| Application No. | Consultees Name: | Received: | Comment: | Printed on: 26/01/2021 |
|------------------------------------|------------------------------------|---------------------|----------|---|
| Application No: 2020/5628/P | West Hill Park Management Co. Ltd. | 25/01/2021 15:09:14 | OBJ | Response: I am writing as a Director of West Hill Park Management Company Ltd to object to the application being made for the enlargement of and changes to No 23 West Hill Park. The company is owned by the residents who elect some of their number to be directors to maintain the common parts and common interests. |
| | | | | The estate is a unified architectural whole showing consistency via the forms, materials and detailing on dwellings within the estate. The original designs by Ted Levy Benjamin & Partners have been kept. The estate therefore features the same architectural language, with no significant interventions to the original design. The estate remains homogenous and 'as built'. |
| | | | | The proposal at 23 West Hill Park does not fit in with the current style and appearance of the estate. The directors have discussed this together carefully and wish to observe that |
| | | | | 1) The second floor extension would be unique on the estate, and would be out of keeping, whether seen from front or rear |
| | | | | 2) The ground floor extension at the rear is shaped like an arrow head, and as such would be unique on the estate and would be exceptional and discordant. |
| | | | | 3) The front extensions would be visible from the roadway outside, and the rear extensions visible from 22, 24 and 25 West Hill Park. |
| | | | | 4) The estate was laid out with homes either staggered or at an angle with blind wall so that even though the housing density is high, residents are not overlooked in their gardens or interiors. The proposed layout would deprive neighbours of privacy. The extensions proposed would defeat this feature of the built environment, and should be disallowed on this basis alone. |
| | | | | We would therefore ask the planning committee to reject this application entirely. |
| | | | | We also wish to point out the more general point that The Management Company has taken considerable trouble to follow the wishes of the residents to conserve and enhance the visual integrity of the whole estate and that it is hoped by all that the Planning committee would recognise, encourage and support this. |

09:10:05

| Application No. | Consultees Nomes | Daniwada | Comments | | 09:10:05 |
|-----------------------------|--------------------------------|-------------------------------|--------------|---|----------|
| Application No: 2020/5628/P | Consultees Name: DANIEL SIMON | Received: 15/01/2021 14:38:21 | Comment: OBJ | Response: | |
| 2020/3628/P | DANIEL SIMON | 13/01/2021 14:38:21 | OBJ | West Hill Park is a fine example of mid-late twentieth century housing development adjacent to Hampstead Heath with strong design emphasis characteristic for its period. Although the estate is not nationally/statutorily listed, the Council took steps to designate the estate as a non designated heritage asset (locally listed) due to its architectural and townscape significance. The Camden Local List describe the estate as follows: A housing estate from 1971-3 designed by Ted Levy, Benjamin and Partners whose work is found throughout Camden. Built on the site of St Pelagia's Convent which has been hardly altered since it was built. It consists of houses of varying sizes and the block of flats, West Hill Court. The design is typical of good developments of the period and has considerable architectural significance. It demonstrates how a densely built estate can be designed to sit within the topography of the site and prevent overlooking and ensure privacy. | |
| | | | | The estate was developed as a singular architectural piece and it features a strong and defined character via the forms, materials and detailing on dwellings within the estate. The estate therefore features the same architectural language, with few examples of significant interventions to original design. The estate is currently homogenous and 'as built'. | |
| | | | | The proposal at 23 West Hill Park does not fit in with the current style and appearance of the estate. In particular: | |
| | | | | - The second floor extension would be unique on the estate, and would be out of keeping, looking at it from the front and also the rear. No other houses in the vicinity have a second floor at all, let alone an ill conceived extension. | |
| | | | | - The ground floor extension at the rear is shaped like an arrow head, and as such would be unique on the estate and would be out of keeping. | |
| | | | | The front extensions would be visible from the roadway outside, and the rear extensions visible from 22, 24 and 25 West Hill Park. | |
| | | | | These extensions would be unsympathetic to the clear design language of the estate. | |
| | | | | For these reasons, the proposals would fail to preserve or enhance the character and appearance of the conservation area. | |
| | | | | There is also the matter of the increased overlook of the gardens and houses at 22 and 24 West Hill Park, particularly from the new second floor. The master plan for West Hill Park was ingenious in that homes are staggered or houses turned at angles to minimise overlooking and allow privacy for all residents. The housing density in West Hill Park is therefore able to be much higher. | |