

| Application No: | Consultees Name: | Received: | Comment: | Response: |
|-----------------|------------------|---------------------|----------|---|
| 2020/4570/P | Manoj Nair | 20/11/2020 14:17:50 | COMMNT | <p>Garden Flat, 11 Lindfield Gardens London NW3 6PX</p> <p>To, Ms. Charlotte Meynell Development Management Camden Town Hall Judd Street WC1H 9JE 20th November 2020</p> <p>Ref: Planning Application No. 2020/4570/P</p> |

Dear Ms Meynell,

I am writing to object to the above planning application, which proposes to convert No. 6 Lindfield Gardens, currently a single-family dwelling, into a block of nine flats. As you know Lindfield Gardens comes within a conservation area.

As the owner-occupier of the Garden flat at No. 11 Lindfield Gardens, I am concerned about the impact this development will have on my family's ability to enjoy our home, particularly in terms of additional noise and overlooking. But above all, we are alarmed by the additional 9 residents parking permits which the residents would have to be provided with. Such a request should have to be turned down under Section 106 which refers to no further parking permits being issued. There are already insufficient parking spaces in our road.

I also think that there is a lot one can oppose on the grounds of aesthetics, particularly the front facade. The views of the artificial grass terraces with Velux windows above his swimming pool, demonstrate that any promise to further landscape the front will not be possible. Trees cannot be planted in solid concrete! In 2010 the same owner, Mr Zaidman, reneged on his tree planting obligations to Camden, to replace the trees he felled during the last development. Etc etc visual impact on the conservation area, thanks to its unsympathetic design and disregard for the Edwardian building's remaining architectural character.

Design and Conservation

The applicant states that 'all comments and issues raised' at the pre-planning stage 'have been addressed

Application No: Consultees Name: Received:

Comment: Response:

appropriately to comply with the Council's policies and pre-application recommendations.' Even without sight of the initial pre-application drawings, this is demonstrably not the case.

The Council's Pre-application Advice Letter, dated 14.05.2020, lists numerous grounds for refusal on the basis of damage to the character and historical fabric of this period building in the conservation area. These grounds for refusal have not been addressed in the revised proposal, which continues to contravene the following pre-application advice:

1. 'The applicant seeks to justify substantial rear extensions with the desire to achieve symmetry and a more consistent rear building line. However, it is not considered that symmetry equates to a sympathetic design and the proposed extensions overwhelm the rear elevation. Officers note that the property has been extended a number of times in the past and while the historic character of the rear elevation has been lost at ground level, it retains its basic original form on the upper levels, with an intact roofscape and some original window openings. [...] There is scope to extend at ground floor level to the rear, however further upper floor extensions are not recommended.'

The current proposal disregards the Officer's comments both about the 'overwhelming' upper floor extensions and the homogenizing symmetry of the proposed design, with its undifferentiated rear line. The original Edwardian house was constructed on an asymmetrical plan, featuring a north wing that advanced further into the rear garden, while the south wing was set further back. (That wing featured a finely detailed decorative bay, which was destroyed by the rear extension granted permission in 2006 [2005/5019/P], pursued by the same applicant.) Meanwhile, the house's roof structure combines three gables of different sizes, heights, and degrees of setback, whose asymmetric interplay of intersecting slopes adds visual interest to the whole.

As the Officer states in his pre-application letter, the previous erosion of the house's character at ground level should not be used as a precedent to justify destroying its remaining architectural features at the upper and roof levels.

2. 'The proposed extensions are full height on both wings. The original triple-eaves roof form is infilled, creating a monolithic crown roof, completely altering its profile.'

In the current proposal, the rear extensions are still full height (that is, two-storey) on both wings, while the south wing's proposed roof extension creates, in effect, a three-storey extension on that side of the house. The present rear elevation above ground level will be more or less entirely masked and/or demolished by these additions.

Camden's own design guidance on rear extensions states that 'Extensions that are higher than one full storey below roof eaves/parapet level, or that rise above the general height of neighboring projections and nearby extensions, will be strongly discouraged. This is because such extensions no longer appear

Application No: Consultees Name: Received:

Comment:

Response:

subordinate to the building.' The visual mass and bulk of the proposed upper-level extensions will increase overshadowing and the sense of enclosure through their additional height, destroying in the process the rear elevation's remaining historical fabric and architectural character.

