



From: Chris Knight [mailto: [REDACTED]]
Sent: 11 June 2014 09:07
To: Martin, Carlos
Cc: Richard Fletcher
Subject: Ref: 21 Belsize Crescent. 2014/2947/P

Dear Carlos,

May I please raise objection to the CoL request above and below.

[PT=Planning%20Applications%20On-Line&TYPE=PL/PlanningPK.xml&PARAM0=383699&XSLT=/Northgate/PlanningExplorer17/SiteFiles/Skins/Camden/xslt/PL/PLDetails.xslt&FT=Planning%20Application%20Details&PUBLIC=Y&XMLSIDE=/Northgate/PlanningExplorer17/SiteFiles/Skins/Camden/Menus/PL.xml&DAURI=PLANNING](#)

1/. What exists at the site is both an unsightly infill, it is unauthorised, poorly designed, and of poor quality structure which does not enhance or preserve the conservation area.

2/. This CoL would further legitimise the building of the roof area over the flank wall window of number 19 Belsize Crescent which by itself is unacceptable.

3/. The area is covered by Article 4 which this application offends.

4/. This application also offends LDF DP 25 below follows a copy and paste from the header page of DP 25 Development Policies

"b) only permit development within conservation areas that preserves and enhances the character and appearance of the area;"

5/. The following copy and paste below is also taken specifically from LDF DP 25.8 which speaks for itself and this application simply does not meet with this policy

Camden Development Policies 2010 pages 98 & 99

"25.8 Applications for total or substantial demolition in conservation areas must demonstrate to the Council's satisfaction that effective measures will be taken during demolition and building works to ensure structural stability of retained parts and adjoining structures.

Before conservation area consent for demolition is granted, the Council must be satisfied that there are acceptable detailed plans for the redevelopment.

Any replacement building should enhance the conservation area to an appreciably greater extent than the existing building.

When a building makes little or no contribution to the character and appearance of a conservation area, any replacement building should enhance the conservation area to an appreciably greater extent than the existing"

Finally the creation of Conservation Areas, serving Article 4 Direction, LDF Development Policies have been put in place to prevent this poor level of development, this application does not meet with Camden policy and I would therefore ask that this application be refused.

Chris Knight 13 Belsize Crescent, NW3 5QY



From: TAG Architects [mailto: [REDACTED]]
Sent: 12 June 2014 12:51
To: Martin, Carlos
Cc: Richard Fletcher
Subject: 21 Belsize Crescent London NW3 5QY , 2014/2947/P

Dear Mr. Carlos,

This is further to the above certificate of lawfulness application.

As the owner/resident at the house opposite, I wish to object to this application:

1. The proposal, if granted the certificate, will legitimise this non-permitted infill extension.
2. The extension has been constructed without planning consent, its squalid shed-like shape and infill position is harmful to the street scape and should be removed as soon as possible.
3. The whole extension is at odds with the character of the street front, but the proposed French doors at the front make it even more odd in the context of the adjoining houses. They certainly will not enhance the Conservation Area, only removing the whole extension will.
4. Legitimising such substandard extensions in this area may create dangerous precedent to other unscrupulous developers.

Regards,

Thomas Gliszczynski
14 Belsize Crescent
London NW3 5QU



From: TAG Architects [mailto: [redacted]]
Sent: 12 June 2014 12:51
To: Martin, Carlos
Cc: Richard Fletcher
Subject: 21 Belsize Crescent London NW3 5QY , 2014/2947/P

Dear Mr. Carlos,

This is further to the above certificate of lawfulness application.

As the owner/resident at the house opposite, I wish to object to this application:

1. The proposal, if granted the certificate, will legitimise this non-permitted infill extension.
2. The extension has been constructed without planning consent, its squalid shed-like shape and infill position is harmful to the street scape and should be removed as soon as possible.
3. The whole extension is at odds with the character of the street front, but the proposed French doors at the front make it even more odd in the context of the adjoining houses. They certainly will not enhance the Conservation Area, only removing the whole extension will.
4. Legitimising such substandard extensions in this area may create dangerous precedent to other unscrupulous developers.

