

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2022/1872/P	Eleanor Naughten	13/06/2022 12:24:01	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><b>Factual inaccuracy</b></p> <p>The application suggests that “most of the houses in Hillfield etc.. are 5 bedroom houses”. This is a) not true (I can confirm that our house a few doors away is a 4 bed house) and is blatantly trying to mislead. Many houses on the other side of Hillfield Road are indeed probably 5 bedroom but they have a larger footprint. The total footprint of this property is much much smaller and squeezing 5 bedrooms into it is neither reasonable nor appropriate.</p> <p>Furthermore this application heavily references permission granted to 2a Hillfield Road in 2008 and 2011. Given this work has not started I assume these permissions have now lapsed and are thus utterly irrelevant.</p> <p><b>Negative Visual Impact and adverse impact on the character of the street</b></p> <p>The application makes much of the fact that the other houses on this side of the cul de sac are 3 stories high and have roof terraces, but it should be noted that 2 Hillfield Road is higher up the hill so going to 3 stories will actually take it out of line with the rest of the neighbouring houses. It is also clear from their own drawings that the additional story juts out well beyond that of the 3 existing houses with loft extensions creating a jarring eyesore.</p> <p>The reality is that this proposed development is too large, very ugly and will result in very significant negative visual impact, and very significantly and adversely impact the character of the from both Hillfield Road and Gondar Gardens.</p> <p><b>Loss of amenity</b></p> <p>The proposed rear extension will overlook our garden significantly reducing any privacy we may have, significantly reducing light to our garden and resulting in a major loss of amenity. The amenity loss will be even worse in number 2a Hillfield, and will also impact numbers 4 and 4a, as well as the flats on Mill Lane.</p> <p>The application suggests that the size of the building will be the same as numbers 2b, 4 and 4a due to the fact it will have 3 stories. However, these houses are have only a very small 3rd storey which is not developed all the way back, so this design will be out of line and overlook our roof terraces resulting in a significant loss of amenity.</p> <p>The reality is that the back of the proposed property will be significantly higher than the back our property, thus this will exacerbate the impact of overshadowing, loss of privacy and loss of light on all the other 4 properties on the cul de sac.</p> <p>The report says there will be no loss of daylight but I simply disagree. There will be significant loss of daylight for 2a and 2b Hillfield Road.</p> <p><b>Density and Overdevelopment</b></p> <p>This development represents “garden grabbing”. This is a very significant increase for a relatively small plot.</p> <p><b>Summary:</b></p> <p>We object to this development as ugly, overly dense, resulting in significant loss of amenity and being out of character with the local area. It is extreme garden grabbing. 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><b>Site Management and Inappropriate Site Usage</b></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</p>

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

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.

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 sent separately to the planning email address 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?

---