

<b>Application No:</b>	<b>Consultees Name:</b>	<b>Received:</b>	<b>Comment:</b>	<b>Response:</b>
------------------------	-------------------------	------------------	-----------------	------------------

2021/3839/P	E John Corso	27/10/2021 22:05:08	OBJ	
-------------	--------------	---------------------	-----	--

Dear Kate Henry,

I'd like to object in the strongest possible terms to the planning application of an additional floor to Howitt Close, on the points made below:

Howitt Close is an Art Deco building, and as such, was built with an appropriately fitting flat roof. To suggest it looks 'unfinished' is a play on words to work around core Conservation Area principles. An additional floor and mansard roof would completely ruin the aesthetic integrity of this historic Art Deco building, and contradict Camden's Conservation Area principles. Suggesting otherwise sets an awful precedent for what should be a conserved area.

The claims in the Planning Application that Howitt Close is not of a similar height to the surrounding buildings are totally incorrect. Any new additional floor would severely impact on light for nearby residents, whilst also significantly increasing overlooking into multiple rear gardens.

Howitt Close is a significant historical building, located in the heart of Camden Council's 'Belsize Conservation Area'. Developing it would deeply harm the character and appearance of the Conservation Area, and become an eyesore from not only Howitt Road and Glenilla Road, but also very much to residents in properties to the rear of Belsize Park Gardens and Belsize Grove. As stated in Camden's Conservation Area Statement, Howitt Close not only falls within the area, but is one of the named core properties of 'Buildings And Groups Of Buildings That Make A Positive Contribution To The Conservation Area' in Sub Area Four - Glenloch' – To permit such a building to be interfered with, suggests core Conservation Area principles are being unprioritized.

Considering the scale and disproportionate disruption, along with lasting negative aesthetic effects which would be caused by the proposed development, I was appalled to learn that the Planning Application was not communicated to any Howitt Close residents, or indeed the vast amount of would be affected neighbouring residents, other than by the smallest of lamppost signs. I find this extremely disturbing, as I strongly feel there is a bias towards the developers, and that Camden Council will not be looking to take objections seriously. I will further add that this smallest of lamppost signs was in the singular, and that Camden Council were hoping for a very small audience to notice it within the originally planned 2 week window, whilst also hoping to ignore opinions from the neighbouring properties in Belsize Park Gardens who are also extremely directly affected.

In addition to the above points, no consideration has been made to the risk of further subsidence to the property, or any consideration to where current roof top water tanks are to be moved to, or indeed if the relocation of the roof top water tanks would further elevate the development, or possibly even reduce the already minimal number of flats to below 7. In my view I find the whole project extremely disproportionate to housing gain, and instead very geared towards profit.

Howitt Road is already a hugely problematic area for simple day to day through road traffic and parking, and adding to this disturbance with this development, would be extremely damaging with the large number of lorries and builders having to be on site for extended periods of time.

Yours faithfully,

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
				John Corso 34 Howitt Close
2021/3839/P	anne zeki	01/11/2021 16:40:41	COMMNT	<p>Dear Kate,</p> <p>I object strongly to the construction of the mansard roof extension on Howitt Close It it a nice Art Deco Building with a flat roof, surrounded by trees and bushes.The addition of those seven flats would make it into a carbuncle. And has anybody thought about the structure of the building, the effect on the tenants and neighbours? The risk of subsidence of this and other buildings near by.</p> <p>I object because I see the all the vegetation surround the building and hiding it from the other buildings would have to be felled in order to use scaffolding and contractors engines. And this would certainly go against the policy of preservation of trees for environmental reasons.</p> <p>I object because it will only increase the density of the population in the area making it even more difficult to park and increasing the rubbish left in the street( see Howitt road and Glenmore road .)</p> <p>This is a conservation area under constant attack from developers to build basement, roof extensions making it a misery for the existing inhabitants of the area.</p> <p>I have lived here for the past 40 years and would like to put a stop to the continuous degradation of our environment.</p> <p>Thank you and I hope my comments would be taken into consideration</p>

