

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2020/4971/P	Fortune Green and Wet Hampstead NDF	14/12/2020 18:46:08	OBJ	The Fortune Green and Wet Hampstead NDF objects to this proposal because its depth, height, bulk, mass and design would be overly large and disproportionate in size to the original building and would be detrimental to the character and appearance of the host property and the surrounding area contrary to Policy D1 (Design) of the Camden Local Plan 2017 and Policy 2 (Design and Character) of the Fortune Green and West Hampstead Neighbourhood Plan 2015.
2020/4971/P	Bruno Linder	16/12/2020 15:12:37	OBJ	<p>I'd like to strongly object to the proposed development. The end of Hillfield Road has seen its green space and gardens shrinking at a scary and worrying speed recently and any further extension should be prevented at any cost.</p> <p>I moved here 5 years ago and it feels like every year the view and green space is replaced by bricks and mortar which is a shame and completely unnecessary, as well as not in sync at all with the current character of the neighborhood.</p> <p>Besides that, residents are simply very frustrated with the endless work being undertaken left, right and center in this end of Hillfield Rd (current and planned) - most of it being done without party walls being served, etc.</p> <p>My flat has already suffered damages as a result and we/I don't need more; nor do we need more noise, more bricks, more shrinking gardens and generally more inconvenience.</p>
2020/4971/P	Linda Sluys	19/12/2020 12:31:15	OBJ	The applicant has already had many refusals on these two properties which are far from being family friendly and will be suitable only for flat shares due to the inevitable high rent. There isn't any clarity but I think the proposal is to join the two buildings via the extension. Apart from changing the nature and character of what is essentially a Victorian road, the applicant will actually be intensely over developing a small quiet cul-de-sac that was once considered to be a beauty spot of West Hampstead. I refer you to the Neighbourhood Development Plan. Should be noted that garden space will be lost which in turn will have an affect on contributing to increased air pollution levels. The extension will fill the side returns and impact on neighbouring properties by diminishing light and privacy finally the applicant has no regard for his neighbours by starting works that he has no permission for and then leaving the house boarded up. They are neither finished nor inhabited (apart from his workers). Finally, there is no consideration of what the increased numbers of residence will do in respect to parking in the area, which is already at a premium.
2020/4971/P	Corin Holfeld	20/12/2020 20:40:35	OBJ	<p>We are the owners of Flat 2, 5 Hillfield Road. Our flat is on the 1st floor, directly above Flat 1. The 2 bedrooms of our flat currently look on to the garden of Flat 1. Our flat has a small balcony which has views of the green space below. If the extension to flat 1 were granted, it would result in a roof with skylight extending 4 m out from the balcony and take away the view of any green space at all resulting in a significant loss of outlook and give a sense of enclosure. The second bedroom would look on to the lightwell and an additional 6 metres of roof, again this would totally block any view to green space and create a sense of enclosure. This proposed extension would significantly affect the amenity of our flat.</p> <p>The proposal is completely out of character with the existing building. It results in a bulk addition to the property, which is over bearing and harmful to the Council's policy D1 for design.</p>

