/P) which was an application for a Green roof which was a condition of the original approval. All that has happened since the approval of these is that the owner has dug an extraordinarily large hole in the property and caused a very significant amount of nuisance, disturbance and stress to the other residents of the cul de sac. Further the application asserts that the developer is “local and [a] contractor who has a history of delivering high quality housing and been a part of the Camden community for over 10 years”. This is clearly a falsehood unless the mark of a good developer is to build extremely large holes and fail to complete any building work for over 13 years! And sadly for the residents of Hillfield Road he has been a (unwelcome) part of the community for 13 years not 10!</p> <p>Negative Visual Impact and adverse impact on the character of the street This is an overly large, very ugly proposed development which is too big for the site in which it is proposed to sit. The design is out of character with the buildings surrounding and will have a significant negative visual impact. The application asserts that the “visual gap” due to the flat roof of the 3 properties at the end of the cul de sac will be addressed by this development. However, we believe that quite to the contrary, the excessively high and ugly roof extension at the front will only serve to exacerbate the differential between the neighbouring properties. This is particularly true given the roof of number 2A Hillfield Road will remain at the current lower height. Furthermore, the roof extension is not remotely in line with the roofs of 4, 4a and 2b Hillfield Road, which form a neat and uniform terrace. As can be seen from the application itself, the roof extension will be very significantly higher than the roofs of the other houses in the terrace. The application makes much of spurious comparisons of levels of different buildings but neglects to point out that this is a) due to the fact that the whole cul de sac is on a hill, b) the buildings as they currently stand have been in place generally for a significant period of time and c) the proposed development is not at all in line with the neighbouring properties and will be much higher and as a result a very obvious eyesore. The visual impact is not only negative at the front. Although as the application points out, gardens in this part of the street are small, the presence of these gardens in marking a natural divide between this and the back of the flats above the shops on Mill Lane is a crucial part of the character of the street and this major development up to 3 stories of the small back garden will severely degrade the character the remaining houses on this side of the cul de sac and all the residents of the flats on Mill Lane. The reality is that this proposed development is too large, very ugly and will result in very significant negative visual impact, and very significantly and adversely impact the character of the street at the front and at the back.</p> <p>Ugly, overbearing design Apart from keeping the front elevation up to the existing 2nd story, this building has been designed without any consideration for the way in which it impacts the local area. It is out of character and ugly. In particular, the</p>

Application No: Consultees Name: Received:

Comment: Response:

design of the zinc dormer roof is ghastly and totally out of character with the other roofs locally. The overbearing size of the proposal exacerbates this issue very significantly.

Loss of amenity

The proposed rear extension is clearly far too large and will leave a very ugly and oddly small gap to the flats which are to the South. It will overlook our garden significantly reducing any privacy we may have, significantly reducing light to our garden and resulting in a major loss of amenity. The amenity loss will be even worse in number 2a Hillfield, and will also impact numbers 4 and 4a, as well as the flats on Mill Lane.

The application suggests that the size of the building will be the same as numbers 2b, 4 and 4a due to the fact it will have 3 stories. However, these houses have only a very small 3rd storey which is not developed all the way back, so this design will be out of line and overlook our roof terraces resulting in a significant loss of amenity.

The application also says it will be a similar height to the flats on Mill Lane. The flats on Mill Lane are approximately 3-4 metres higher than any of the other properties on Hillfield Road demonstrating that this proposal is clearly far too big and not in line with the other houses in this terrace. The reality is that the back of the proposed property will be significantly higher than the back of our property, thus this will exacerbate the impact of overshadowing, loss of privacy and loss of light on all the other 4 properties on the cul de sac. The report around loss of daylight and sunlight demonstrates that a large number of properties will be negatively impacted by this development. The report dismisses this as irrelevant as they are "probably" bedrooms but that total aggregate impact is clearly very large due to the very significant size of this development compared to the size of the site.

Density and Overdevelopment

This development represents "garden grabbing" in the extreme. The proposal is for 9 flats in place of 2 flats currently (with current permission for 2 dwelling houses). This is a very significant increase for a relatively small plot and shows that this developer is seeking to put far too many properties into this small space. This will result in loss of amenity for the local residents with a substantial increase in noise likely from cramming 9 families into a space fit for 2.