In the current application, drawings of the proposed rear and south-east side elevations make clear just how extensively the roof form is still to be altered, requiring the demolition of a substantial proportion (approaching one third) of the original roof structure. The need to retain this 'intact roofscape' was cited in the pre-application advice as grounds for refusal.

3. 'In addition, four sets of glazed patio doors are proposed up all the rear of the house. These are incongruous when sited at a high level and would not be supported.'

The four sets of glazed patio doors remain in the current proposal. Three are situated at the first and second-floor levels, despite the Council's indication that their inclusion would not be supported. The two sets of patio doors at the first-floor level provide access to those flats' proposed roof terraces. The second-floor patio doors, belonging to proposed Flat 7, lead onto a flat roof marked 'Maintenance Access Only', though there is nothing indicated on the drawings to prevent this area's use as a terrace.

Rear Terraces

The pre-application advice cites the 'noise and disturbance' that would be created by the proposed rear and roof terraces. We are particularly concerned by the two rear terraces at the first-floor level. As the pre-application letter states, 'Each rear terrace would serve a different flat giving the opportunity for occupiers of multiple properties to use these external spaces simultaneously and generate significantly more noise than a single-family household.' The terraces remain in the current proposal, and the concerns raised by the Officer have not been addressed.

Communal Roof Terrace

The proposed communal roof terrace has been reduced in size since the pre-application, but at 24m sq is still large enough to 'generate a significant level of noise and disturbance not typical of Lindfield Gardens, a quiet residential street.'

As the pre-application advice continues, 'the noise generated could travel relatively long distances in all directions.'

Application No: Consultees Name: Received:

Comment: Response:

Furthermore, the Officer states that 'A roof terrace on a new crown roof would be visible, both from the street and in private views, which would be an incongruous feature at high level. The terrace would likely cause more visual harm than is indicated on the submitted drawings due to the potential for the collection of large paraphernalia such as umbrellas and planters associated with its outdoor use.'

Main Entrance at Side of Property

The main entrance for eight out of the nine flats has been relocated to the side of the property adjacent to 8 Lindfield Gardens, tucked away at the end of a narrow passageway where the property's service entrance is currently located. It seems inappropriate to block off that house's present grand main entrance (even if maintained as a dummy door), so as to cram in another studio flat. As a result, the foot traffic associated with eight flats will be directed into the narrow side passageway, where it will cause disturbance and noise to the residents of No. 8. The resulting constricted communal entrance hall is extremely small to serve the residents of eight flats, while its narrowness could cause difficulties with safe evacuation in the event of a fire.

Front Elevation

The developer's Design and Access Statement states that 'The existing front elevation landscaping to the staggered brick framed panels is of poor quality creating an unsightly appearance for the conservation area. The proposed landscape alterations would substantially enhance the appearance of the property by improved boundary treatment and greater use of greenery.'

We agree that the present basement extension frontage is an eyesore that significantly detracts from the Conservation Area and would welcome any planting scheme that would hide it. However, we share the Planning Officer's skepticism as to whether the proposed landscaping would, in fact, 'significantly contribute to enhancing the appearance of the property'.

In fact, the attached landscape design by Jonathan Snow Design simply reiterates, in its projected overall effect of masking and softening the concrete/brickwork, that proposed in 2008/1373/P when the basement extension was originally granted planning permission.

In other words, the applicant is simply proposing, at long last, to implement the type of planting mandated as a condition of that permission – a condition they continue to stand in breach of.

Quality of Accommodation

While recognizing the need for new homes in the area, we are concerned about the density of the proposed accommodation. The current plan appears to compromise the quality of these new dwellings at the expense of cramming in more units than the space can accommodate. The pre-application advice letter expressed

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

concerns as to whether the smaller proposed units would fully comply with all space standards, concluding that the 'quality of accommodation for some flats would be substandard'. Some of those concerns remain in the current proposal. It is still unclear, for example, whether the second-floor units would meet the 2.3m minimum ceiling height across 75% of their Gross Internal Area, since only the '1.5m height line' has been marked on the drawings where the floor space is extensively tucked under the eaves.

Consultation with Neighbours

The Council's pre-application letter concludes by advising the applicant to 'enter into consultation with local residents and the Redington Frognal Neighbourhood Forum at this stage, in order to fully understand and address their concerns before an application is made.'

No such consultation has occurred. This suggests the developer's aggressive disregard for the concerns of neighbours, and unwillingness to work towards a mutually agreeable outcome.

