

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:
2020/3553/P	Eleanor Naughten	11/11/2020 17:23:19	OBJNOT

Response:

I am writing to object to the revised proposals for this application. Our original objection is below, and we believe all the points raised below remain valid objections to the revised development so please consider these as part of my objection. However, we wish to add some additional specific comments about the alterations made (which we assume were made because it was clear that the original application was totally inappropriate) and why I believe it remains, out of scale, inappropriate and garden grabbing.

First, although the development has been reduced slightly in height it remains extremely large and will result in an unacceptable loss of amenity for the neighbouring properties. I believe that my comments below on this topic remain valid. It will continue to be very close to a number of neighbouring properties significantly affecting their outlook and overshadowing them substantially.

Second, the number of flats has not been reduced and this remains far too dense a development for the site and is garden grabbing in the extreme. It will result in the overly dense development of this area. Whilst I make this comment on a stand alone basis for this application, I believe that this must be considered in conjunction with the recently approved application for a major development of 1 Hillfeld road. In aggregate this application would result in a dwelling house originally composing 2 flats and a garden, becoming home to 11 families. This is an extreme case of overdevelopment.

The design of the building remains overbearing and out of sync with the rest of the area and the building will continue to be too close to other buildings in the area. This is a design which is ugly and out of keeping with the area. I would make the point that the revised application appears to attempt to make this revision look more appealing by drawing a few extra trees in front of the monstrosity proposed. It should be noted that in parallel to this application, the applicant has also made a request to fell 4 trees and substantially prune a number of others which are covered by Tree Protection Orders on this land with no rationale given (we assume the rationale is to make way for this horrendous proposal), so it seems that in fact there will be less greenery for this revised proposal. Therefore the pathetic attempt to make this look "nicer" in the drawings by adding trees should be discounted from any assessment.

All the other factors noted below are not affected by any of the revised proposals and so remain valid objections in our view and should be read as part of this objection.

In summary, we object on the following grounds:

- Loss of Amenity
- Unacceptable density
- Design and visual impact
- Increased risk of flooding
- Increased risk of subsidence
- Conflict with rationale for approval of previous application on site
- No provision for social housing

ORIGINAL COMMENTS SUBMITTED ON 11th SEPTEMBER

Subject: Comments on 2020/3553/P have been received by the council.

We would like to object to the proposed development 2020/3553/P at 1 Hillfield Road on the following

Application No: Consultees Name: Received:

Comment:

Response:

grounds:

- Loss of Amenity
- Unacceptable density
- Design and visual impact
- Increased risk of flooding
- Increased risk of subsidence
- Conflict with rationale for approval of previous application on site
- No provision for social housing

1) Loss of Amenity: The proposed development is a large entirely new building on a substantial proportion of the current garden of 1 Hillfield Road. It will result in a significant loss of privacy for many neighbours, substantially overshadowing their properties. It will block light from South Mansions, Gondar House and 1 Hillfield Road, as well as the gardens of 3-7 Hillfield Road, resulting in the loss of a view of open land, loss of privacy and probably noise disturbance due to the extremely close proximity.

2) Unacceptable density and site overdevelopment: The council have only just approved a substantial redevelopment of the main existing building on this site, including a major basement; Adding this substantial building with six flats will result in far too high density of usage of this land and significant loss of the open aspect of the neighbourhood. The proposal would result in a significant new building which runs extremely close to the boundaries of all the above mentioned properties. This proposal would lead the site moving from providing 3 x 1 bed flats and a garden to a site with 10 flats and virtually no garden. It is garden grabbing in the extreme and seeks to cram far too many properties into this site.

3) The design: The Building will reach across the entire garden and border extremely closely a number of properties including the back of houses on Gondar gardens, South Mansions, and properties on Hillfield Road. This design will lead to significant visual impact due to the extreme size of the building compared to the site and the fact it is going to be so close to so many other properties, resulting in a cramped look, more similar to a Mumbai slum than a pleasant neighbourhood in London. Furthermore the building design is not in keeping with the Victorian properties and mansion blocks in the area. Given it's horrendous scale it will be very damaging visually.

4) Increased risk of flooding: The flood risk report in the pack is a whitewash and simply untrue. It claims there is no evidence of flooding in this part of Hillfield Road. However, I am aware that a number of properties on that side of the cul de sac in hillfield Road have had to install pumps to prevent endemic flooding from the watertable. With the already approved developments, this further major development will put the whole area at significant risk of major flooding and related risks.

5) Increased risk of subsidence: A number of the properties on the same side of the Hillfield Road cul de sac have previously suffered from subsidence. A further major basement development will put all the properties in the area at further risk of subsidence

6) Conflict with approval of previous development of main property at 1 Hillfield Road: We understand that in the Planning Committee meeting which led to the approval of the initial 1 Hillfield Road development, the Council insisted that the extra waste generated by this major development would be stored at the rear of the house. If this development at the rear of the house is undertaken, how will the developer get rid of this waste, and the new waste generated by the development of the entire garden? Hillfield Road cul de sac is small and unable to sustain any further major developments.

7) No provision for social housing: the application refers to "much needed housing" but does not allow for any social housing and so will not contribute to reducing the housing waiting list in Camden, despite seeking to cram 10 properties into a site which previously provided for only 3 x 1 bed units. Any proposal to allow the

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

developer to submit a sum to the social housing fund should be based on the value of the properties being proposed so ensure it really does support the reduction of the housing waiting list in the borough.

In summary this development is entirely out of keeping with the local area, will result in significant loss of amenity for residents, resulting in far too high density of housing on this site, is so large it will be very damaging visually, and will put local properties at risk of subsidence and flooding.

Furthermore it should be noted that although the application states that a consultation has been performed, as extremely close neighbours of the property, we were not contacted at all as part of this consultation so the consultation cannot be considered effective and should be discounted. Finally the proposal that this is a “car free development” but this is disingenuous. The parking controls on Gondar Gardens and Hillfield road are only between 10-12pm and very poorly enforced so residents could easily have a car and drive to work. It is very hard to find parking in the road in the evening and 10 additional flats with possibly 2 cars per flat would be very damaging. We would also point out that the times stated to walk to the train stations nearby are not realistic. For most people the tube is at least a 15 minute walk away, meaning residents are likely to want cars.