The development is not designed to be car free and there is a possibility that 9 flats could result in 18 extra cars trying to park in the road. Indeed the proposed bike store would only support 6 bikes which is probably because there is not room for any more. It demonstrates yet again that trying to squeeze 9 flats into this small plot is far too dense. It also demonstrates that the likely impact of additional cars from this proposal will be significant. This is a tiny cul de sac where parking is already challenging. Even 9 extra cars would be unsustainable and demonstrates how inappropriate the size of this development is for this small cul de sac. It should be noted that even if the permission was granted without allowance for parking, the parking restrictions in this area are only from 10-12 so this would be unlikely to deter the future owners of these many flats from owning and parking cars in the area.

The application suggests the development will bring diversity to the community but makes no mention of any units for social housing and given the price of properties in the area, is unlikely to be affordable or support the reduction of the housing list locally.

Summary:

We object to this development as ugly, overly dense, resulting in significant loss of amenity and being out of character with the local area. It is extreme garden grabbing. Furthermore, the developer has a track record on this plot of failing to develop anything. He should not be given any more permissions but should be forced to finish what he started over 13 years ago.

Finally we would note that there is a supporting comment already from Anna Proud who purports to be a director of the management company at number 5 Hillfield Road. Given Anna Proud is the partner (family and

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
				<p>business) of the applicant, and has never lived at 5 Hillfield Road, this comment should be discounted as a self supporting comment from the applicant. We understand her and the applicant bought the flat at number 5 Hillfield Road recently, presumably to try to reduce objections to their horrendous schemes for numbers 2 and 3 Hillfield Road which they also own.</p> <p>Furthermore, whilst there are a couple of additional supportive comments, in most cases these individuals do not indicate where they live or why they support, apart from one person who admits he is a letting agent so must be rubbing his hands in glee at the prospect of being able to let 9 flats in such a small plot. These comments should be viewed with caution given there is no clarity on why they are supportive. Eleanor and Cormac Naughten</p>
2020/1671/P	John and Vesta Curtis	23/10/2020 21:26:48	PETITNOBJ E	<p>We would like to register the strongest possible objection to application no. 2020/1671/P.</p> <p>Various applications have been submitted in the last twelve years for the development of 2 Hillfield Road. Starting in 2007 and continuing until the present time the same developer has applied for the construction of two houses with a swimming pool in the basement in 2007 (2007/2689/P, 2007/6306/p and 2008/1472/P) to the most recent one (application number: 2020/1671/P) of 'the conversion of 2 dwelling houses (Class C3) into 9 x self-contained flats (Class C3), associated alterations'. One can only assume that it was his intention from the outset to create 9 flats in this building and that the swimming-pool was a ruse to dig out the basement. The cynical and calculating behavior of this developer is evidenced by the fact that he (and "Anna") recently sent a pathetic letter (9th November 2019, available for inspection if required) to all local residents urging them not to object to his planning application for No. 3 (which he also owns), as he was "only seeking to make a home for his wife and family"!</p> <p>The 'development' of no. 2 has been ongoing for an incredible 12 years and the only result has been the digging of a massive hole which has become a haven for rats. Lorries removing the earth arrive as early as 7.30 am blocking the cul-se-sac end of Hillfield Road causing considerable inconvenience to local residents. The pavement outside no 2 is cracked, sunken and broken and usually covered with clay. No. 2 is hidden behind an unsightly hoarding. This is planning blight of the worst kind and should not be tolerated by Camden Council.</p> <p>Objections to the application are as follows: -</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The provision of 9 flats is clearly over development of a small site. 2. The existing attractive roof-line will be disrupted. 3. The Victorian character of Hillfield Road/Gondar Gardens will be undermined. 4. The provision of 9 apartments here will put an intolerable strain on the already limited parking facilities. <p>It is nothing short of scandalous that this development should have been allowed by Camden Council to drag on for 12 years without any end in sight, and it is incredible that a new planning application is even being considered at this stage.</p>