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2021/3839/P	Brendan Gleeson	21/10/2021 19:35:42	OBJ	<p>We would like to object to Planning Application - 2021/3839/P, Freshwater's proposal to create seven new flats on the roof of Howitt Close, on these grounds:</p> <p>-We purchased a flat in Howitt Close for our elderly parent because it was a quiet block in a quiet street. At the age of eighty, she is forced to spend most of her day at home in her flat on the top (second) floor of Howitt Close. She cannot be expected to bear three years of building works on the floor above her. In addition to the quiet nature of the block and the street, this flat was purchased specifically because it was on the top floor, and there would be no question of her being disturbed by noise from above.</p> <p>-The proposal contravenes Camden's responsibilities under the Planning (Listed Building and Conservation Areas) Act 1990, and Howitt Road has been part of the Belsize Park Conservation Area since 1988. As per Camden's Unitary Development Plan, altering the roofline and appearance of Howitt Close, and consequently changing the appearance and roofline of Howitt Road itself, made up entirely of residential houses apart from Howitt Close, goes against Camden's own commitment to preserving the character and appearance of the area. Not only would an extra floor ruin the architectural integrity of a well-preserved Art Deco building, it would affect the sunlight of neighbouring properties.</p> <p>Howitt Close is specifically mentioned in Camden's own Belsize Conservation Area Statement as a building that makes a positive contribution to the area. A similar proposal (TP948/12543) was refused in 1961, even before the extension of the conservation area, which now includes Howitt Close.</p> <p>See Camden Unitary Development Plan EN24, sections 4.59 – 4.60 See also page 31 of Belsize Conservation Area Statement (Camden)</p> <p>-Howitt Road is already considered a heavily-parked street, with demand exceeding 90% of the available kerbside space. Adding further flats on Howitt Close, especially given its location at the bend in the road, will further aggravate an already overcrowded street, as per the Unitary Development Plan. See Camden Unitary Development Plan Appendix TR4</p>
2021/3839/P	Sara Robinson	30/10/2021 10:46:08	OBJ	<p>I am writing to object to the submitted plans to add an extra storey to Howitt Close.</p> <p>This area is a designated Conservation Area with outstanding architectural attributes. I have lived in Howitt Road for over 15 years and have followed conservation guidelines with my own property. The road is mostly Edwardian architecture. However, Howitt Close was built later in the 1920s/30s and is a very good example of the Art Deco style. It was designed to blend into the proportions of the neighbourhood which it does successfully and harmoniously.</p> <p>The proposed plans are inconsistent, out of proportion and obtrusive going against the spirit of Conservation guidelines.</p> <p>The construction would lead to major disruption on what is an extremely narrow road resulting in the road constantly being blocked for the duration of the build. It would also create excessive pollution and inconvenience to the residents with no long term benefit to the neighbourhood.</p> <p>I do not want this to set a precedent for further out of keeping developments to this Conservation area.</p>

