

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2022/0760/P	Eleanor Naughten	05/06/2022 14:27:19	OBJ	<p>We wish to object in the strongest possible terms to the proposal for development of this property on the following grounds:</p> <p>Negative Visual Impact and adverse impact on the character of the street</p> <p>The extension of this existing permission to give full dormers will look unpleasant and out of line with the other houses in the street. Whilst three houses do have existing dormers in the cul de sac they are significantly further back and not jutting out so much. This will be very ugly and out of line with the rest of the street.</p> <p>Summary:</p> <p>We object to this development as ugly, unnecessary and resulting in significant loss of amenity and being out of character with the local area. Furthermore, the developer has a track record on this plot of failing to develop anything. He should not be given any more permissions but should be forced to finish what he started over 15 years ago.</p> <p>Site Management and Inappropriate Site Usage</p> <p>This is a site which has been poorly managed for many many years and should not be given permission for an even bigger development which will likely take a further 15-20 years to complete based on current progress. Firstly the approved planning permissions are in no way recent. They date from 2007 (2007/2689/P, 2007/6306/P and 2008/1472/P – the original permission to develop two flats into two vertical dwelling houses and a basement for a swimming pool, and 2015 (2015/6120/P) which was an application for a Green roof which was a condition of the original approval. All that has happened since the approval of these is that the owner has dug an extraordinarily large hole in the property, turned it from 2 nice dwellings to a derelict empty shell and caused a very significant amount of nuisance, disturbance and stress to the other residents of the cul de sac.</p> <p>The ground floor property has been empty since around 2008 and the upper floor property empty for around 5 years. Camden have a significant housing shortage and should now be pursuing compulsory purchase so this property can be sold onto a developer who will develop the site quickly to enable 2 families to actually live in it. Furthermore, it is clear that the developer is now repurposing this domestic site as a unofficial and unapproved builders yard. Every morning and afternoon, multiple Elevations vans arrive to load and unload building materials. If you look at the photo attached you can see there is far too much material for a single and dormant building site. This is clearly being used as the builders' yard for the company Elevations multiple sites around the area. I do not believe the use of this site in this way is permitted. Please can Camden start proceedings to stop the use of the site in this way?</p>

<b>Application No:</b>	<b>Consultees Name:</b>	<b>Received:</b>	<b>Comment:</b>	<b>Response:</b>
2022/0760/P	Darion Pohl	06/06/2022 02:33:00	OBJ	REVISION TO OBJECTION

---

We submitted an objection to this application, however this was done after we looked at 2 planning applications recently made by the applicant at the same time, and was not focussed on this particular application. We are hence writing to revise our objection to focus on this particular application as follows:

---

Dear Council,

I am writing to fully object to the planning application submitted herein being application 2022/0760/P. I am the landlord of the property next door to the proposed development. My wife and I own 2a Hillfield Rd. The grounds for my objection are as follows:

1. Loss of privacy and overlooking. The application drawings do not show the rear of 2a Hillfield Road on the proposed rear elevation. This is key.

The rear of 2a Hillfield Road is a paved and planted garden which we enjoy in private. It receives sunlight and privacy. We enjoy spending time in our rear garden knowing that we can do so without overlooking from 2 Hillfield Road.

However, the proposed changes in the positioning and size of the windows at the rear of 2 Hillfield Rd as denoted on this application will detract from our own privacy as there will be increased overlooking into the rear of 2a Hillfield Rd. We cannot support this and must object.

2. Loss of amenity and Not in keeping with the area. The dormer design and front fence as proposed are not in keeping with the remainder of the cul de sac. The character of the street needs to be properly considered.

