

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2021/5750/P	THE HEATH & HAMPSTEAD SOCIETY	07/01/2022 12:46:15	OBJ	<p>Comments & Objections</p> <p>From: THE HEATH & HAMPSTEAD SOCIETY PART 1</p> <p>Firstly we wish to query the planning legality of the subdivision of what was a single planning unit when permission was given for the existing house to be divided into 8 flats together with what was described as an extension dwelling on the south side of the existing house poised over the driveway into the garden partly occupied by parking. Garden access was available to all flats. The current Application has detached the garden from the detached house leaving it with only a narrow open strip on the garden side. Is this permissible in law?</p> <p>We also wish to object for the following reasons.</p> <p>1. WE OBJECT TO THE DOUBLE BASEMENT.</p> <p>The drawings included with the application are not clear about the existing levels of the surrounding gardens. Visual inspection of the site shows that existing garage to be removed is below the surrounding gardens - particularly the garden on the rear boundary which is above the level of the roof of the proposed garden dwelling.</p> <p>The proposed new dwelling in the what was the garden will therefore be at basement level and the extra, deep basement for the car park and the `Cinema` will be a two storey basement not permitted by Camden`s Local Plan.</p> <p>Any changes to ground water movement and possible ground movement by the deep excavation required could seriously affect the surrounding houses - which contribute to the Conservation Area.</p> <p>(End of Part 1) Part 2 to follow.</p>

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2021/5750/P	The Heath & Hampstead Society	07/01/2022 17:35:28	OBJ	<p>Comment & Objections From THE HEATH & HAMPSTEAD SOCIETY</p> <p>PART 2 THREAT TO LISTED BUILDING. The proposed basement borders a Grade II Listed building - 2 & 2a Hampstead Hill Gardens. The deep basement would threaten the structural stability of the listed building.</p> <p>PRESERVING HAMPSTEAD GARDENS AND BIODIVERSITY. Camden's Local Plan (A3 & A3 (c)) promises to protect biodiversity and gardens. The proposal to build over all the garden is unacceptable. A reinstated garden (the existing garage has to be removed) would fulfil Policy A3.</p> <p>RESTRICTING THE SIZE OF BASEMENTS IN GARDENS Policy A5 is very specific that a basement: Clause (h) - must not exceed 50% of each garden space; Clause (j) - must extend no further than 50% of the garden depth from the main building; Clause (l) - must be set back from the garden boundaries. This proposed basement does not meet these requirements and therefore should be refused.</p> <p>TREES The trees close by in adjacent gardens are bound to be affected by such a deep basement.</p> <p>EXTRA HEIGHT ON EXISTING TALL DWELLING (8a) The application adds insult to injury by adding extra height in proposing a terrace at roof level. The existing building dwarfs the adjacent semi-detached houses only 2 metres away and this extra height makes the situation worse. Please refuse this terrace.</p> <p>We request that the new extension building be refused.</p>
2021/5750/P	Devorah Weisz	09/01/2022 17:52:14	COMMNT	<p>I support this application and encourage the council to approve it. The house is in desperate need of repair and the garage behind it is a blight on the neighbourhood. The scheme appears to be a thoughtful response to the challenges of the property and will certainly be a vast improvement for the surrounding neighbours and neighbourhood in general. The changes to the townhouse are thoughtful and modest, and the glass extension complements the house's existing architecture and reduced the potential for overlooking. The rear development is a clever and innovative response to the surroundings and will likely become an exemplary piece of architecture.</p>

