

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2021/6168/P	Jonathan Fish	27/03/2022 17:40:28	COMNOT	<p>Objection to Planning Application: 2021/6168/P Site address: Rear of 38 Hillfield Road London NW6 1PZ</p> <p>I strenuously object to the application for the following reasons:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The application is disingenuous in that it does not illustrate the proposed development in context, either from the perspective of Mill Lane or from the perspective of the rear of the houses on Hillfield Road. Consequently, it is nearly impossible for a lay person to visualise the impact of the proposed development relative to other buildings on either Mill Lane or Hillfield Road. 2. The application is misleading because it does not show the proposed development in the context of the full plot of land (Land Registry Title Number LN159509) referenced on the application form. In particular, it does not show its proximity to the main house comprising 38 and 38A Hillfield Road which has already had a full width ground floor and first floor terrace extension. The main house has already been extended by over 4 metres further into the garden (towards the proposed development) than the neighbouring property at 40 Hillfield Road, and that is before taking into consideration the raised concrete patio at ground level which extends a further 3 metres or so towards the proposed development. 3. If permitted, the proposed development will result in a gross overdevelopment of the overall plot of land (referred to in point 2 above) with a significant further loss of garden as well as a loss of light and visual amenity for the residents of 38 and 38A Hillfield Road and the neighbouring properties of 40 Hillfield Road and 36 Hillfield Road. 4. The footprint of the proposed development is excessive and out of proportion compared with neighbouring properties. The proposed development is 9.83 metres deep and 7.14 metres wide. By comparison, the neighbouring properties at 33D, 33E and 33F Mill Lane (at the bottom of the former gardens of 40, 42 and 44 Hillfield Road) are approximately 8 metres deep and 6 metres wide. Consequently, the proposed development will encroach far further into the garden of 38 Hillfield Road relative to its neighbouring properties. 5. At 6.74 metres tall, the height of the proposed development is excessive and out of proportion relative to all other neighbouring properties and comparable developments on Mill Lane. 6. The false hip pitched roof façades at the front and rear of the proposed development will be unsightly and out of keeping with neighbouring and other properties on that section of Mill Lane. They are unnecessary as they serve no obvious practical purpose. I wonder whether their inclusion is a cynical attempt to distract attention away from other aspects of the proposed development in the full knowledge that they will almost certainly have to be removed should any form of redevelopment of the existing garage be permitted. I also wonder whether there is a hidden agenda, perhaps to leave the door open for a roof terrace between the pitched roof façades at some point in the future. The applicant has a history of unauthorised development. For example, a certificate of lawfulness was required for the ground floor extension and 1st floor terrace of the main house (see previous planning application: 2008/1845/P). 7. The choice of external finishes detailed in the Design and Access Statement, namely "The exterior will be in a black/charcoal painted render finish... With dark brick cladding to the side elevations. All new windows will be white timber painted" are unsympathetic, oppressive, unsightly, and completely out character with the area.

Application No: Consultees Name: Received:

Comment: Response:

It would be a travesty to permit any of the applicant's choices of external finishes that will so obviously irreparably damage the streetscape and create an eyesore for all passers-by and residents of properties with a view of the proposed development. By contrast, the neighbouring properties at 33D, 33E and 33F Mill Lane incorporate natural finishes and softer, far more sympathetic colour palettes that help them blend into and even enhance the streetscape and views from houses on Hillfield Road and Mill Lane.

8. The Design and Access Statement states that "The exterior will be in a black/charcoal painted render finish, as per the existing garage." This is, in fact, an untrue and misleading statement. As can be seen from the photograph of the rear of the existing garage submitted by the applicant, the rear façade of the garage is white, not black.

9. The proposed choice of roof material detailed in the Design and Access Statement, namely "Three layer felt Bitumen felt membrane..." is inappropriate and will be an eyesore for all residents of Hillfield Road and Mill Lane that have properties overlooking the proposed development. In contrast, the neighbouring properties at 33D, 33E and 33F Mill Lane as well as at 33C Mill Lane (which I'm sure is well-known to the planning department at Camden Council and will no doubt be highly relevant as a precedent for this application), all have "living" grass/wildflower rooves that help the properties gently blend in, contribute to the environment and do at least something to offset the loss of garden.

10. It is noted that the primary living space is intended to be on the first floor at the rear of the property and that large bi-fold "windows" (which look like doors to me) will open onto a Juliette balcony overlooking the garden of 38 Hillfield Road. The doors are likely to be open in the warmer months (and quite possibly whenever the sun is shining given the black roof, black façades, and specification of the insulation). This will lead to a significant loss of privacy and amenity for the residents of 40, 38A and 36 Hillfield Road as well as 38 Hillfield Road itself if and when the proposed development is separated from 38 Hillfield Road. I note that loss of privacy was one of the major concerns with the developments at 33C, 33D, 33E and 33F Mill Lane and therefore I trust that the planning department at Camden Council will seek to mitigate this by imposing strict conditions such as, but not limited to, restricting the opening of the "windows" and requiring the glazing in those windows to be opaque. Should the proposed development be permitted in any form, I trust that I will be consulted on measures that are to be put in place to ensure that my family's privacy is maintained on an as-is basis and that there is no increase in noise and disturbance as a result the change of use or the residents of the proposed development living on the first floor.

