

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2018/1439/P	G Harding-Edgar	140 Belsize Road	12/04/2018 14:51:30	COMMNT	<p>Reference: PLANNING APPLICATION 2018/1439/P</p> <p>Erection of a single a story rear extension at lower ground floor level. Alteration to front fenestration. Increase in length of front lightwell and new railings to the front with associated landscaping (retrospective) at 140 Lower Ground and Ground Floor Flats, Belsize Road, London, NW6 4BG by Mr Ian Hislop</p> <p>I write in connection with the above planning application. I have examined the plans and I know the site well as owner and occupier of the flat directly above where the works are proposed. I wish to object to the retrospective change to the the doors and windows at the front of the property, from timber framed (as was granted in application 2017/1889/P) to UPVC. My objection to the application is that the use of such materials is in breach of Camden Planning Policies and supporting documents which have been developed to help guide planning decisions, and offer no positive impact to the building and the surrounds.</p> <p>Through the implementation of these policies and adherence to these documents by developers, residents and the Planning Authority Belsize Road, has maintained a good character and design that warrants protection. A high percentage, if not all, the properties, on the north side of Belsize Road between Fairhazel Gardens and Abbey Road, have timber windows and doors.</p> <p>The South Hampstead Conservation Area, Character Appraisal and Management Strategy', February 2011, was prepared by the Conservation & Urban Design Team at London Borough of Camden, to 'define the special interest of the Conservation Area'. The documents intends to help the community recognise the key attributes of the area and therefore they can be protected and managed appropriately, including putting in place a strategy to ensure 'appropriate enhancement' (paragraph 1.4).</p> <p>The specific mention of windows and doors, and the materials used throughout the document highlight the fact they are an important feature that should be protected. Belsize Road lies within the conservation area, and number 140 is situated in the middle of a terrace of 62 properties that are broadly uniform in character, with wooden doors and wooden sash windows. There are many statements within the document that suggest that installing windows and doors as proposed is not in keeping with the Council policy. With reference to the document:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The document in paragraph 5.22 talks of the 'Definition of character areas or zones' and specifically, the 'uniform terraces of Belsize Road and some sensitively designed

Application No: **Consultees Name:** **Consultees Addr:** **Received:** **Comment:** **Response:**

recent buildings' (point iv). The highlighting of this, in a positive light, in a section entitled 'Character Analysis' can only mean that this should be preserved/protected, which can be done by using materials in keeping with the rests of the area (i.e timber windows and doors.) The use of UPVC in no way protects such character, and is something that has been achieved in other properties more recently developed.

- The houses within the area are 'made special by a variety of decorative treatments including terracotta panels.....timber doors and windows.... '(paragraph 3.1) In paragraph 6.7 the use of UPVC is specifically described as 'unsympathetic' and one of the 'negative elements' which 'detract from the character and appearance of the conservation area' (6.1) that were found in the heritage audit of the area. Again, the Council are drawing attention to the positive impact of timber and negative impact that UPVC has if and when it is used.
- UPVC is specifically mentioned once again in paragraph 12.22, where it is stated that such material' cannot achieve the same quality and visual attraction as the adjacent historic building.' The paragraph continues, suggesting the use of UPVC 'serves to highlight the difference in quality between the two'.
- 'The loss of original joinery.....can have considerable negative impact' (paragraph 13.22) on the subject property, but the surrounding properties on the street.

With reference to Camden Planning Guidance, Design, CPG1, July 2015:

- The document is a 'Supplementary Planning Document' and therefore should form a 'material consideration' in planning decisions including this one. (paragraph 1.1)
- Paragraph 2.9 says the purpose of 'good design' is to 'positively enhance the character.....this is particularly important in conservation areas'. Given Belsize Road's location within a conservation area, the points in this document should therefore not be ignored in assessing this planning application.
- The document continues to describe the principles of good practice for external alterations, including windows, in saying specifically in paragraph 4.7 'Where it is necessary to alter or replace windows that are original or in the style of the originals, they should be replaced like with like wherever possible in order to preserve the character of the property and the surrounding area.
- New windows should match the originals as closely as possible.....' 'Where timber is the traditional window material, replacements should also be in timber frames. uPVC windows are not acceptable both aesthetically.....' This in itself should be enough to convince the Council that the use of UPVC windows and composite door rather than timber is not reasonable and the application should be refused with a condition to replace the windows and doors that are currently in situ.

Having considered the proposals and studied the documents I refer to above, I would contend that the use of the UPVC window and aluminium doors for the basement flat are entirely

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
					<p>inappropriate.</p> <p>The previous planning application was granted on the basis of proposed windows and doors being as 'timber framed to match' (section 11 of the application (2017/1889/P). I see no positive argument for the use of such materials in the property over the use of timber that was consented last year. UPVC and timber frame windows both require ongoing management, and if managed appropriately the timber frame windows will last longer. Cost is of course a factor for the developer, but should not be enough of a factor to result in permission being granted given the detrimental effect on the area and the policies set out by the Council.</p> <p>As such, the retrospective planning application, for UPVC windows, French doors and composite material doors should not be permitted.</p> <p>I am however fully supportive of the proposal for the use of winter beach hedging at the front of the property, this will enhance the area and provide a good balance between hard and soft landscaping at the front of the property as advised in 6.35 of Camden Planning Guidance - Design, CPG 1, London Borough of Camden. If possible I would hope the Council would put obligations on the developer to ensure the planting is sufficiently managed, particularly in the first year to ensure that the planting has the greatest chance of survival and being a positive addition to the streetscape.</p> <p>I note that there is a discrepancy between the 'proposed plans' of the 2017 application and the 'existing plans' in the 2018 application. This suggests that what has been built is not in keeping with what was granted pursuant to the 2017 permission. These differences include</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Number of bedrooms (Ground Floor- studio to one bed, Lower Ground Floor - one bed to two bed) • The extent of excavations at the rear of the property, • The scale of the bi-fold aluminium doors at the rear, (although the change in the material used is sought) • The number of and positioning of the roof light in the rear extension. <p>It does not appear that this application is seeking retrospective permission for these</p>

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
					<p>changes, some of which, are (I believe) material changes i.e. number of bedrooms. Section 17 of the Planning Application does not give detail of these changes. The other changes I believe are non-material changes, but something the council should still be aware of given the difference to what was consented in 2017 pursuant to application 2017/1889/P</p> <p>Given my comments above I think application 2018/1439/P is ill judged when viewed in context of planning policy documents that have been adopted by the London Borough of Camden, the consent that was granted little over 6 months ago and the works that have been done that are not in keeping with the 2017 permission.</p>

Total: 7