

---

**From:** [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** 06 May 2022 18:19  
**To:** Matthew Dempsey  
**Subject:** RE: 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

My responses are shown below in [Blue](#)

Alan

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

From: "Matthew Dempsey" <Matthew.Dempsey@Camden.gov.uk>

To: [REDACTED]

Sent: Friday, 6 May, 2022 At 11:26

Subject: RE: Comments on 2022/0266/P have been received by the council.

Dear Alan, & CRASH,

[Re: 2022/0266/P – 37 Compayne Gardens](#)

I have received the following responses (in [red](#)) from the applicant in relation to the points you have raised (in black):

“CRASH (Combined Residents' Associations of Sooth Hampstead Wishes to make a few observations on the proposed development at 37 Compayne Gardens. It finds that the applicant makes declarations which are then contradicted and fails to provide necessary detail.

Example 1. Section 15 of the application form asks if new pedestrian access is to be provided - with NO being provided as the answer. A new pedestrian gate is quite clearly shown on the front elevation drawing. [A new pedestrian gate is proposed as shown in the drawings. This is not considered a material change to the existing situation and hence the answer in the application form. There was no pedestrian access, and now a pedestrian entrance is proposed. This IS a material change.](#)

Example 2. Section 18 of the form asks if there are any trees on the site - with No being answered. A tree is quite clearly shown on the forecourt plan. [There is a holly bush in the front garden. No works are proposed that would effect this bush. Hence the answer in the application form. First, the tree/s shown on both the existing & proposed forecourt plan is quite plainly not a holly bush, but a mature tree \(over thirty feet tall\) with another mature tree \(possibly a hawthorn but I'm not an expert\) beside it. Secondly, as already pointed out, the forecourt plans ignore, as does the applicant in this exchange, the presence of a further semi-mature tree on the other side of the](#)

forecourt. This tree reaches to the height of the first floor balcony so is hard to ignore. Presumably the applicant intends to fell this tree - CRASH would object to its loss. Yet again, the applicant is being unhelpful.

Example 3. A new bin enclosure is shown on the forecourt plan, but not shown on the front elevation drawing. How are we to judge its height and bulkiness without a drawing? **It is assumed that the council can condition this if required.** Is the applicant seriously suggesting that Camden Council design the bin enclosure, with consultees being unable to judge its appearance? The applicant's answer is unhelpful.

Example 4. The surface of the forecourt is described as "permeable paving e.g. retain gravel". We doubt if the current surface is gravel, so how can it be retained?" **This is a typo. It should say "retained gravel", which is proposed as a sustainable permeable surface in place of the existing hard landscaping.** Gravel is invariably spread by vehicle movement beyond the property onto the pavement and into the gutter where it is washed into the drains. CRASH objects to its use.

<end>

I would be grateful if you could have a look and advise if you wish to uphold your objection? **The applicant's answers do not effect our objection. The objection remains.**

Any queries, please let me know? Thank you.

Kind regards,

Matthew

Matthew Dempsey  
Planning Officer

Telephone: 0207 974 3862



The majority of Council staff are continuing to work at home through remote, secure access to our systems. Where possible please communicate with us by telephone or email.

---

**Sent:** 29 April 2022 10:50

**To:** Matthew Dempsey <Matthew.Dempsey@Camden.gov.uk>

**Subject:** Fwd: Comments on 2022/0266/P have been received by the council.

**[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 -----

From: [planning@camden.gov.uk](mailto:planning@camden.gov.uk)

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 at 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

Preferred Method of Contact is Post

Comment Type is Objection

This e-mail may contain information which is confidential, legally privileged and/or copyright protected. This e-mail is intended for the addressee only. If you receive this in error, please contact the sender and delete the material from your computer. See our new Privacy Notice [here](#) which tells you how we store and process the data we hold about you and residents.