11. It is noted that "All heating & appliances will be electric; there will be no gas services." I assume therefore that an air-source heat pump will be installed. As far as I can see, the location of the external componentry of such a heat pump system has not been specified on the plans and nor has any specification with sizing, appearance and a decibel rating been provided as part of the application.

12. The proposed use of UPVC black rainwater pipes is disappointing given the effort that the developers of neighbouring properties have gone to to conceal rainwater pipes or make them a design feature by using more aesthetically-pleasing metal rainwater pipes and gutters. This is just one more example of how ill-conceived and poorly designed the proposed development is.

13. The mixture of car parking and residential space in the same building is inappropriate and would set a dangerous precedent if the application was granted. I note that planning for the retention of the garage was

Application No: Consultees Name: Received:

Comment: Response:

previously granted with the condition that “The Garage shall be retained and used for the accommodation of private motor vehicles only...” and the reason given for this was: “Any other use of the garage would be prejudicial to the amenities of the residential building and the area generally” (see planning application: 34580). Whilst the condition and reason may well be historic, it is still highly relevant in the context of the history of development at the site as well as current planning regulations and policies.

14. I note that the Design & Access Statement was updated at the end of last week and the applicant is now seeking to justify the proposed development stating, “He now seeks to retain this single car parking section with the existing garage and the rear door to the garden access with the self-contained unit for a carer’s use & their Achondroplastic son.” We note that the proposed development has just one bedroom (on the ground floor) and has a large open plan living and dining room, study area and kitchen on the first floor which seems inconsistent with the stated intended use. A sceptic might say that the applicant is relying on a sympathy vote to justify the proposed development.

15. If and when – it is surely only a matter of time – the proposed development is separated from 38 Hillfield Road (either through sale, lease or otherwise), the resident(s) of 38 Hillfield Road will be left without any off-street or right to on-street resident’s car parking. This will be contrary to the spirit of the Section 106 Legal Agreement dated 15th January 2009 (a condition of granting of the previous planning application: 2008/1845/P made by the applicant and which divided the house into two flats) that relinquished the right of the resident(s) of 38 Hillfield Road to on-street resident’s parking on the basis that they already enjoyed the benefit of one off-street parking space, namely in the existing garage.

16. On the Application Form, the applicant has answered “No” to both questions in Box 9. Trees & Hedges yet the Arboricultural Impact Assessment and the Tree Survey Drawing, both of which form part of the application, clearly show this to be untrue as there are a number of trees identified as either requiring removal or forming a constraint due to their proximity to the proposed development.

17. The proposed development contravenes much of Policy 2: Design & Character of the adopted Fortune Green & West Hampstead Neighbourhood Plan, including:

All development shall be of a high quality of design, which complements and enhances the distinct local character and identity of Fortune Green and West Hampstead. This shall be achieved by:

- i. Development which positively interfaces with the street and streetscape in which it is located.
- ii. Development which maintains the positive contributions to character of existing buildings and structures.
- iii. Development which is human in scale, in order to maintain and create a positive relationship between buildings and street level activity.
- iv. Development which has regard to the form, function, structure and heritage of its context - including the scale, mass, orientation, pattern and grain of surrounding buildings, streets and spaces.
- v. A presumption in favour of a colour palate which reflects, or is in harmony with, the materials of its context.
- vi. New buildings and extensions that respect and are sensitive to the height of existing buildings in their vicinity and setting.
- vii. Extensions - and infill development - being in character and proportion with its context and setting, including the relationship to any adjoining properties.
- viii. The provision of associated high quality public realm.
- ix. Having regard to the impact on local views across the Area and the streetscapes within the Area (as

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
				<p>identified in A11 and Map 2).</p> <p>x. Development which aims to fulfil the criteria set out in Building for Life 12 (as detailed in A18).</p> <p>18. Design and construction budget is of course a matter for the applicant however it is clear from this ill-conceived, low-quality application itself as well as the choices of materials and overall design that the applicant intends to build the proposed development as cheaply and quickly as possible. Whilst I have every sympathy for the applicant's personal health circumstances, any redevelopment of the existing garage should be carefully thought through to ensure that it enhances, rather than detracts from, the neighbourhood and minimises any adverse impact on residents living in neighbouring properties on Hillfield Road and Mill Lane.</p> <p>I urge the planning officer dealing with the application to undertake a site visit prior to forming any view on the proposed development.</p> <p>Yours sincerely,</p> <p>Jonathan Fish 40 Hillfield Road</p>

2021/6168/P	David Samuel Eden	29/03/2022 13:25:08	WREP	<p>I would like to object to this proposal based on the following:</p> <p>The design is poor and not in-keeping with the area. Including the aesthetics and pitched roof.</p> <p>The proposed development is too large for the plot and is over bearing on the surrounding properties which are on Hillfield Road damaging their amenities.</p>
-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------	---
