

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2022/0186/P	Andrew Jacobs	11/03/2022 17:05:07	OBJ	<p>We object to this application as designed. In particular:</p> <p>- We object to the large additional side protrusion on the front left hand side (next to no.18) incorporating the stair tower at the back and a bathroom towards the front of no. 16. In views from New End Square, including from Burgh House down towards Well Walk, the large additional side protrusion would become legible on the front facade and unbalance the symmetry of nos. 14 and 16 and also impact on the roof of the listed building at no.18. It will appear unduly bulky and dominant relative to the roof of its dominant neighbour, the double-fronted no.18, and imbalanced compared to its neighbour at no. 14 where the stair tower is placed at the rear of the house.</p> <p>Accordingly this is not a classic mansard and not in keeping with a listed Georgian house. It is not an established traditional form.</p> <p>Note that the large additional side protrusion is not apparent in all drawings and plans submitted with the application. For example, in the proposed elevation drawing NES16 - P200 (A), the roof line of the bathroom is described as "Line of stair tower beyond". In fact, the bathroom is within the large additional side protrusion in front of the stair tower and set back from the front by only around 2 metres. That drawing also says "Dual-pitched asymmetric Mansard designed to match approved at neighbouring 14 New End Square"; but no. 14 does not have a vertical structure that close to the front elevation of the hipped mansard roof. In order to have a pleasing symmetry, the stair tower, to which there is no objection in principle, should not be extended towards the front of the house.</p> <p>The historic (2003) planning approval for double hipped roofs across numbers 14 and 16 was made on the basis of them matching one another. This was carefully worked out over many years of discussion. It is not entirely right to say that "The proposals have been designed to match approved plans at neighbouring 14 New End Square (LPA Ref 2021/4022/P) and to mirror those approved as part of a joint application in 2002 (LPA Ref LWX0102153)." (Design, Access etc. Statement para. 1.1).</p> <p>- We object to the terrace. It makes a nonsense of the statement in the Design, Access etc. Statement that a key consideration for the proposal was "protecting the residential amenity of neighbours by preventing overlooking into adjacent gardens".</p> <p>It is a relatively wide and deep terrace compared to the balconies referred to at the back of the opposite terrace of houses and pictured in the Design etc. Statement. Unlike those balconies, it would allow for chairs or recliners to be placed on the terrace. This would result in overlooking of the houses opposite, including their habitable rooms. It would also encourage greater time being spent on the west-facing terrace, resulting in more overlooking of neighbouring houses, gardens, balconies and first floor terraces, including my garden. Someone peering over the railings would be able to look into my windows at roof level; and directly into my garden. The terrace would also be big enough for about 15 people to stand on with drinks, encouraging looking into houses opposite.</p> <p>It would create more noise and disturbance within a horse-shoe shaped group of houses (running from 20 to 2 New End Square and from 57 to 71 New End) where the noise resounds and echoes.</p> <p>Whilst the mansard is claimed to be designed to match the recently-approved mansard at no.14, that mansard</p>

Application No: **Consultees Name:** **Received:****Comment:****Response:**

does not have a terrace. It would be better if no.16 matched no. 14 in this regard.

The applicant's architects acknowledge that the arrangement at the rear is unusual and irregular. The photo that they show to support the terrace (on page 20 of the Design, Access, Planning & Heritage Statement, with a lamp post, fire escape and railing on a roof; taken from the corner of New End and Streatley Place although not identified) is of a view that is both unattractive and not typical of Hampstead. It should not be used as an acceptable comparator for what is proposed at no. 16.

In addition, the planning policies quoted in the Design Statement make it clear that roof terraces "can be an opportunity for external space" or "can provide amenity space for flats that would otherwise have little or no exterior space". 16 New End Square is a house with a rear garden and a patio at the front of the house. It already has a reasonable amount of external amenity space. There is no good reason to allow a terrace, and a number of reasons outlined above not to allow it.
