
From: Richard Farr [REDACTED]
Sent: 05 May 2021 17:45
To: Sofie Fieldsend; Planning
Subject: Planning Application 2020/5347/P - 1 Oak Hill Park Mews, NW3 7LH - OBJECTION

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Flagged

[EXTERNAL EMAIL] Beware – This email originated outside Camden Council and may be malicious Please take extra care with any links, attachments, requests to take action or for you to verify your password etc. Please note there have been reports of emails purporting to be about Covid 19 being used as cover for scams so extra vigilance is required.

Dear Ms Fieldsend

I note that the applicants have submitted revised design drawings for this application.

Whilst I note the deletion of two windows and a marginal reduction in height, I remain opposed to the proposals and set out below an updated version of my previous letter of objection and would be grateful if your department will take these comments into account when assessing the application.

Many thanks

Richard Farr
8 Oak Hill Park Mews
London NW3 7LH

8 Oak Hill Park Mews
London NW3 7LH

28th April 2021

Dear Planning Officer

**OBJECTION TO PLANNING APPLICATION 2020/5347/P
1 OAK HILL PARK MEWS, LONDON NW3 7LH**

UPDATE

Further to my letter of 18th February, I understand that revised drawings have been submitted. I am writing to confirm that, whilst these are an improvement, I still object to the proposals as they will still be detrimental to my enjoyment of my house. I have updated my previous letter of objection as now set out below:

BASIS OF OBJECTION

I have enjoyed living at 8 Oak Hill Park Mews since 2004 and greatly appreciate how fortunate I am to live in such an outstanding environment which is peaceful and varied.

My objections to this planning application relate to the damage the proposals will cause to the local environment which is in a Conservation Area and the detrimental effect they will have to my enjoyment of my house.

IMPACT ON OAK HILL PARK MEWS

Environmental

Oak Hill Park Mews is divided into two distinct areas; the entrance area and the lawn. The dividing line is roughly the boundary between numbers 1 and 2 Oak Hill Park Mews.

The approach to the mews is slightly uphill and the first building you see is 1 Oak Hill Park Mews, which looks like a cottage and which relates to 93 Frognal. Both of these properties are accommodated on ground and first floors with 93 Frognal also having a concealed basement area.

Numbers 7 and 8 Oak Hill Park Mews are of a totally different design and scale and were built in the early 1960s.

There is a sycamore tree in the heart of this area that adds to the attraction of the area and its relaxed ambience.

This area and indeed Hampstead generally benefits from a wide range of architectural styles which are mixed together to give a delightful and rich overall impression.

The proposed continuation of the building design style of numbers 2 and 3 Oak Hill Park Mews to number 1 sounds logical as does the argument that it should match all the other buildings in Oak Hill Park Mews by having three storeys. This however totally misses the point. The current building at 1 Oak Hill Park Mews with its two gable-ended walls and pitched roofs, has a cottage-like appearance and sits very attractively and shares its historical style with 93 Frognal. They jointly provide an attractive counterbalance to the other houses in the mews. This mix of styles is one of the more attractive aspects of Hampstead and is particularly relevant here in Oak Hill Park Mews, particularly as we are within a Conservation Area.

Whilst the removal of the windows facing 7&8 Oak Hill Park Mews and the slight reduction in height is appreciated, nonetheless, the proposed extension will still result in a substantial block of nondescript architecture which will dominate the entrance to the mews. The areas of painted stucco with the loss of the two gables and a uniform top to the wall with an extensive grey mansard roof above will still appear dominant and austere, especially when compared with the currently charming cottage. As a consequence the attractive, friendly approach to the mews will be lost.

The two gables with their two apices provide interest, softness and relief to the area, compare well with the rectangular 1960s buildings and provide an attractive approach to the mews.

The hefty mass of the new building is exacerbated when the topography of the mews is considered. There is a significant increase in land height from the entrance to the mews to the start of number 1 and there is nearly a metre difference in ground height between the bottom edge of number 1 and the far corner of number 3. Accordingly the proposals will appear even more dominant than might be anticipated.

It should also be noted that whereas numbers 2 and 3 relate to the lawn area of the mews, number 1 does not. Number 1 very much belongs to the mews entrance and should be assessed on its contribution to the gentler nature of the entrance area. The two areas are distinct and any design should reflect this and even reinforce it

Oak Hill Park and Oak Hill Park Mews are an amazing pleasant, quiet and gentle location. The proposal is inconsistent with that and will detract from the currently harmonious mix of buildings.

Finally, the currently submitted drawings, rather misleadingly, still do not include a direct elevation drawing of the proposed south east wall. This continues to seem extraordinary as it is, in fact, the building's longest elevation and the one which will impact most significantly on the mews, my house and its entrance.

The proposed garden area currently has a substantial wooden fence along its southern boundary and we trust this is to be reinstated following the building works. It is essential that it screens the proposed ground floor extension which would otherwise dominate and detract from the approach to the mews.

There are no sections included so it is a little difficult to understand the positioning of the mansard roof. Generally there seems to be a lack of detailed information.

IMPACT ON 8 OAK HILL PARK MEWS

The approach and entrance to number 8 is from the entrance area and so the loss of the cottage and its charm and the overbearing nature of the proposals will be detrimental to the approach, enjoyment and setting of my house.

The house will also suffer from an increased sense of enclosure and urbanisation as well as the loss of sky area which is currently enjoyed over the top of number 1's pitched roof and gabled walls. I have previously attached photographs taken standing in front of my kitchen sink on the ground floor and from the pillow of the bed in my north-facing bedroom.

This when considered in combination with the close proximity of 93 Frognal, will result in a reduced sense of wellbeing in addition to a loss of openness and light. The slight reduction in height included in the revised drawings will make little difference to this.

FOLLOW UP

Please let me know if you would like to discuss this further or would like to visit my property to assess the impact for yourself.

Yours sincerely

Richard Farr