Regards,

Thomas Gliszczynski
14 Belsize Crescent
London NW3 5QU

Akhaja, Jagdish

From: Martin, Carlos
Sent: 18 June 2014 16:20
To: Akhaja, Jagdish
Subject: FW: Objection 21 Belsize Crescent 2014/2947/P

Carlos Martin
Planning Officer

Telephone: 020 7974 2717

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

From: Deborah Townsend [mailto:debtownsend@googlemail.com]
Sent: 18 June 2014 12:48
To: Martin, Carlos
Cc: Richard Fletcher
Subject: Objection 21 Belsize Crescent 2014/2947/P

Dear Sir,

Objection: 21 Belsize Crescent 2014/2947/P

1. This infill extension was constructed without planning consent. It is unsightly and should be removed.
2. The proposal, if granted the certificate of lawfulness, would legitimise it and create a precedent for other such development.
3. The proposal is no better than the existing structure. It obscures the ground floor window of 19 Belsize Crescent and there is no set back from the the basement window. It would therefore have a negative impact on the amenity of the residents of number 19. The proposed building would spoil the street scape of the conservation area. It would be a squat infill between the terraces with French doors facing onto the road, clearly visible from the public highway. It would look completely out of place.
4. This application does not 'preserve and enhance the character of the area'.

Camden should not give planning permission to a structure which detracts from the conservation area and partially covers the ground floor window of 19 Belsize Crescent.

Regards,

Deborah Townsend
24 Belsize Crescent

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

From: Jane Boardman [mailto:jane.boardman@camden.gov.uk]

Sent: 17 June 2014 11:51

To: Martin, Carlos

Cc: Beaumont, Elizabeth; Chris Knight; Thomas; Ben's Gmail

Subject: Fwd: Objection. 21 Belsize Crescent. 2014/2947/P

Dear Mr Martin,

OBJECTION. 21 Belsize Crescent, 2014/2947/P

You will have seen the submission from Aragon Land & Planning Ltd made on my behalf. This states that the works as described are not permitted development; it should be subject to a full planning application, and the application for a certificate must be refused.

When I first contacted Camden Enforcement circa 1988 to lodge a complaint about the illegal structure placed over two windows of No 19 Belsize Crescent, Camden Enforcement agreed that I had a justified complaint but 'could not afford enforcement action', this document is on record.

I have been reassured on many occasions by Camden that when a development of the unpermitted structure takes place--and it has been lying derelict for over 10 years—it would require full planning permission, at which stage the full conservation guidelines would apply. It was hoped that we would have a building there which would enhance the conservation area. And since then Camden has additional powers under Article 4 Direction, as the space between the terraces is highly visible from the street.

Aragon Land has filed the letter of Rob Tulloch to Mr Fletcher dated 18 March 2009. We were informed then that "normal Council policies will apply". Mr Tulloch goes on to say "nos 19 and 21 Belsize Crescent are considered to have a positive impact on the conservation area and any proposal which would negatively impact on these could not be considered favourably". You further instructed Mr Fletcher in an e-mail dated June 2, 2014 "We will check if the proposal complies with the criteria for permitted development, taking into consideration the article 4 direction and the location of the property within a conservation area". It all seems a bit casual to me.

Two constraints listed by Camden in the certificate materials are compliance with Conservation Guideline and Article 4 Direction. I'm not a planning expert, but it is patently obvious that the curious shape was constructed without planning permission; it's infill position is harmful to the

street-scape, and should be removed as soon as possible. The BCAAC say the wedge shaped structure should never receive planning permission. Camden must avoid giving legitimacy to a structure which is an eyesore to the conservation area. It must refuse the certificate.

Incidentally, as you appreciate the structure partially blocks my ground floor window, coming up 2 feet above it, right up to the window. And towards the rear, the structure comes round up to my basement window. As I state above, I complained years ago, the complaint is on file, but Camden did nothing. There is absolutely no way that the existing and proposed structure can comply with conservation guidelines with respect to neighbour amenity and the enhancement test. And now Article 4 Direction gives Camden the power to do something about it, as the infill is highly visible from the street.

The photographs contained in Member's Briefing 14/11/2013, as part of Aragon Land's submission, prepared by the Case Officer, demonstrate beyond all doubt the dilapidation of the building, so this development will involve a piecemeal demolition, and a rebuilding, referred to the applicant as "development" or a "refurbishment". The facts speak for themselves; it is a complete re-development. The builders will cast aside every piece of the old building and construct anew, in the same unpermitted shape. The building would be a blight on the conservation area for years to come.

This application for a certificate must be refused.

This is being copied to Elizabeth Beaumont at Enforcement and those in Belsize Crescent who have lodged objections so far.

Jane Boardman
19A Belsize Crescent
London NW3 5QY

copy

Chris Knight
Thomas
Ben