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2020/1671/P	FortuneGreen and West Hampstead NDF	25/10/2020 13:16:03	OBJ	<p>2020/1671/P</p> <p>Fortune Green and West Hampstead Neighbourhood Forum object to this proposal. We note that the Fortune Green and West Hampstead Neighbourhood Plan (NDP) is not mentioned in this application and clearly it has not been consulted.</p> <p>Height</p> <p>The proposed development raises the roof line considerably above the roof line of adjacent neighbouring houses. This is in direct contradiction to policy 2 of the NDP. The proposal suggests that the buildings to the rear of the site on Mill Lane are higher than those on Hillfield Road. It is a basic premise of the architecture of West Hampstead that buildings on the main streets are higher than those in streets behind the main streets.</p> <p>Materials</p> <p>The proposed roof is to be "natural" zinc and contrary to Policy 2 of the NDP. Zinc is not one of the materials historically used for roofs in low rise streets in West Hampstead, particularly in a terraced street such as Hillfield Road which has slate or tiles on all the pitched front roofs. Indeed all the roofs in Hillfield Road have traditional pitched roofs.</p> <p>Loss of private green space</p> <p>The basement in this proposal extends across the front garden, with large lightwells and hard surfacing on the small remaining space. Half the remaining small rear garden is taken by basement with a concrete pit taking up the rest of the rear garden, leaving no green space at all.</p> <p>The light wells and the rear pit appear to be extremely dangerous for wild life. Policy 2 and policy 16 refer to the need to maintain green space and the importance of wildlife.</p> <p>Basements</p> <p>Basements, in particular two storey basements, are a matter for concern in the area as described in Policy 2 of the NDP. It also seems that any deeper basement, or added "pits" to the rear of the building in this new application should have revised basement assessments.</p> <p>Overdevelopment/Massing</p> <p>The design and access statement shows clearly that the massing of the development is greater than that of its neighbours. The rear extension is higher than all other rear extensions, and comprises an extra storey. Twenty bedrooms seems a high for a development of this size footprint.</p> <p>Parking</p> <p>There is no reference to restrictions on parking rights for the flats as now generally required for all new flats in this area.</p>

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2020/1671/P	Fernando	27/10/2020 21:35:56	OBJ	<p>I would like to object to this proposed development.</p> <p>I feel that what is being proposed is excessive for the area and will affect our property by reducing sunlight exposure for one.</p> <p>Privacy and noise is also going to be a concern with more people, windows and balconies facing our building. Local street parking spaces are also going to be affected with more families moving into the immediate area.</p> <p>We have been putting up with construction noise and disruption from this site for more than 10 years. Never mind the building site we have had to look at, out of our windows for that whole time too.</p>

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2020/1671/P	A J Kelly	28/10/2020 09:45:08	OBJNOT	COMMENTS ON 2020/1671/P

I would like to object to this application. The drawings on the front covers of the Design Access statement and the Daylight and Sunlight report are perfect illustrations of why. This development would stick out like a sore thumb. It is ugly, overbearing, too dense and will result in considerable loss of amenity for neighbouring properties.

Incidentally, a cursory reading of the DAS reveals several misleading statements. Firstly, it says "the developer has a history of delivering high quality housing and has been part of the Camden community over 10 years". One only has to look at the photos of the existing site or visit the Hillfield Road cul-de-sac to see the "high quality housing" he has delivered. Numbers 2 and 3 are both owned by him and he has reduced two fine residential properties into uninhabitable derelict sites over 12 and 7 years respectively.

The work associated with these two non-developments has been carried out with no regard whatsoever to the affect of those of us living in the cul-de-sac and has also gone on longer than can possibly be warranted. No end is in sight after 12 years. Mr Sebba has indeed been "part of [our] community" but in the way Attila the Hun was part of the community of the Roman Empire.

Secondly, the DAS makes mistakes about the history of number 2. It is clear from the OS map for 1896 that there was building on the site of number 2 with a garden. It seems that, at that time, the three houses to the east had already been built as had the terrace on the north side of the road. At that time, number 2 was a detached property in a larger garden.

By 1915, as shown on the OS map for that year, the building at number had been turned into one larger house (number 2 before Mr Sebba got his hands on it) and the house to the east (2a) and the neighbouring property, Gondar House, in Gondar Gardens had also been built.

It is obvious that this terrace differs from the buildings opposite and the three properties to the east because it was built around the older building and it was designed to complement the design of that existing building. It is therefore of historical importance and the original design should be preserved.

In addition, the application is not seeking "to regularise a number of recently approved" applications. The permissions are historic and the developer has simply failed to implement them within a reasonable time but instead has just dug a very large hole, causing disruption, nuisance and annoyance to those of us living in the cul-de-sac - documented extensively over the years.

