

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2020/5187/P	Jack Turner	10/01/2021 18:58:29	OBJ	<p>I am writing to object to this retrospective planning application for what is included (albeit sketchily) in the application, for the misleading errors in the application, for what has been omitted (and should not have been) from the application and because the application should really form an integral part of the anticipated application for a new build house, with substantial basement works and most likely the loss of 4 parking spaces. This is, in reality, one site, and there should have been one application.</p> <p>It is difficult not to harbour cynical thoughts on this retrospective application and the applicant, London Residential Housing Ltd (which, by the way, does not seem to be registered at Companies House).</p> <p>In my opinion, this developer has treated the whole planning process with contempt, including not showing the full plan for the development of the site, conducting major works without planning permission, ignored the legal obligation for party wall agreements, has not kept close neighbours informed of building work that disturbed their lives for many months, and in cases, I am informed, made them fear for their safety.</p> <p>This experienced developer knows how difficult it is to reinstate a site once work has been substantially completed, and the damage done. To this end, a substantial basement excavation, complete with a huge roof light, was conducted under the cover of tarpaulin, without planning permission, proper assessment or party wall agreement. This huge roof light will be a cause of light pollution and will disturb close neighbours, as well as wildlife.</p> <p>The rear garden has been levelled by removing a huge amount of earth and building a concrete retaining wall very close to mature trees in neighbouring gardens, undoubtedly causing severe root damage. All this without party wall agreement, which makes one question if the relevant professional advice was sought i.e. structural engineer and tree surgeon. Mature trees have been removed and confusion caused by misnaming in planning applications.</p> <p>This large area of levelled earth has now been almost entirely covered over by artificial grass. This is not sustainable for the environment, and, in my opinion, should not be allowed. Rainwater will run into drains, with a potential risk of localised flooding, instead of soaking into the ground. This could cause the water table to drop, causing a risk of subsidence to adjacent Victorian properties, which are built with meagre foundations.</p> <p>It is upsetting that this developer seems to have no respect for the Hampstead Conservation Area, with no regard to greenery, or to the important contribution that No.14, a fine Victorian Italianate semi-detached villa (part of 14 to 20 group) makes to the Conservation Area.</p> <p>I would be grateful if you would make sure, where possible, that any damaging work be rectified, and the developer be held to account.</p>

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2020/5187/P	Patricia K Carvis	10/01/2021 19:14:59	OBJ	<p>I would like to register an objection to this planning application for the following reasons:</p> <p>Extensive works have already been undertaken to the existing building without prior planning consent. This includes the construction of a lower ground floor basement extension with an enormous roof-light which will disturb neighbouring properties and compromise the previous dark habitat for wildlife. The garden was effectively lowered by several feet with no Basement Impact Assessment or Party Wall Agreement. The garden has been denuded of trees and shrubs and the grass area replaced by Astro turf. There was a failure to assess the flood risk which has been increased with the removal of vast amounts of soil and vegetation. Tree roots have been damaged by the erection of a large concrete wall.</p> <p>Application 2020/2165/P, also part of this development associated with this application, for the lower ground floor basement (which has already been completed) fails to refer to the parking space for 4 cars which will effectively disappear with the new building which constitutes an overdevelopment of the existing site. The developer has shown a complete disregard for planning protocols and submitted an application which is full of inaccuracies and omissions.</p>
