

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2025/0405/P	MR ALON E SHAPIRA	02/03/2025 18:46:00	COMMNT	<p>I am a fellow freeholder at 24 Winchester Road. However, Mr Joseph Woolley did not consult me prior to his submission, and I only learned it from the other fellow freeholder, Mr Ruari Macdonald.</p> <p>Mr Macdonald further informed me that Mr Woolley does not actually plan to undertake the 'Extension', but has only submitted for the purpose of 'increasing value of the property'. I replied that a) if application is successful, Mr Woolley may change his mind at any time. b) a prospective buyer, paying the extra value, would likely do so with the intention of doing the extension. Consequently, it is best not to create the possibility of this circumstance.</p> <p>My concern is accentuated by the Objection raised by our neighbour at No 22, Mr Paul Fineberg, who as a City Architect, is best qualified to assess Mr Woolley's application. Mr Fineberg, who messaged us: 'I submitted my comments, noted below, in case of use. Feel free to add / adapt use as you see fit.' I can only repeat Mr Fineberg's comments:</p> <p>Please note my following objections to this proposal.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The applicant's Conservation and Heritage Statement asserts "we consider the proposed extensions and refurbishment works will be a positive contribution to the conservation area", yet no reason or explanation is given of how and why proposals would achieve this purported benefit. 2. The proposal represents a clear dis-benefit to the Conservation Area (CA) in pushing back substantially beyond the rear face of the house. This would represent a breach of the established pattern of development at the rear of this terrace of CA houses. 3. The proposals would take up a very significant portion of a very small rear garden area, pushing back more than half-way into this small green area. 4. Please note the entirely misleading public notice of this application, displayed in Winchester Road, which shows an incorrect application site boundary. The garden depth (length) is less than half in actuality that depicted on this official notice. <p>Note, the applicant's Conservation and Heritage Statement is copied entirely from Camden Council's own explanation of the designation and character of The Belsize Park Conservation Area, and concludes with the unsatisfactory single line statement referred above.</p> <p>For the reason noted under point 4, the application needs to be withdrawn and re-consulted with accurate representation of the lesser extent and area of the site.</p>