

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2022/3729/P	Peter Ratzer	12/10/2022 13:15:58	OBJ	<p>It is good to see an old door being renewed. This is an eclectic addition to the many such details in Hampstead. As long as the materials are of good quality and the new brickwork matches the existing in colour and texture (re-cycled if possible) we have no objection.</p> <p>I have seen the above comment submitted by the Heath and Hampstead Society and would like to make the following comments:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none">1. I have no objection to an old door being renewed or reused, but this is not the right place for it.2. The proposed gothic arch is certainly an eclectic addition to the many such details in Hampstead, but again this is not the right place for it. It looks incongruous in the middle of the lower section of the wall. My wife and neighbours have already made this point in more detail.3. I concur with the comments about the materials, but I would suggest that the whole design of the gateway would be better utilised as the entrance of an older building rather than as a garden gate.

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2022/3729/P	Diana Homa	12/10/2022 00:14:52	COMMNT	<p>The proposal for a “period arched feature” at 42 Willow Road, along the boundary wall in Gayton Crescent is in my view entirely out of keeping with the surrounding area. I see the proposed new entrance from my window and strongly object to the inappropriate and disproportionate style, as well as the newly created position, disrupting the charm of a long garden wall, overhung by an apple tree.</p> <p>It is wholly misleading to say the least, for the proposal and attached illustration SK01 EXISTING, to suggest that the “period arched feature” will be “over an existing entrance”. The so called “existing” entrance was created a few months ago without permission, following approval of an earlier application (2021/1641/P), where the following was clearly stated: “The boundary walls front and side on Gayton Crescent remain untouched including the existing blue side door which will be sealed from the inside. We want to maintain the exact appearance albeit the need to paint the door a darker colour in keeping with good taste.”</p> <p>The position of the “existing blue side door” is shown in the following link, reflecting the “good taste” acknowledged by the applicant... and the inherent style and character of the conservation area: https://postimg.cc/ftNcZYpY</p> <p>I firmly disagree with claims that the view “will be very pleasant” and that the feature will make the long wall and the street “more architecturally interesting”... and whilst the applicant refers to “very nice and supportive comments from neighbours”, I am only aware of neighbours who have watched in horror as the height of the wall was considerably increased, mismatched bricks of different colours added, and continuity of the relatively low wall was interrupted with the unwelcome appearance of a disproportionately high and inappropriately styled template of a Gothic door.</p> <p>I would also add that I see nothing comparable in the pictures attached to the proposal, where (dissimilar) arches appear to fit well in their surroundings.</p> <p>I urge the planning committee to oppose this application and to ensure commitment to clearly stated assurances, prior to consent: “...to maintain the exact appearance albeit the need to paint the door a darker colour in keeping with good taste.”</p> <p>Thank you</p>