3. The developer. Elevations, headed by Mr Sebba has left 2 Hillfield Road as a building site since commencing work on 1/1/2009. The front has been a huge mess with construction materials and hoardings for 10+ years and the rear has had a huge hole at the back of the property with building materials scattered about for approx. 10 years. The developer cannot be trusted to proceed with any application granted and makes all our lives in the area an absolute misery through his incessant applications and leaving the property as a building site since that time. We have recently had council members visit the site and we have our own photographic proof of 2 Hillfield Rd being left as a construction site over this time. we should not be subjected top this every day for 10 years - a nightmare you wouldn't wish on your worst enemy. So that we can all live our lives in peace at this end of Hillfield Rd, the council needs to urgently impose a completion order on Mr Sebba and 2 Hillfield Rd on his already granted application from 2007/2008. All that happens time after time over the past 10-15 years is that Mr Sebba/Elevations makes application after application to council and leaves the property at 2 Hillfield Rd as an absolute tip with hoardings out the front, construction workers coming and going and a massive hole at the rear– which adversely affects the amenity for all of us in the area. Being a developer himself, there is no way that Mr Sebba could have been working for 15 years to build these two houses at 2 Hillfield Rd. We believe he uses the property and hoarding area he keeps building at the front simply as a storage area for other properties he is working on developing (eg in Maygrove many years back). The property at 2 Hillfield is not zoned as commercial and should not be used as such. I would be happy to show you proof of hoardings being at the front of 2 Hillfield Road, and the rear of Hillfield Rd being a construction site going back for circa the past decade. The developer and his continual non-action at 2 Hillfield Rd – leaving the whole place – front and rear as a construction site - is hence a huge negative for all our amenity and enjoyment of the area. I have no doubt you will receive other similar comments from others in the area and you will have your own history you can refer back to. We all really need council to act.

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2022/0760/P	Vesta & John Curtis	02/06/2022 21:17:19	OBJ	This applicant has a shocking record in developing No. 2 Hillfield Road. The house is now derelict, it is an appalling eyesore and has been infested with rats. The applicant has submitted planning application after planning application and is making a mockery of the whole planning process and also of the appeals process. Local residents are becoming very frustrated at the seeming inability of Camden to deal with this problem, and all applications from this developer ought to be rejected. If the developer were truly serious he would have done something since 2007, the date of the first planning application. Instead the building site has not changed or improved, but got worse.
2022/0760/P	Vesta & John Curtis	02/06/2022 21:17:24	OBJ	This applicant has a shocking record in developing No. 2 Hillfield Road. The house is now derelict, it is an appalling eyesore and has been infested with rats. The applicant has submitted planning application after planning application and is making a mockery of the whole planning process and also of the appeals process. Local residents are becoming very frustrated at the seeming inability of Camden to deal with this problem, and all applications from this developer ought to be rejected. If the developer were truly serious he would have done something since 2007, the date of the first planning application. Instead the building site has not changed or improved, but got worse.

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2022/0760/P	A Kelly	03/06/2022 14:08:14	OBJNOT	COMMENTS ON PLANNING APPLICATION 2022/0760/P 2 HILLFIELD ROAD, NW6

I am objecting to this application on the following grounds.

1. Loss of amenity

It is clear that the proposed development will affect the amenity of other properties on that side of the cul-de-sac and also those behind in Mill Lane. No assessment seems to have been made of the impact on the light of surrounding properties.

Camden's reduced consultation process also almost certainly means that the owners of the properties in Mill Lane will not be aware of this application as they are unlikely to have seen the site notices.

I note that the owner of 2a has objected and considers that his amenity, privacy and light will be adversely affected. This is because of the size and siting of the dormer windows and the changes to windows on the first floor. This is likely to be true for other surrounding properties as well and should result in the application being refused.

2. Effect on the character of the property and the neighbourhood

The developer has a track record for unsightly development - see number 3 Hillfield Road, rear roof and extension. The properties in Hillfield Road are Victorian, although having consulted historical ordinance survey maps, it appears that any house on the site of number 2 is almost certainly older than the rest of the terrace.

It is important that any development is done sensitively and is in keeping with the character of the property and also the area. It is clear from the drawings and plans that this proposal does not meet this criterion. The size and design of the proposed windows are not consistent with the existing property and the area. Again, this should be a strong ground for refusal.

3. Overdevelopment

The site of 2 Hillfield Road is very small. There is a small garden which should be maintained. The developer has constantly tried to overdevelop on the site to maximise his profits. The existing planning consent represents the maximum that the site can endure and any additions will result in overdevelopment.

Finally, others have commented on the appalling record of this developer in relation this property and others in the road. It is clearly ludicrous for the property to be in the state it is after 15 years of ownership by the developer. He bought a property which people had been living in as two flats and quickly turned it into a derelict eyesore which has now persisted for well over 10 years.

Camden's inaction in dealing with this is deplorable and the property is now clearly being used as a store for supplies and tools used in relation to other properties the developer is "working on". This alone should have elicited enforcement action.