

[REDACTED]

---

**From:** Sofie Fieldsend  
**Sent:** 13 September 2021 16:51  
**To:** Planning Planning  
**Subject:** FW: 2021/1564/P: 14a Hill Gardens  
**Attachments:** 20210905\_162659.jpg; 20210905\_163356.jpg; 20210905\_163417.jpg; 20210905\_163527 (2).jpg

[REDACTED]

Thanks,

Sofie

---

**From:** John Malet-Bates <[REDACTED]>  
**Sent:** 07 September 2021 08:11  
**To:** Sofie Fieldsend <Sofie.Fieldsend@camden.gov.uk>  
**Subject:** FW: 2021/1564/P: 14a Hill Gardens

[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.

Sent from [Mail](#) for Windows

---

**From:** [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** 07 September 2021 08:03  
**To:** [Fieldsend, Sofie](#)  
**Subject:** FW: 2021/1564/P: 14a Hill Gardens

Dear Sofie,  
Omitted this and end address etc.

HCAAC Objects to the application as follows –

1. The proposed building is considered unattractive in form and the fenestration particularly to the front ground an first floor appears out of kilter with itself and with the immediate neighbours. The fenestration offers to level with the Immediately adjacent buildings, but the normally perceived perspective view does not support the attempt, which is irrelevant anyway.
2. The proportions of the proposed building are clearly unfortunate and inappropriate for a single house.
3. It may be the presentation but the perspective view in the DAS shows large undivided glazing which has to be more carefully handled on a front elevation.
4. Even as lower than the immediate neighbour the proposed house is unnecessarily too tall , out of proportion to its width.
5. The DAS shows 'respect' of the neighbouring houses to its north, while making the same error of comparing the flat roofed top line with that of the adjacent ridges, which is not the point and is often used in over-development.

6. The appropriate design aim is to relate more to the houses to the north, ignoring their ridge heights.
7. The developer is stacking extensive accommodation to produce an overbearing and out of proportion addition to the existing houses.
8. The adjacent semi-detached houses separate their entrances while the proposal puts a new entrance right against that of the neighbour.
9. The entrance 'porch' appears clumsy also dominant right against the neighbour.
10. We cannot accept the proposal as more than a neutral contributor to the CA as it lacks quality in development of the street elevation.
11. A more acceptable relation is shown in the attached photographs of a similar development elsewhere. In this the fenestration is carefully moderated while not needing to level with that adjacent. Also the building's overall proportions are well-managed and detailing introduced in entire sympathy with its neighbours.
12. We are not suggesting a copy of the W11 house, but that more care needs to be invested in such a design as at no. 14a.
13. 2002 Conservation Area Statement *"Development began in the 1870s with a fine group of stucco-faced semidetached villas (Nos.14-20 and 25-33). These are three storey with basements, a dentil cornice and parapet at roof level..... "A few small modern houses and flats have been added in recent years, which, although in marked contrast to the older villas, do not detract from the character of the area."*
14. We find aspects of the proposal not in full compliance with officers' pre-app advice which is disappointing. A 3-storey with basement proposal was and is acceptable conditional upon high quality design which this flat-faced offer is not.
15. The pre-app advice mentions an upper floor set-back, which does not appear in the proposed scheme.
16. Harm to the CA is threatened by such a building which has nothing of the discreet careful massing and proportionality of so much of the past modern housing for which Hampstead is justly proud. The applicant seems to call in aid the more carefully thought modern houses without apparently being prepared to apply their lessons.
17. We note detailed objections from many persons and organisations around and affected by the proposals. We agree with most of those but cannot replicate nor equal their full content.
18. We refer to the NPPF stress on the importance of local residents' views and of neighbourhood plans, part of NPPF and Locality intentions.

John

John Malet-Bates RIBA  
 For Hampstead CCAAC,  
 c/o [REDACTED]  
 4 Ferncroft Avenue,  
 London,  
 NW3 7PH  
 [REDACTED]  
 [REDACTED]