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2020/4971/P	Eleanor & Cormac Naughten	17/12/2020 12:24:18	OBJNOT	<p>We wish to object to the planning application for Numbers 3 and 5 Hillfield Road on the grounds that it represents very significant overdevelopment, it is unsightly and ugly and not in keeping with the surrounding properties and that it results in very significant loss of amenity for neighbours. We also have very significant concerns about the joint nature of the application.</p> <p>Significant overdevelopment Despite statements to the contrary in the Design and Access Statement, where it describes the proposals as “subservient to the host” this is quite the opposite. For number 3, the currently half built extension already extends well beyond the boundaries of other neighbouring properties. This proposal is to add a further 6m it seems which will be a vast extension. It will nearly double the footprint of the house and is garden grabbing in the extreme. With regard to number 5, the proposal is to fill in the side return and build out 4m, which given the current size of the 2 bed flat is a very significant increase in property size.</p> <p>Ugly, unsightly and not in keeping with the period properties and neighbouring properties The Design and Access Statement contends that this extension is in keeping with the character of the property. However, this is not the case. Both extensions are far to large to be in keeping with the character, and are poorly designed. They will simply be characterless boxes built onto beautiful period properties. The proposal also suggests they are not visible but this is not true. They are very visible to all the surrounding properties, including those at the back such as South Mansions.</p> <p>Loss of amenity The proposal claims there is no loss of amenity but this is simply not true. There is very significant loss of amenity for number 7 Hillfield. Furthermore, the lack of ventilation means that the proposed bifold doors of number 5 are likely to be left open resulting in significant noise disruption on an ongoing basis.</p> <p>Joint application concerns The application follows 4 unsuccessful applications for number 3 in the last 2 years (2019/4621/P, 2019/4710/P, 2020/4603/P and 2020/3034/P). All have been quite rightly refused. In submitting a joint application, the applicant has now admitted that positive comments posted for recent applications (including that for number 2) by the director of the management company at number 5 should be dismissed as self made comments as these parties are partners. This demonstrates that the applicant has acted in a previously dishonest manner and this behaviour should be taken into account. However, also worrying is whether by submitting a joint application, the applicant is hoping to get approval and then could choose to just develop number 3 to a design which has previously been refused. A further concern would be whether the intention is to join the two properties which would be of very great concern.</p> <p>Use of Property The proposal suggests that the property will be lived in by a family, but the developer rents out properties and in West Hampstead a 3 bed flat is far more likely to be rented by 3 professionals.</p> <p>Other considerations Whilst disruption caused by works is not generally considered as part of planning applications it surely must be taken into account that this applicant has a history of starting and not finishing developments and has already turned 2 perfectly nice houses in the small cul de sac here into derelict ruins, causing very significant disruption to local residents, including recurrent issues with rats, damage to the pavement, noise, damage to cars and a large number of construction vehicles regularly blocking the cul de sac without parking suspensions. The inability of this applicant to actually finish building anything which he has been allowed to start is causing very significant distress to all the residents of the cul de sac.</p> <p>Finally the applicant has been bombarding the council with repeated applications which are variations on a theme and are correctly being refused. How can the council prevent this applicant from continuing to waste the council's time and stop him continuing to submit the same application over and over again?</p>

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2020/4971/P	Vesta & John Curtis	20/12/2020 19:34:18	COMMNT	<p>In summary we believe this applicant should be turned down yet again as this is an inappropriate, oversized, ugly development which represents garden grabbing and will result in very significant loss of amenity for neighbours.</p> <hr/> <p>We wish to object to planning application 2020/4971/P for the same reasons as we have objected to Planning application 2020/4908/P: We live in no. 4 Hillfield Road, immediately opposite nos 3 and 5 Hillfield Road, and are therefore affected by any building activity in the cul-de-sac end of Hillfield Road. For the purposes of this objection, we will restrict our comments to the major building work proposed for no. 3 Hillfield Road. It is a matter of great concern that this application has already been submitted, and rejected, multiple times. To submit it yet again, basically the same proposal but with the addition now of the 'infill work' at no. 5, is a waste of everybody's time and in the case of Camden Council, money – after all, it is council tax payers who are indirectly funding this charade. Why is this applicant allowed to make multiple applications? The addition of the work at no. 5, now owned by the applicant's partner, is a red herring, presumably to divert attention away from no. 3.</p> <p>The grounds for objecting to the extension at no. 3 are the same as before, namely:-</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Overdevelopment in an already overcrowded residential area. 2. Garden grabbing with detrimental environmental and ecological effects. 3. Loss of amenity for neighbouring properties. Please note that for the last application, approval of the scheme was posted by the new owner of no. 5, who turns out to be the applicant's partner. We will refrain from commenting on the morality of this. 4. Extra strain on parking facilities which are already over-strained. 5. Lastly, the applicant has an appalling track record in the immediate neighbourhood. Work has been ongoing at no. 1 Hillfield Road for an incredible 13 years with nothing to show for it except for a very ugly hoarding, a broken and cracked pavement, a rat-infested building site, and continual disruption with heavy lorries and fragrant violation of parking regulations at the cul-de-sac end of Hillfield Road. Similarly, work at no. 3 has now been ongoing for several years. The applicant should be forced to finish his existing schemes, rather than devising new ones which are simply going to prolong the huge inconvenience to local residents.

