

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2018/6013/P	[REDACTED]	02/01/2019 14:22:43	OBJ	<p>I object to this variation to the planning permission and in particular to the removal of the hipped roofs and changes to the central façade. The hipped roof, pediment and other previously agreed features are in my opinion integral to making the building appear coherent and consistent with the local environment. As currently constructed the building is totally out of character with its surroundings and presents a very bulky, bland, stark and domineering façade on a street that has plenty of character and charm, which this new building completely lacks. As it stands there is nothing that breaks up the bulk of the building or softens its square lines. It needs the agreed features to make it blend in.</p> <p>If I am not mistaken, the original planning for this location was granted for a house with an Arts &amp; Crafts style design which was intended to enhance the character of the Belsize Conservation area. The house as now proposed is far from that concept and detracts from the local character of the Conservation Area.</p> <p>Furthermore a very similar proposal to erect a building without gables has already been refused before (2016) because it would have been out of keeping with the local area. Also, as this application rightly states, the previous attempt to get approval for this scheme was not looked upon favourably - this scheme is attracting the same reaction.</p> <p>Furthermore, the application tries to imply that there are other buildings in the Belsize area with similar features. None of the examples quoted however, have bays which have a square finish and extend above the roof line with a flat top to them, which is the main issue with this plan. The hips are needed to break up the incoherent design which has these lumps stuck on to the front of the house extending above the roof line. The application also says that the front is now consistent with the back. Fortunately, we cannot see the back from the road, and even if it was true it is not a reason to accept such a poor design. However, the rear does not have two side bays that extend above the roof line.</p> <p>I also think that a stand must be taken against people who build with total disregard for the planning agreements and then later seek to get the planning changed. It has already been conceded to drop the glazed bay windows, which many local people objected to. I had understood this was agreed on the basis that the remainder of the house would be finished as per the approved planning consent. This incrementalist approach to amending the design seems wrong. Where will it stop? It sets a poor precedent if this is allowed to proceed. Further deviation from the original plans which were approved after much input from local residents should therefore be strongly resisted.</p> <p>For all these reasons, these amendments should be refused and the original planning should be enforced. This issue needs to be finalised now so no appeal should be allowed.</p>
2018/6013/P	Sanya Polessek for Belsize Residents Association	02/01/2019 14:01:51	OBJ	<p>The proposed variations of the approved design are regrettable as they reduce the quality of the resulting building. The original Planning Permission was granted for the design rooted in the context of the immediate area. Indeed the currently submitted studies of the surrounding buildings capture the essence of the local design, in particular the wealth of the many variants of the pitched roof designs with its turrets, dormers and many other creative contributions to the Edwardian design. The proposed removal of the original more intricate roof design and other original details render this large building as brutal, ordinary and ill-suited for the Conservation Area.</p>