

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2023/5480/P	Alexander and Mary Ryzantsev	23/02/2024 15:34:47	OBJ	Generally, we are keen to support any reasonable development that would improve the property at 133 Haverstock Hill and are excited about the proposed development, but have a couple of points we'd like to put on record.

It is commendable that the property will have improved environmental elements, such as a bank of solar panels on the roof, as well as an air source heat pump – subject to the latter not adding any noise pollution to an area that is incredibly quiet, especially at night.

We have been communicating with the Applicant about some of the issues arising from the Application. We believe that the Applicant has accepted some issues raised with respect to the boundary encroachment on some of their existing and proposed drawings, and therefore will not raise these in this objection. We would however like to state that any planning application granted for his development should respect the legal land boundaries as per the Land Registry.

Apart from the boundary issues, we have the following comments, which we have been unable to resolve directly in the limited time as we only saw the proposed plans for the first time 12 day ago.

1. Front Garden – boundary line, the proposed removal of trees and the building of a tall boundary wall
 - Have English Heritage been consulted about the building of a new wall?
 - While we do not object to a new boundary wall in principle, it is very hard to see how one can be constructed without felling of mature trees or damaging their root network. We would agree if the Applicant choose to amend the drawings so as to push the wall back and maintain the existing trees.
 - It is also not clear how the new boundary wall will be attached to the Georgian facade and whether this will have a detrimental impact on the heritage status of the 129/131/133 Haverstock Hill terrace. There seem to be no images of the proposed wall design to clarify this. We would like to see the proposed drawings as this would impact the facade of 131HH – these drawings have not been provided on the proposed plans.
 - As 131HH facade is pushed forward by around 300mm relative to 129HH and 133HH, our view is that regardless of the actual boundary line, no wall can be attached to the section of the building that comes out forward, as this would disturb a natural balance of a listed building
 - We would also like to note that we already have a small raised wall on 131HH (see image), as does 133HH with mature trees in between. Based on the drawings submitted, in order to achieve the building of the proposed new wall, this would require the removal of all trees and shrubs, which would leave 131HH with no trees and instead, a tall dividing wall in addition to the existing small raised wall on 131HH and all new replacement trees situated on 133HH. This would significantly impact the front garden of 131HH.
 - The proposal to fell all the trees and attach a new wall presumably very close to the existing raised wall of 131HH needs further explanation and illustration, as we may find that we have a very small plant bed between the two walls that would be impractical and unnatural in look and feel.

2. Front Garden

- There is a discrepancy between the arboricultural survey commissioned for the Application (the “133HH Survey”) with the one performed in relation to an earlier application 2021/2621/P for 131HH (the “131HH Report”). The 133HH report shows that both hollies (“T5” and “T6” in the 133HH Survey and “T3” and “T4” respectively in the 131HH Report) are positioned on the land belonging to 133HH, while the 131HH Report suggests that the T5/T3 sits on the actual boundary, while T6/T4 is on the land that belongs to 131HH.
- We fully appreciate these surveys may well be not precise enough to have a clear answer as to which land exactly these hollies are on, however, it’s fair to suggest that some of these trees are likely to be fully or

Application No: Consultees Name: Received:

Comment:

Response:

partially on or very close to the boundary.
- For the record, we oppose the felling of these and other trees in the front garden. Felling of these trees would have a significant impact on the natural habitat as well as on the privacy [REDACTED]
[REDACTED] In addition to privacy, trees offer sound dampening from the main road. These trees are 30 feet tall with mature stature.

3. Heat pump noise

- We are excited about the environmental properties of 133HH including the PV panels and the air heat pump and will obviously support this addition to the property, which also future proofs the development
- We are, however, concerned about the potential noise. The air source heat pumps are designed to run through the night with a maximum noise threshold allowed in the UK of 42dB. At the same time, the rear gardens of 129/131/133 Haverstock Hill are incredibly quiet at night, as neighbouring properties are set significantly away and across the Antrim Grove allotments, which are unoccupied after dark
- The Applicant has shared a Noise Impact Assessment report with us, which indicates that without mitigation, the proposed heat pump will generate excessive noise both during the day and at night time. The report suggested that the heat pump noise can be mitigated by either a) moving the unit to a different location, b) changing to a quieter alternative, or c) installing a barrier/fence around the unit to create an open topped enclosure.
- We would like to have all three of the above mitigation proposals to be imposed by planning

4. Size of Rear extension – loss of light and boundary positioning

- We have discussed the size and positioning of the rear extension with the Applicant as the current proposals show the new rear extension built beyond the boundary, on the 131 parapet. The Applicant has assured that this will not be the case and the rear extension will be built entirely on the 133HH side.
- Our remaining comment is to do with the depth of the extension, as it would appear that both the depth and the height of the extension shall be larger than the current footprint. This would significantly obstruct evening sun in the summer months for the patio, which is used extensively in the summer. While the overall height at its peak is only higher than the existing by around 200mm as far as we can tell from the drawings, its gable increases the height facing our patio by around a metre or so.
- We are looking forward to 133HH having a new beautiful extension and will support it in every way, but its size will need to be adjusted to be inside the 133HH boundary and not have a negative impact on our right to light.

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2023/5480/P	Belsize Society	25/02/2024 14:22:59	OBJ	<p>The Belsize Society notes with great concern the proposed front boundary treatment. 129-133 Haverstock Hill are noted in the Conservation Area appraisal as 'the most notable group on Haverstock Hill. They make an important contribution to the Conservation Area and reference the early development of Belsize Park'.</p> <p>At the moment there is an open view to the important house, in common with the two adjacent Grade II listed properties at 129 and 131. The proposals for high brick walls and for new painted metal panelled pedestrian and new electric painted metal panelled timber car gates in place of the existing metal gates are completely unacceptable here.</p> <p>The infilling and raising of the height of the brick wall to the top of the historic brick pillars is a material change to the design of the walls and similar pillars evident on the adjacent houses and the Victorian villas on the other side of Haverstock Hill. For example Nos 163, 164 and 166 have all retained these pillars which are a distinctive feature which will be lost if a brick infill to the top of the pillars is permitted.</p> <p>It is particularly misleading for the applicant to claim (para 6.6(d)) that since the proposed walls are no higher than the existing brick pillars there is therefore considered to be no harm. This disregards the design of all the neighbouring buildings with these distinctive high brick pillars. That approach by the applicant casts doubt on the whole of its Planning and Heritage Statement which should be reviewed thoroughly by the Council's Listed Buildings team.</p> <p>Virtually all of the nearby buildings have low boundary walls and this is an important feature of the streetscape. The ability to be able to view the houses from the street is a very valuable asset and feature of the whole of Haverstock Hill.</p> <p>This is a low crime area and there is no valid argument that would justify such very obtrusive and visible structures which would seriously impact this listed building and its neighbours.</p> <p>The fact that very unwisely, Camden appears to have permitted solid gates elsewhere, for example on unlisted buildings in Lawn Road, merely highlights how unattractive and 'wrong' these gates are.</p> <p>There would be breaches of numerous heritage and Conservation Area policies if the changes to the boundary wall and these gates were to be permitted. In particular Policy D1 and D2 and Policies A1 would prevent this kind of proposal.</p> <p>The Belsize Society strongly objects to the application</p>