

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2020/3552/P	Nick Trompeter	28/11/2020 18:01:13	OBJ	I object to this planning application. Sumatra Road already has a very high density of houses converted into HMOs / flats / housing association flats. The prevalence of this type of conversion contributes to anti-social behaviour, fly tipping and littering (all of which are a serious and continuous problem on Sumatra Road). Further, it is inevitable that houses converted into HMOs fall into disrepair, with little incentive for the landlord to undertake the necessary repairs. This can be seen walking up and down Sumatra Road, where a large number of dilapidated and run down houses can be seen. There is no justification whatsoever for losing yet another single occupancy house to an HMO. It might be added that an HMO is likely also to add to pressure on local amenities and parking in the neighbourhood, which is already stretched to the limit.
2020/3552/P	FortuneGreen and West Hampstead NDF	27/11/2020 18:11:40	OBJ	<p>Since the previous application for this site in 2015, turned down on appeal in 2017, much has changed in planning and in West Hampstead. Any general accord with parts of that application by Camden planning or the appeal examiner will need to be newly and fully assessed in light of Camden's revised policies and guidance and The Fortune Green and West Hampstead Neighbourhood Development Plan (NDP). The Fortune Green and West Hampstead Neighbourhood Development Forum (The NDF) objects to this application on the following grounds.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Further conversions of houses to Houses in Multiple Occupation are not necessarily desired in the Area. See POLICY 1: Housing page 14 and Para A5, Page 15 of the NDP.</li> <li>• The amount of accommodation provided, particularly in the basement, and the proposed number of residents is, in our opinion, grossly excessive, and the proposal lacks sufficient facilities for this number of occupants. The external appearance of the rear roof extension is considered acceptable although we are not qualified to judge space/height legalities of the rooms</li> <li>• The planned basement is over 4 times the size of the existing basement and is around 50% larger than the existing footprint of the house which is excessive. The rear extension to the basement drops below the existing basement and is halfway to being a contravention of the NDP being a double depth basement. On the western side there appears to be little support to the neighbour's wall. The light wells in the front take up most of the front garden. All in contravention to the NDP Para A15 page 19</li> <li>• In our view the extension of the basement requires very careful consideration, in terms of construction methods, being full width of the house and going deeper than the existing basement</li> <li>• There is no confirmation that the scheme will be car free.</li> <li>• Access to the cycle racks in the rear garden is via two flight of steps which are also used as access to and from the basement which raises questions of safety , cleanliness , inconvenience and whether the racks will ever be used.</li> </ul> <p>The NDF is pleased to see that if the scheme does go ahead the collapsed frontage is to be replaced as was, and that the frontage roof line exactly matches the adjacent roof lines, in accord with the NDP, and the NDF expects materials to be the same as original, or in the case of the roof, alternatively matching the current adjacent style of tiling.</p>