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2021/3839/P	Andrew Fitzmaurice	21/10/2021 19:39:33	COMMNT	<p>I live opposite this building and I am horrified by the proposed development. I am a professional historian, and I find the claims made in the Heritage Statement highly contentious and unsupported, despite the rhetoric. The report argues that the surrounding buildings all have mansard stories on top. This is true, but the surrounding buildings are all three levels, not the four proposed in development. This building will loom over the rest of us, and it will cut light to the area. The plans show the bottom three levels being all of similar character, with the mansard on top - this is deceptive. As the photos show, the existing top floor of the building is stucco with two levels of brick below, so the three levels are not at all uniform. The effect is nice and it is, in fact, in character with the mansard levels on the surrounding buildings with the 2/1 pattern of levels (clearly the original architect's intention). A further fourth level of yet another style will be a strange melange - typical of the worst developments. Why not also add a fourth level to all the terrace houses! It is not because roofs in Belsize Park Gardens (whose villas are also only three levels) poke up above the three levels some distance away that we should keep pushing up. It is similarly unconvincing to point to the existence of a four level block of apartments at the other end of Glenmore Road, completely out of sight.</p> <p>If this development application succeeds, I will be persuaded that Camden Council is happy to stand aside while companies worth 2.5 billion dollars ( <a href="https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Daejan_Holdings">https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Daejan_Holdings</a> ) ride roughshod over the quality of life of local residents.</p>
2021/3839/P	Abhijit Naik	31/10/2021 19:04:49	OBJ	<p>Dear Ms. Henry</p> <p>I am Abhijit Naik and I live in Straffan Lodge directly behind Howitt Close. I would like to express by opposition to the plans to extend Howitt Close by a floor for the following reasons:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The application's claim that Howitt Close is unfinished is at best a prevarication. Howitt Close was built in the 1930s in the Art Deco style and is a very good example of the same. We have very few such buildings in the Belsize conservation zone and preserving the character of the area should be a priority</li> <li>2. We receive very little sunlight at Straffan Lodge and the extra floor will block that very little that we do receive especially in the evening. In the winter this will create more stress for residents of Straffan Lodge</li> <li>3. The noise caused by construction at Howitt Close will significantly impact me especially given that I have PTSD and anxiety. Builders never follow commitments to restrict work to specific times as has been evidenced by the recent works in the area. The pollution that will result from the construction will be very detrimental to me, an asthmatic</li> <li>4. Howitt Close building is quite close to Straffan Lodge's fence and detritus from the construction will spill over to our garden. We have painstakingly cultivated this garden which has protected trees and we believe that the construction will significantly damage our garden</li> </ol> <p>Kind Regards</p> <p>Abhijit Naik</p>

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2021/3839/P	Howitt Close Resident	22/10/2021 15:51:59	OBJ	<p>To consider building an entire new floor on top of what is already a completed and lived in building is an outrage to the whole neighbourhood.</p> <p>The Party Wall Act of 1996 would be breached.</p> <p>No consideration whatsoever about noise, rubbish, dust.</p> <p>How will the security of the residents be guaranteed in light of scaffolding being put around the original building?</p> <p>The natural sunlight would be restricted for so many in the area.</p> <p>What solutions are being brought as to facilitate this construction? There is not enough space for 2 cars to drive simultaneously and the Council wants to approve for a construction of an entire new floor on a building which I assume would require at least a couple of special equipment cars? What would happen to the allocated parking and an eventual need for an emergency vehicle?</p> <p>Has there been a through survey and enough data to strongly say that the building would even support another floor?</p> <p>Has there been a research about the quality of the pipes, electricity wires and others to positively say that it will handle the pressure of another floor?</p>
2021/3839/P	Bradley Fishman	20/10/2021 19:17:04	OBJ	<p>Objection to adding an extra floor to Howitt Close. We live behind Howitt Close, in Manor Mansions with windows facing Howitt Close, and will therefore be directly and negatively affected by this proposal. Firstly it will reduce light and views over Hampstead for us and 14 other flats in Manor Mansions that have windows facing Howitt Close. Secondly, there are subsidence issue concerns in the immediate area, including for Manor Mansions, with increased load on the ground and foundations of nearby buildings. Thirdly, this proposal is not in keeping with the Belsize Conservation area, with a negative visual impact for all Belsize residents. Finally, this will increase traffic and pollution for the neighborhood. And during a prolonged construction process this would heavily impact quality of life with noise and dust pollution. In summary, we strongly object to this planning application on grounds that it will negatively impact the Belsize Conservation area and all its residents.</p>
2021/3839/P	Kevin Cumiskey	18/10/2021 09:50:34	COMMNT	<p>This is an imposing building built with a certain character. Adding another full floor is going to fundamentally change this character not conserve it. Our house is directly opposite Howitt Close. As such we have limited sunlight at certain times of the day. Adding a floor on top is going to significantly reduce the light in our residence and something I am very keen to avoid. In addition, finding spaces to park is already challenging enough. If you add 7 more flats where is the additional parking coming from? We strongly oppose this extension.</p>

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2021/3839/P	Duncan Webster	02/11/2021 12:40:27	OBJ	CAMDEN PLANNING- APPICATION No 2021/3839/P- APPLICATION OBJECTION.

HOWITT CLOSE LONDON NW3 4LX.

OBSERVATIONS AND COMMENTS- 02.11.2021

Attn: Ms. Kate Henry / Planning Officer.