This has taken him 12 years. A small child with a bucket and spade could have dug it faster.

Over-development and density

Turning now to the current proposal, this represents a gross over-development of the site. In fact, it almost feels like a practical joke. Surely no serious developer could suggest this scheme?

It is ridiculous to put nine flats on a site which was, since at least 1980, two flats with permission to turn them (back?) into two houses. To do this by putting four flats into a double basement and extending upwards by two floors is quite simply overdevelopment on a grand scale.

Application No: Consultees Name: Received:

Comment: Response:

The existing small gardens at the front and back will almost disappear - extraordinary garden grabbing on a site with very limited green space in a built up city area. Virtually no recreational space will remain. The proposal seeks to build over the whole site and squeeze every last drop of money out of the development.

The flats will be very cramped and the lower ones will lack natural light, condemning the inhabitants to a troglodyte existence and severe vitamin D deficiency. Four flats in a double basement is ludicrously dense as is extending upwards by two floors.

Design

As I have already said, this building will stick out like a sore thumb as it is far too big for the site and aesthetically most unpleasing. The sing roof is a particular monstrosity.

It is overbearing out of scale and out of character with existing development in the area. Over 30 years ago, the original double fronted detached house at no 15 Hillfield Road was re-developed and, although the development resulted in the loss of a lovely building, it was at least developed in a way that was in keeping with the neighbouring properties.

It will raise the height of the middle of this terrace (including the Gondar House property by two floors. It will turn an attractive late Victorian terrace, with a pleasing countrified look, as a nod to the rural nature of this area until the after 1876, into an unattractive modern block totally out of keeping with the character of surrounding properties. The visual impact will destroy this part of Hillfield Road.

Loss of amenity

Because of its size and height, this development will result in considerable loss of amenity to the residents of the cul-de-sac, those in Mill Lane at the rear and in Gondar Gardens to the west.

Building such a monstrously large building in this small space will result in considerable loss of privacy and light to the neighbouring properties, as well as overshadowing and overlooking, particularly from the terrace.

Inevitably putting nine additional households into this small site will mean greater noise and disturbance emanating from the property particularly the terrace on the third floor.

Parking

There is no mention the flats being car-free and this will therefore put a further burden on the limited parking in the area. Even if the flats were to be designated a car free, the fact that the controlled parking hours are only 10-12 weekdays means that they will not deter car ownership.

Affordable housing

What the borough lacks is high quality affordable housing. It does not need any more expensive properties which serve only to line the pockets of developers. There is no mention of any of these flats being affordable housing and I suspect that the most that is likely to come out of this application is a small contribution to affordable housing elsewhere. It would be great if a substantial part of the existing site (not this crazy nine flat notion) could be devoted to high quality affordable housing.

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

Finally. I see that a few supportive comments have been submitted. I would urge caution about attributing too much weight to these. At least one is from a known associate of the applicant and I think it is entirely possible that others are too; else, why bother to say anything about a development proposal that does not affect you in any way?

Anna Proud is Mr Sebba's domestic partner and his co-director of Gondar Gardens Investment Company Limited. She could be said to have a pecuniary interest in the development and it is extraordinary that she apparently considers that it is appropriate to comment on this proposal.

A J Kelly
October 2020

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2020/1671/P	A J Kelly	28/10/2020 09:45:05	OBJNOT	COMMENTS ON 2020/1671/P

I would like to object to this application. The drawings on the front covers of the Design Access statement and the Daylight and Sunlight report are perfect illustrations of why. This development would stick out like a sore thumb. It is ugly, overbearing, too dense and will result in considerable loss of amenity for neighbouring properties.

Incidentally, a cursory reading of the DAS reveals several misleading statements. Firstly, it says "the developer has a history of delivering high quality housing and has been part of the Camden community over 10 years". One only has to look at the photos of the existing site or visit the Hillfield Road cul-de-sac to see the "high quality housing" he has delivered. Numbers 2 and 3 are both owned by him and he has reduced two fine residential properties into uninhabitable derelict sites over 12 and 7 years respectively.

The work associated with these two non-developments has been carried out with no regard whatsoever to the affect of those of us living in the cul-de-sac and has also gone on longer than can possibly be warranted. No end is in sight after 12 years. Mr Sebba has indeed been "part of [our] community" but in the way Attila the Hun was part of the community of the Roman Empire.

