

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2020/2165/P	Jasbinder Bains	23/02/2021 17:13:03	OBJ	<p>I object to these proposals because the retrospective planning permission is being requested based on what are materially inaccurate 'pre-existing' drawings, so approval cannot be granted on an incomplete understanding of the scale of the development.</p> <p>Having resided at 16 Hampstead Hill Gardens since 2010, I can confirm there has never been a concrete and stone patio extending out to 4.8m from the rear of the property with a retaining wall built around it. What was there was a small, patioed area extending 1m out from the rear of the property - the same distance as my old balcony extended out. I have photographic support for this observation.</p> <p>This patio extending out 5.8m was created under tarpauling and by hand, for reasons best known to the developer, during the end of 2019 and start of 2020. This unauthorised development was flagged to the Planning Department at the time the tarpauling was taken down.</p> <p>Also, there is no mention in the drawings of the material depth of excavation of the rear garden of 14 Hampstead Hill Gardens. This has dropped approximately 1m across the whole of the site through the removal of about 90 skips of soil and the complete stripping of existing foliage. The drawings make no indication of the pre-existing or the post-development ground levels - a further oversight of a material fact that should be considered in the decision-making process.</p> <p>I do not believe planning permission can be granted until these two significant details are accurately reflected in the drawings, or formally acknowledged by the developer to help restore trust, so that a more realistic 'before' and 'after' assessment can be undertaken to reach a fair outcome for all.</p>

---