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2020/4971/P	A J Kelly	18/12/2020 11:44:45	OBJNOT	COMMENTS ON PLANNING APPLICATION 2020/4971/P

Before commenting on the detail of this application, I must reflect on the fact that this application is the fifth application to extend the current, half built, extension at number 3 Hillfield Road in just over a year. There is also a sixth one in the pipeline (2020/4908/P) and the applicant has lodged an appeal with the Planning Inspectorate against the refusal of his prior permission application.

Last year, previous applications 2019/4621/P and 2019/4710/P were refused by the planning authority. This year application 2020/3034/P and application 2020/4603/P have also, quite properly, been refused.

Instead of accepting these decisions, the applicant has chosen to re-apply yet again and this application continues to pursue the idea of extending the half-built extension at number 3 but also proposes building an extension to number 5 which is extremely concerning. However, at least the applicant has now come out of the closet and owned up to his interest in number 5 rather than seeking to obscure this by getting his partner to comment favourably on his behalf on applications in relation to number 3, her future home.

Aside from the planning reasons for objecting to this application, I am additionally concerned that, given the applicant's apparent obsession with filling in the side return, he is simply using this application as a device to circumvent the previous decisions and has no intention of building both extensions were he to get approval. Otherwise why submit applications in relation to two separate properties in different legal ownership as part of one application?

The Design and Access Statement says that "the proposed extension" (sic, I assume this should be be extensions unless it is proposed to join the two buildings which would be of great concern and should be clarified) "would preserve the character and appearance of the neighbourhood and would not result in a significant impact upon levels of amenity enjoyed within residential neighbourhood properties." It goes on to say that "the scale and design of the proposed extension" (again I assume that this should be plural) is subservient to the host buildings."

This is disingenuous and the reasons for refusing the previous applications must also apply with equal force to this one.

Extending these properties in the way the applicant intends would be overdevelopment. It would be garden grabbing and and result in two unsightly structures not in keeping with the character of the property or the neighbourhood. It would detrimentally affect neighbouring properties both because of its visual impact and the consequential loss of amenity.

Overdevelopment

The half built extension at number 3 already over-develops the site and takes the property boundary out way past the boundaries of the other properties in the terrace. This fresh application seems to be a hybrid between 2019/4621/P and 2019/4710 which were refused. Whilst it does not completely square this construction off, it does build to the boundary wall by taking up the side return and also building beyond.

The plans for this application are not very clear but what is clear is that the proposed extension essentially nearly doubles the footprint of the property.

Application No: Consultees Name: Received:

Comment: Response:

The current length of the two reception rooms of the houses in this terrace is c.9.4M from the front bay to the beginning of the side return. The original rear addition is c.7.25M. Mr Sebba is already building out a further 6M at number 3 and this proposal increases that extension by building out from the side return nearly to that 6m boundary, thus subverting the original Victorian design. As such, it is hardly "subservient to the host building" as the Design and Access Statement asserts. It will further destroy a pretty Victorian terraced house.

The proposal for number 5 compounds the overdevelopment as not only is the side return to be filled in but the proposal is then to build out a further 4m. Again, given the size of this two bedroom flat, this can hardly be subservient to the host building.

The D&AS refers to an imaginary 'new family' for number 5 to enjoy the garden. The reality is that this property has been purchased by a property management company which rents out properties. Given the average rental of a 3 bedroom flat in West Hampstead currently, it seems doubtful that it will attract a family; three adults is far more likely. That must be the reason for wishing to change the garden access arrangements which, to my knowledge, have not caused a problem for residents over more than 35 years. If the garden access arrangements are a problem, the most obvious solution would be to restore the original French windows which would involve minimal disruption and cost and be in keeping with the character of the property.

Design and the effect on the character of the building / neighbourhood

The original design of the properties is the same as others in Hillfield Road. They are typical late Victorian terraced houses with adjoining side returns which enhance the appearance of the property and also provide much needed space between each property. This mirror image layout is normal in Victorian terraces and part of the distinctive character.

