

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2020/5950/P	A J Kelly	05/06/2021 12:05:26	OBJNOT	<p>Statutory consultation</p> <p>Before commenting on the application itself, I would like to comment on the consultation on the application. No notices have appeared on Hillfield Road and the application affects not just the Hillfield Road neighbours. Those at the rear who will not know about the application and what is proposed.</p> <p>I am writing these comments just before consultation closes. There is only one other comment on the website in contrast to the large number of comments submitted from properties all around 2 Hillfield Road in relation to application 2020/1671/P referred to below. This would indicate that the application has not come to the attention of those who commented or objected previously and who are affected.</p> <p>History of the site</p> <p>There still seems to be some confusion about the history of the site. Indeed the officer report on which the refusal of 2020/1671/P was based does not seem to have been informed by a consideration of historic documents.</p> <p>It is clear from the OS map for 1896 that there was building on the site of number 2 with a garden. This seems to be a much older building which predated the terraces on both sides of the road (which were built in the 1880s) as otherwise the larger terrace would have been extended to the end of the road.</p> <p>By 1896, the three houses to the east had been built as had the terrace on the north side of the road. At that time, number 2 was a detached property in a larger garden.</p> <p>By 1915, as shown on the OS map for that year, the building at number 2 had been turned into one larger house and the house to the east (2a) and the neighbouring property, Gondar House, in Gondar Gardens had also been built.</p> <p>It is obvious that this terrace differs from the buildings opposite and the three properties to the east because it was built around the older building and it was designed to complement the design of that existing building. It is therefore of historical importance and the original design should be preserved, particularly as number 2 only constitutes two thirds of the small terrace.</p> <p>History of recent (non-)development of 2 Hillfield Road</p> <p>The history of the work to 2 Hillfield Road will be well known to those reading the comments submitted so I will not rehearse it here. I do, however, want to say a little more about application 2020/1671/P referred to above.</p> <p>This was submitted in April 2020 but was only the subject of statutory consultation - with notices outside the property and in Gondar Gardens and Mill Lane - in October 2020. It was finally refused in March 2021. This application was for a huge block of flats on the site of as opposed to the conversion of the two flats to two houses for which the applicant gained permission in 2007.</p> <p>It now appears that the applicant submitted this present application in December 2020 i.e. shortly after the consultation on 2020/1671/P closed and without waiting for a determination.</p> <p>Unless application 2020/1671/P represented a sudden rush of blood to the head from which the applicant has now recovered, it seems likely that his real intention now is to obtain planning consent for flats in incremental</p>

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
				<p>stages. This application needs to be considered with that in mind.</p> <p>Evidence of this is provided by comparing the plans for the two applications where they overlap.</p> <p>Overdevelopment While the extension in this application is obviously much smaller than the block of flats in the previous application, it is very similar to that part of the previous application. As a result, the existing small garden at the back will almost disappear. This is garden grabbing in a site with very limited green space in a built up city area. Virtually no recreational space will remain.</p> <p>In addition the extension will have the effect of reducing daylight into what will already be a dark space because of the small plot.</p> <p>Loss of amenity Because of the overdevelopment, the extension will result in considerable loss of amenity to the residents of the cul-de-sac, those in Mill Lane at the rear and in Gondar Gardens to the west.</p> <p>It will result in loss of privacy and light to the neighbouring properties, as well as overshadowing and overlooking, particularly from the balconies.</p> <p>The application cites the permission given for numbers 2a and 4 a which refer to a terrace and balcony respectively. These properties are completely different in design as they are in line with the other properties in Hillfield Road which are higher.</p> <p>In addition, the creation of balconies at roof level at number 2 is further evidence that the applicant's ultimate intension is to turn the building into flats.</p> <p>Finally, it is clear that the proposed extension would not preserve the character and appearance of the property and thus the neighbourhood. Further changes to what is already proposed would simply erode the character of a unique historical building further and increase the impact on neighbouring properties.</p>

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2020/5950/P	Vesta & John Curtis	04/06/2021 20:25:28	OBJ	<p>We objected to the last application by this developer to turn no. 2 Hillfield Road into 9 flats on the following grounds: (i) overdevelopment; (ii) loss of amenity; (iii) altering the appearance and character of a Victorian house. The addition of 7 (seven!) extra dwellings in the cul-de-sac end of Hillfield Road will severely affect the quality of life in this quiet residential area, to say nothing of putting an intolerable strain on the overstretched parking resources. It is difficult to see how the present proposal differs in any significant way from the previous proposal that was rejected. The subterranean extensions at front and back, and the huge and unsightly above-ground extension at the back, within the footprint of two houses and their gardens, will surely provide spaces for 9 flats and perhaps even more. The greed and cupidity of this developer know no bounds. He is engaged in developing three (perhaps four) different properties at the cul-de-sac end of Hillfield Road, and is constantly putting in planning applications with total disregard for the interests of local residents. No 2 Hillfield Road has been under development for an incredible 12 years and there is nothing to show for it except two huge rat-infested holes at the front and rear and an ugly hording around the front of the property. In addition, the pavement outside is cracked and broken and poses a real danger to elderly residents. It is quite extraordinary that Camden has allowed this intolerable situation to continue for 12 years. We as council tax payers surely have a right to expect something better.</p>

---