We ask that the Council refuse permission for the reasons above.

Yours Sincerely,

Manoj Nair
Garden Flat, 11 Lindfield Gardens,
Hampstead, London, NW3 6PX

| Application No: | Consultees Name: | Received: | Comment: | Response: |
|-----------------|-------------------|---------------------|----------|---|
| 2020/4570/P | LIDIA TYSZCZUK | 20/11/2020 21:01:15 | OBJ | <p>As a resident living next door to this proposed development at Flat 2, 8 Lindfield Gardens, I totally OBJECT to this planning application on the following grounds:</p> <p>LIGHT POLLUTION & LACK OF PRIVACY</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Severe light pollution & lack of privacy from Flat 4's proposed living area with side windows & large patio doors leading onto a balcony. The proposed side windows alone will spill light directly onto my balcony & into my living space. Equally Flat 4 will have direct views on to my balcony at Flat 2, 8 Lindfield Gardens & vice versa, which is totally unacceptable for both parties. My privacy will be further marred as my balcony will also be very easily observed from the terrace of Flat 4. • One of the main reasons I bought my property is because of the unique open beautiful garden views I look onto, unmarred by light pollution from surrounding buildings or street lights, giving one the feeling of living in the country. The new proposal will also increase the glazed areas to the ground floor rear elevation by @ 25%, adding to the major light spillage problem. <p>NOISE & DISTURBANCE</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The inevitable increased noise level of having 8 extra households living next door-especially as the proposal is to include a communal roof terrace & communal rear balconies that will encourage noisy group outside entertaining, destroying privacy & tranquility. This 'noise & disturbance' pre-application concern raised by the Officer by these proposed outside areas appears still not to have been addressed. <p>HIGH DENSITY ACCOMMODATION</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No.6 is one of the last remaining family single dwelling homes on the street & it should be preserved & remain as such. • The proposed disproportionate high density accommodation at no.6 totally compromises people's living conditions & quality of life & this is particularly relevant to the smaller proposed units. Whilst wishing to provide new homes in Camden, these cramped units simply cannot be passed off as 'affordable housing' in one of the most affluent areas in London?! <p>DESIGN</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The rear extension of Flat 4 will obstruct my current open views of 6 Lindfield Gardens & beyond. The sun also rises from this easterly direction, so morning sunlight into my property will be significantly compromised. • The massing of the extension is out of character with the existing building & the proposals seek to exaggerate an already undesirable solution, where the building line is protruding significantly beyond the building line of the 2 neighbouring properties. Would this therefore set a precedent to extend our building to their new building line? |

Application No: Consultees Name: Received:

Comment:

Response:

POSITION OF MAIN ENTRANCE

- The position of the main entrance for ALL the apartments is on the side of the property (currently the service entrance), adjacent to 8 Lindfield Gdns & hence not in keeping with the character of the other houses in the conservation area which are at the front.

All the pedestrian traffic into the building will run along no.8's side of the property causing constant noise & disturbance to the residents of no.8.

An entrance way in the centre of the front elevation is more appropriate & will result in significantly less disturbance.

Indeed they have made the current grand entrance way completely redundant (proposed to be blocked off) & unusable, which would appear to be contrary to the policies of the conservation area.

Why would you destroy the natural flow of a building & simply keep a mock front door?!

- The side entrance also only appears to be 600mm wide at its tightest point which is substandard & not an acceptable amenity for the inhabitants.

- Do the proposals fully consider the fire risks of having all 8 flats using one narrow single route to exit? Could you please forward the proposed fire strategy to me?

LACK OF CONSULTATION

- As per the Council's recommendation, there has been absolutely NO direct consultation with neighbours or the local neighbourhood association to engage opinion, or show any willingness to work with the community to achieve the best mutually agreeable results.

DISRUPTION

- Finally living next door to this mammoth proposal means huge disruption-a tremendous amount of relentless noise from the building works itself, let alone the traffic jams caused by all the lorries depositing building equipment & materials, on a road that is already a rat run during term time & rush hour.

And with the change to working patterns as a result of the pandemic, working from home through the constant noise level of construction will be absolutely impossible.

Can you please provide me with a Construction Management plan.

I would therefore be very grateful if the Council would take into consideration all my objections & refuse this application on the grounds I have stated.

Many thanks

Lidia Tyszczyk