

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2021/5750/P	ARASH SALIMI	04/01/2022 10:51:05	COMMNT	I encourage the council to grant the application. The townhouse has been in urgent need of care for many years and the garage at the rear is an embarrassment to Hampstead and the neighbourhood. The proposed plan seems to be a very well thought out improvement and should be embraced by the council. The improvements to the house itself appear to be subtle and it should be welcomed that the parking area is to be moved below ground. It is baffling to see the Hampstead forum state that the extensive amount of planting and trees is not satisfactory.
2021/5750/P	Penelope Rowlatt	01/01/2022 12:05:35	COMMNT	The applicant proposes to build a two storey detached building with a connecting passage (rather than a single storey rear extension with basement as stated) on this site that already has a block of eight flats and a small house on it (rather than only a C3 dwelling house as stated). This being the case, it seems likely that he after it is built he will convert some of the rooms in the new structure into bedrooms, perhaps the gym, or one or both of the playrooms, or the dining room; then, if he also converts one of the bedrooms in the small vertical house into a kitchen, perhaps the one on the third floor, he will be able to sell the two structures as two independent houses. With eight flats, each with two residents (presumably, possibly more), the vertical house on the side with four or more residents and the new detached house in the garden again with four or more residents, the site will have 24 or more people living on it. This must surely be excessive.
2021/5750/P	Scott Harris	04/01/2022 17:41:29	SUPPRT	<p>I support this scheme.</p> <p>I have driven past this site many times over the years, it is generally dilapidated and detracts from what is a well maintained street.</p> <p>It is good to see that the owner has hired a top architecture firm to create something in keeping with the street which will benefit the aesthetics of the road. The rear elements of the scheme seem especially sympathetic, with environmental benefits too.</p>

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2021/5750/P	alexander g shinder	04/01/2022 21:16:57	OBJ	<p>The existing modernisation of the appearance of 8 and 8a did great harm to the streetscene and the applicant is to be commended in attempting to reduce that harm. The sensitive treatment of the front facade and the boundary does achieve this.</p> <p>The glass top storey however is out of character and draws vertical attention. It harms the streetscene and fails to preserve and enhance the CA as required by NPPF, the Camden Local Plan and the HNP and this feature should either be removed or possibly be retained in volume but in the same style as the rest of the the proposed front elevation as it would not be too conspicuous given the block like appearance.</p> <p>As to the treatment of the garages this unfortunately comprehensively breaches policy A5 of the Camden Plan. The concern here is that the garages were originally the garden of 8/8a which has been reduced as a result. This garden sat alongside the neighbouring rear gardens and a single storey garage block is a low outbuilding and while unattractive and inconspicuous and is private and does not impact the amenity of the neighbouring properties. The proposed roof terrace and raised walls harm the amenity of the neighbouring properties possibly also affecting daylight and sky - A5 a n &amp; q. Treating the garages as garden it also breaches A5 h and is more than the permitted level relative to the host building A5 i ,j &amp; k.</p> <p>The landscaping is preferable to the garage roof but not at this height. One possibility would be for the the basement to be larger than that permitted with light wells surrounding it and the occasional roof light but to have no building above it giving the appearance of restoring the garden. That way the landscaping could be done at a lower level and this would be an enhancement. There would need to be a way found to prevent further upward building and securing that through a Section 106 agreement may be insufficient as this could always be modified at a future time.</p>

---