Secondly, the DAS makes mistakes about the history of number 2. It is clear from the OS map for 1896 that there was building on the site of number 2 with a garden. It seems that, at that time, the three houses to the east had already been built as had the terrace on the north side of the road. At that time, number 2 was a detached property in a larger garden.

By 1915, as shown on the OS map for that year, the building at number had been turned into one larger house (number 2 before Mr Sebba got his hands on it) and the house to the east (2a) and the neighbouring property, Gondar House, in Gondar Gardens had also been built.

It is obvious that this terrace differs from the buildings opposite and the three properties to the east because it was built around the older building and it was designed to complement the design of that existing building. It is therefore of historical importance and the original design should be preserved.

In addition, the application is not seeking "to regularise a number of recently approved" applications. The permissions are historic and the developer has simply failed to implement them within a reasonable time but instead has just dug a very large hole, causing disruption, nuisance and annoyance to those of us living in the cul-de-sac - documented extensively over the years.

This has taken him 12 years. A small child with a bucket and spade could have dug it faster.

Over-development and density

Turning now to the current proposal, this represents a gross over-development of the site. In fact, it almost feels like a practical joke. Surely no serious developer could suggest this scheme?

It is ridiculous to put nine flats on a site which was, since at least 1980, two flats with permission to turn them (back?) into two houses. To do this by putting four flats into a double basement and extending upwards by two floors is quite simply overdevelopment on a grand scale.

Application No: Consultees Name: Received:

Comment: Response:

The existing small gardens at the front and back will almost disappear - extraordinary garden grabbing on a site with very limited green space in a built up city area. Virtually no recreational space will remain. The proposal seeks to build over the whole site and squeeze every last drop of money out of the development.

The flats will be very cramped and the lower ones will lack natural light, condemning the inhabitants to a troglodyte existence and severe vitamin D deficiency. Four flats in a double basement is ludicrously dense as is extending upwards by two floors.

Design

As I have already said, this building will stick out like a sore thumb as it is far too big for the site and aesthetically most unpleasing. The sing roof is a particular monstrosity.

It is overbearing out of scale and out of character with existing development in the area. Over 30 years ago, the original double fronted detached house at no 15 Hillfield Road was re-developed and, although the development resulted in the loss of a lovely building, it was at least developed in a way that was in keeping with the neighbouring properties.

It will raise the height of the middle of this terrace (including the Gondar House property by two floors. It will turn an attractive late Victorian terrace, with a pleasing countrified look, as a nod to the rural nature of this area until the after 1876, into an unattractive modern block totally out of keeping with the character of surrounding properties. The visual impact will destroy this part of Hillfield Road.

Loss of amenity

Because of its size and height, this development will result in considerable loss of amenity to the residents of the cul-de-sac, those in Mill Lane at the rear and in Gondar Gardens to the west.

Building such a monstrously large building in this small space will result in considerable loss of privacy and light to the neighbouring properties, as well as overshadowing and overlooking, particularly from the terrace.

Inevitably putting nine additional households into this small site will mean greater noise and disturbance emanating from the property particularly the terrace on the third floor.

Parking

There is no mention the flats being car-free and this will therefore put a further burden on the limited parking in the area. Even if the flats were to be designated a car free, the fact that the controlled parking hours are only 10-12 weekdays means that they will not deter car ownership.

Affordable housing

What the borough lacks is high quality affordable housing. It does not need any more expensive properties which serve only to line the pockets of developers. There is no mention of any of these flats being affordable housing and I suspect that the most that is likely to come out of this application is a small contribution to affordable housing elsewhere. It would be great if a substantial part of the existing site (not this crazy nine flat notion) could be devoted to high quality affordable housing.

Application No: **Consultees Name:** **Received:**

Comment: **Response:**

Finally. I see that a few supportive comments have been submitted. I would urge caution about attributing too much weight to these. At least one is from a known associate of the applicant and I think it is entirely possible that others are too; else, why bother to say anything about a development proposal that does not affect you in any way?

Anna Proud is Mr Sebba's domestic partner and his co-director of Gondar Gardens Investment Company Limited. She could be said to have a pecuniary interest in the development and it is extraordinary that she apparently considers that it is appropriate to comment on this proposal.

A J Kelly
October 2020