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2021/5750/P	Michael Carter	08/01/2022 17:27:24	OBJ	<p>My property is #2a which adjoins the proposed site</p> <p>In general, I welcome the proposal to improve the external appearance of the property #8a Hampstead Hill Gardens because the property, together with the much larger adjoining #8, is ugly and entirely out of keeping with the appearance and character of the houses in Hampstead Hill Gardens. I also have no objection to the existing garage being redeveloped into the proposed living accommodation on the existing ground floor level per se as part of #8a</p> <p>I do however object to the size of the proposed new basement underneath the existing garage. It appears that Camden Council contends that the reference building for the basement floor area is the existing #8a and not the existing garage, as has been set out in the pre-planning advice from Camden. It is important that this regulation as to the reference building is clarified and confirmed given the very large size of the proposed basement versus the floor area of the reference property</p> <p>I am concerned as to the impact on drainage in the area. Most winters there is flooding from rain water in a number of rear gardens that adjoin the site. This clearly indicates that water struggles to find routes to drain away. Building down further below the existing garage can only restrict further the paths available to water to drain away</p> <p>I am concerned that the Draft construction management plan is incomplete in some important areas. For example: "Please confirm when an asbestos survey was carried out at the site and include the key findings TBC" Asbestos was a commonly-used building material at the time the existing garage was constructed and I would have expected this to have been investigated already</p> <p>The proposed roof garden would be at a higher level than the current height of the garage roof, and would make it relatively easy for someone in the roof garden to see over the wall into my garden, which is obviously intrusive and undesirable. There are proposed bushes/planting to screen the wall from the residents of the new property but not above the wall level, and in any event this can easily be altered by an owner in the future</p> <p>I object to the proposed glass box roof extension on the top floor of #8a. This adds an unnecessary structure to the top of a house which would not be permitted on any other building in the road and is out of character with the rest of the buildings in the road.</p>

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2021/5750/P	Noam Attar	09/01/2022 21:07:45	SUPPRT	<p>I am a local Hampstead resident and encourage the council to approve this application.</p> <p>It is very surprising to see the Hampstead Forum object to the glass extension on the terrace of the house, given the amount of glass architecture in the immediate area. On Downshire Hill, ¿Hopkins House¿ seems to be entirely made of glass. I suspect that when it was first proposed there was substantial local opposition, and now it is a landmark building in the area and has its own Wikipedia page. There is a house near the bottom of Keats Grove (I think 12a) that has very substantial glass frontage towards the street. On Hampstead Hill Gardens itself, Number 1 has multiple mostly-glass additions, one of which has a glass roof. That is just in the very immediate area. Furthermore, the proposed extension has barely more glass than it would if it matched the floor below, as far as I can tell.</p> <p>For this and the many other reasons already mentioned by the other supporters, I encourage the council to grant permission. Thank you.</p>
2021/5750/P	Alessandro Vaturi	09/01/2022 19:55:56	SUPPRT	<p>I support this application and urge the council to grant it.</p> <p>As others have written, the townhouse is in considerable disrepair and an embarrassment to the street and neighbourhood. The garage behind it is an aberration and harms the environment.</p> <p>The scheme seems to be a very well thought out and considerate plan to rejuvenate the property and contribute positively to the surroundings.</p> <p>I note the comments by the HNF, and note that there is an application at No 3 Hampstead Hill Gardens to do exactly what they have written against (a basement under an ¿outbuilding¿). According to the Council¿s pre-application response to No 3, they do not seem to be opposed in principle to basements under ¿outbuildings¿ (and in the case of this application it is going to be part of the actual house). It does not seem to make sense that the ¿host¿ can be a building to which the basement is not attached. In a normal scenario with a house plus outbuilding, if the house had a footprint of 1,000 square ft and the outbuilding a footprint 100 sq ft, would the council therefore allow a basement of 1.5x the area of the house, underneath the outbuilding? I very much suspect they would not. The basement size would be limited by the size of the outbuilding.</p> <p>Therefore it is only logical to consider the ¿host¿ to be the building to which the basement is actually attached, and for the basement policy to apply based on the size of that structure. This application is clearly a very unusual scenario in which the footprint of the so-called ¿outbuilding¿ (which, again, is proposed to be part of the house) is much larger than the original dwelling structure. It is curious that some neighbours, who I suspect are not planning lawyers, believe they are more informed than a Queen¿s Council member.</p> <p>Otherwise, above ground, the proposed structure looks like a very thoughtful approach to the constraints of the property and a clever piece of architecture.</p>