

Hampstead CAAC (HCAAC) Objects to the proposal in general but particularly to the following aspects of the application –

1. HCAAC Objects to what appears to be a building right on the MOL HH boundary if not on the MOL itself.
2. Objection is twofold – intrusive building right on the edge, potential fire hazard close to publicly accessible spaces.
3. The proposed building appears too close to and visible relative to the Pond 2 edge, there being no other buildings that close to any of the 3 ponds, except as regards the swim pond(s).
4. Application lacks essential Location. Plan showing clearly land ownership boundaries marked in red and blue as applicable.
5. Extent of 108 and other lands difficult to relate to the present landform as in Pond 2 shoreline and HH MOL boundary. From Google Map (separate photos with email) fairly clear where gardens up to 106 end. Location plan from OS data may be out of date – doesn't concur with physical pond line – the sharp corner on the location plan is in fact a curve whether by natural ground advancement or other reason.
6. Therefore the exact 'sliver' of land of 108 to the pond edge is unclear.
7. Exact land ownership and boundaries established for the previous consent ? Lines shown on the garden plans appear to confuse the issue with the red chain-dot line suggesting overall demise.
8. The previous consent (2020/3409/P) – (3409) appears to grant COL to the proposal under area and height requirements, but not necessarily to design, detailing or exact location ? Might the building footprint be later increased further ?
9. Is this not outside PD allowance relative to the host building ?
10. As an outbuilding, it appears greatly in excess of Camden's policy allowance 20 sq.metres ? Is that no longer the limit ?
11. The previous consent was for a pool, now for what is effectively a potentially independent dwelling. Applicant mentions side steps for bins (??) but would provide keyed access from the street to the proposed new building.
12. Existing and proposed landscaping details required – there are trees and substantial bushes and hedgerow on and/or around the land of 108.
13. The Design statement justifies the location by reference to the applicant's enjoyment of the location relative to the main garden area. We consider this enjoyment does not require the specific location chosen, but applies if the building is sited further towards the house.
14. We query the extent of the land of no.108, particularly the apparent sliver or larger area ? beyond the proposed outbuilding up to the Pond 2 edge. The site plan in each application shows the site extent according to the applicant but ownership and precise extent seem to need definition. A proper land survey with levels etc to be provided of both the garden areas to indicate the topography of site to assess impact on also neighbouring properties.
15. The proposal should show clearly and accurately materials used and details and sizes, particularly doors and windows, which latter should be in maintained timber as generally in SHP. Materials requiring maintenance can be afforded preservative stains, linseed oil, etc. not necessarily plastics paints. Such selection would also aid the non-obtrusive aims of any outbuilding.
16. The proposal to use UPVC windows is not welcome generally and not in this outbuilding wherever located, even if not on the Heath edge. The CAA appraisal para SHP8 states against such details.
17. Otherwise we consider any such building right on the Heath boundary a bad precedent – we agree with the Objection lodged by Hampstead NF noting also the policies quoted therein. We note also and recommend the Heath & Hampstead Society (HHS) Comment.
18. CAA para SHP18 states that extensions (Prior to outbuildings incidences) should be as unobtrusive as possible. This applies even more to any near-water-side buildings proposed. SHP19 states that acceptability of larger extensions depends on site and circumstances.
19. Proposed sedum roof is unlikely to support bio-diversity and should be substituted by a full-depth planted roof, which it seems the limited spans of the proposal or any revision or relocation would sustain.