The proposed extensions are not in keeping with the original Victorian design and will be unsightly. As both will be built to the boundary fence/wall, they will simply create an unsightly box or boxes stuck on to the original Victorian properties and totally at odds with their late Victorian architecture and the architecture of the other properties in the road.

In addition, it is also of concern that the extension appears to raise the height of the existing ground floor up to the height of the bay window on the first floor. Surely this cannot be acceptable? This underlines the unsuitability for these properties for this sort of extension. The ceiling heights in the back parts of the houses are much lower than in the front part.

The application says that it will use 'the current side extension of both properties and to extend outward beyond the outer rigger of the host building by 4m'. The terminology is confusing but it appears that the applicant does not properly understand the nature of the late Victorian design.

I am assuming that the reference to "current side extension" is to the original design of the properties which involves creating a side return. Far from not serving "a useful purpose", they serve a very useful purpose (mine houses the kitchen) and, as I have already said, are integral to the character of the properties.

The design of the new ground floor flat at number 5 is also unsatisfactory. It involves the construction of a light well as otherwise there would be no natural light to the two small bedrooms on either side. Currently "bedroom

Application No: Consultees Name: Received:

Comment: Response:

two" has a window to the garden. The new "bedroom three" will be very small.

Adverse effect on the amenity of neighbours

These extensions need to be seen in the context of other extensions to number 3 and therefore the effect on the amenity of neighbouring properties needs to be considered in that context. Amenity has already been lost and any additional development will diminish it further and have an increased adverse impact.

The proposed extensions will fill the side returns and beyond and so impact on neighbouring properties, including the upper floor flats at number 5. The D&AS asserts that the proposed extension at number 5 will not affect the amenity of my property - number 7. This is obviously incorrect. Its amenity has already been affected by the works to number 3. Building an extension to number 5 which will extend well into the current garden will inevitably involve additional noise. This has been problem in the past with the current lay out and will obviously be exacerbated by the fact that the living accommodation is to be moved from the front of the flat to the back with bifold doors which are likely to be left open as there will be no other ventilation.

As this extension builds out beyond the current boundary it will cause loss of daylight to the part of our garden that we use for sitting out. This will be completely overshadowed by the new extension. There will also inevitably be overlooking. Our privacy will be greatly reduced.

Visual impact

Adding a large box onto the rears of the two properties is going to result in an unsightly construction.

Contrary to what the Design and Access statement seeks to assert, the extension to number 5 will be visible as is already the half built extension to number 3. The sloping nature of the gardens, which is prayed in aid as a mitigating factor, actually exacerbates this.

In addition, it will be very visible from the upper floors of neighbouring properties.

The D&AS considers the issue of visual impact only in relation to adjoining properties. It needs also to be considered in relation to South Mansions which is sited to the rear of number 1-9 Hillfield Road.

The applicant has relied upon the GDO to begin to build an extension in the side return and the design is ugly and obtrusive, as his his half built extension to the rear boundary to the original property. Extending this further into the whole side return and mirroring it at number 5 means the visual impact would be even worse.

Finally, while I appreciate that the detrimental affect of the works is not a material consideration, you should be aware that the owner has a track record going back over 13 years of starting and not completing works at this property and at number 2 Hillfield Road.

Works at number 3 started over 5 years ago and are still uncompleted. Works have already started at number 5. It seems likely that if this application is granted further works will be begun and then left undone for an extended period causing more rats and an unsightly vista. He only seems to employ five or six people which seems to be one of the reasons work does not proceed to completion.

He has a real talent for turning perfectly habitable houses into derelict sites. Number 5 is just the next victim.

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

The adverse impact on the quality of life of the residents of the cul-de-sac cannot be over-emphasised. It seems nonsensical to have to consider planning applications from someone who has amply demonstrated an inability to finish any alterations whatsoever.

I would hope that the Planning Authority would simply refuse this application as it did the previous 4. The reasons for refusal must apply with equal force. t did not have a choice in relation to the permitted development but, here there is a choice. The monstrosity should just be refused.

A J Kelly
