
From: alan.mason11d [REDACTED]
Sent: 29 April 2022 10:50
To: Matthew Dempsey
Subject: Fwd: Comments on 2022/0266/P have been received by the council.

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Flagged

[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.

Dear Matthew

As you can see, below, the CRASH objection was received by the Council on the 16th April but it does not appear on the application site, which I checked a few minutes ago. Has it been lost?

Kind regards

Alan Mason
Vice-Chairman
CRASH

----- Original Message -----

[REDACTED]
Sent: Saturday, 16 Apr, 2022 At 11:40
Subject: Comments on 2022/0266/P have been received by the council.

CRASH does not object to the basic concept contained in the application, but it has concerns about various details of the proposal, in particular street views in the heart of the South Hampstead conservation area. Our comments are hampered by the unwillingness of the applicant to clarify the vague, and often contradictory, information provided at the time of application (despite our requests for clarification).

Forecourt proposals: As has been pointed out previously, the submitted forecourt plan omits to show an existing tree to the left of the entrance and states on the form that there are no trees affected by the application. CRASH objects to the removal of this tree. There is equal vagueness on the paving to be used on the forecourt. Ideally, CRASH would like to see at least a part of the forecourt surfaced with an eco-friendly grass-base load-bearing grid able to provide parking for cars with an element of 'greening'. As there are no drawings of the proposed bin store we find it difficult to comment on its height and bulkiness, however, we would prefer to see it located against the boundary wall rather than protruding out an an angle. We find the provision of a new pedestrian gate decidedly odd, when it is to be located next to a very wide vehicular entrance. CRASH would prefer a wall rather than a pointless gate.

Front elevation proposals: Although widely-used in the SHCA, in this instance CRASH objects to the use of pitched skylights in the roof. In the English vernacular, attic rooms would be provided with dormer windows - either gabled dormers or hipped dormers - rather than pitched skylights. Unlike modern velux-type windows (even conservation grade ones) which always look anachronistic on a period building, dormers blend well with the late-Victorian / Edwardian aesthetic. CRASH also objects to the proposed

diamond-shaped window in the attic gable. It clashes with its twin on the gable of the adjoining house and is, like the skylights, an anachronism. CRASH would also hope that the opportunity is taken to improve the overall appearance of the building by a re-location of the downpipe that appears from just below the 2nd floor window and travels at an angle across and down the facade.
CRASH objects, on the grounds given above, to the application.

Comments made by CRASH of [REDACTED] Compayne Gardens, South Hampstead, London, NW6 3DG

Comment Type is Objection