Dear Ms. Henry,

Further to the street notification posted along Howitt Road I formally register my objection to the above application.

I am the owner of a 2nd floor flat purchased in 1992, so nearly 30yrs, 33 Howitt Close, London, NW3 4LX which will directly be effect by any works.

Just to say I purchased my flat due to all the character of the conservation area, its individuality and architectural charm that Howitt Close brings to its setting & neighbourhood.

Best wishes

Please find my observations & comments below:

#### ASSESSMENT:

- Policy States: self-contained housing identified as priority use within the Local Plan and there is no objection to the 'PRINCIPLE' in providing addition floor space is welcomed?!
- Is not the Council 'protector' of the conservation areas: Are not the council by policy legally obliged to provide protection of those buildings of historic interest. The above statement is hard to understand when Howitt Close (HC) is stated as and 'identified as making a positive contribution to sub area 4 (Glenloch) of the Belsize Conservation Area'.

#### DEIGN CONSIDERATIONS:

Generally Based on the Applicants Submission.

#### Policy and Written Statements regarding HC:

- Is Camden Council not the guardian of Conservation Areas? The Councils Design Policies (D1) or Heritage (D2) do not appear to be considered after the pre-application advice dated of 12.05.2020, which clearly highlights all the qualities of HC.
- Both the council and the applicant's written statements: Have Camden Council & the applicant not identified and confirmed HC as a building that 'makes a positive contribution to the conservation area as a building of interest'.

#### HC Architectural Integrity:

- Local Housing Patterns: In generally, it can be seen that the conservation area comprises of large residential zones built at different times, with their own identity woven and joined together by smaller scale buildings like HC.
- HC Architectural Language & Honesty: Is an Arc Deco design constructed between 1920-35's (stated by

Application No:      Consultees Name:      Received:

Comment:

Response:

applicant) which is nearly 100 yrs old. (surely it didn't take 15yrs to complete)? The architectural influence of Arc Deco features is executed both externally and internally (all common parts), with its enchantment being completely driven by its visual appearance, palette of material and detail. If anything and to the contrary, it can be clearly viewed that HC has taken inspiration from some of influences embodied in the Edwardian terraces of HR, respecting and extending the material essence and language with in its design.

- HC should be seen and retained for what it is: A unique individual building of its time, certainly not subservient to any other. The 'L' form of the building accommodates both changes in level & works as a pivotal transition between the compressed terrace line of HR into the more open Glenilla Road (GR) and spacious Belsize Park Gardens (BPG).
- HC is of a distinct mass and scale: It combines materials and colour cleverly to create its architectural form. Its visual composition is broken down by its fenestration patterns, access / egress points and incorporates a flat roof that typifies Art Deco buildings. The extended 'eaves crown' reinforces the elevational modelling visually making it complete, and certainly does not look unfinished as implied in application! Why ruin a perfectly good building's appeal by adding an additional floor to impersonate its neighbours?!
- The new addition is a total foreign architectural element: HC is designed as an individual apartment block. Surely if HC was meant to match its neighbours, it would have been repeated when the building was 1st introduced to the area. HC must be seen for what it is, a unique individual building of its period, and maintained as existing retaining the integrity of it and the conservation area.
- Adding a false mansard would certainly detract from its value as an asset of historic significance. Adding a false mansard to HC can never be make it become a part of the continuous terraces that typify HR, GR and BPG.
- HC composition: Skilful uses a palette of materials, colour and texture as not to dominate its location. The lower ground levels are constructed from dark brick to form its base. It is crowned by a lighter white rendered upper floor with a slim extended eaves, which reduces its mass, scale sensitively fitting well within its setting and neighbours.
- HC is clearly seen to be a similar height to adjacent residences. The addition of the 3rd floor would not just make the building over dominant, but would overwhelm the existing building's, mass and scale crowding its delicate composition.
- It is evident from renders that HC would lose its individual architectural honesty. The proposals do not provide a new positive contribution to both HC and the conservation area. It evades and mimics the form of a mansard. It is a fake, consisting of a slopping angled roof line, topped with what is basically a flat roof. The roof and it's projecting window bays creates a pattern of what entirely engrosses HC and its neighbours, being completely out of scale and inappropriate to its setting providing a negative response to a heritage asset.
- Existing & proposed drawings not complete: One alarming point is that the existing (No 005 / 006) & proposed (015 / 016) drawings do not show the existing services (RWP / SVP, roof top water tank, boiler flue and roof top distribution). These would require modification and some extension. They would defiantly have a visual and physical impact on the proposals indicated. They are not just missed from the drawings, but are omitted from the architectural renders creating a false impression.
- Bay study of existing & proposed: In addition, it is surprising that there is no general construction study of the existing and proposed additions (section / elevation). The associated images do not provide confirmation of what the proposals are? The study would have provided clarity in:

1. Comprehensive understanding of buildings constructional composition: There is no information to explain materials, their build-up, thicknesses and the impact on interface between existing building and the new. 3rd floor addition This would also expose the relationship between the mass, scale and materials negative

Application No: Consultees Name: Received:

Comment:

Response:

relationship between too.

2. From the DAS, it appears to introduce elements that are totally foreign to any architecture in the area- windows are termed 'Micro HC Frames'?

3. Confirmation of the buildings final height: There are no levels indicated on application information- the building can well grow in height after any potential approval that is graphically shown on the drawings. You have thought levels would be fixed at the application stage and not later?

Internal Original Common Parts:

- Although not a part of planning: The internal communal areas are generally original, intact and have been well maintained.
- Staircases & Internal Features: Some of the existing features such staircases, railings and mouldings will no doubt be destroyed during local demolition of the 3rd level floor slab (existing roof) with the new insertions link the 2nd floor, completely ruining the current integrity of the unified interiors of the main and escape staircases.

ENVIREINMENTAL & SUSTAINABLITY:

Comments based on 'Environmental Services Report & Drawn Submissions'.

The existing (elevations 05 & 06) and proposed (roof plan 014, elevations 015 / 016 and section 017):

- The drawings do not show the existing services? How are these taken into account within the proposals e.g. The water tank would need to be raised above the 3rd floor roofline to form a local 4th level, existing boiler chimney extend, SVP extended above the new windows heads- all will have a visual impact on the building.
- Can the existing RWP system accommodate the additional load? or would pipework need remodelling.
- The Executive Summary Statement, 'to be green: renewable energy': This document mentions the use of onsite renewables incorporating photovoltaics (PV's) PPC1 'Climate Change Mitigation'. The planning drawings do not indicate the location, their extent and impact on the existing and proposed building. A flat roof has been indicated. The flatter the panels the more you require (The optimum performance for PV's London is around 65° the proposed roof is approx. 1.5-2°). Surely if allowed these would become an eye saw to those who have an elevated roof top view.

Be Lean- Use Less Energy:

- Mechanical Ventilation with Heat Recovery (MVHR) Assume these units are located within each flat (there is no pitched roof void to accommodate the units, basically a flat roof).
- 1. Are these units not traditionally an air to air heat hump facility that would require both air inlet and exhaust ports (IEP's)? Does the MVHR's require any external plant that has not been identified?
- 2. The IEP's have been omitted from the proposed roof plan (014), section (017), elevations (015 & 016) and architectural renders- what is the visual impact?
- 3. Do the IEP's have the potential to create external noise and contaminate outside air adjacent to other windows?

Additional Comment:

- It can only be concluded: In general, it would appear that there is a scope list to comply with Camden's Local Policy and Buildings Regulation Requirements etc. There is no demonstration of the impact the 3rd proposals will have on the exiting roof top services / distribution. They are completely ignored as if they don't



Application No:      Consultees Name:      Received:

Comment:      Response:

exist & would need reinstated for HC to operate. (It is assumed that some the existing services would need to be temporarily disconnected cause all kinds of problems for the existing occupiers?)

- Construction Management Plan (CMP): On writing the CMP was not on CC's planning portal. It is assumed the above will be reviewed as part of planning application, ensuring the proposals have been fully investigated to a sufficient standard to confirm that there are no complications further down the projects path.

#### AMENITY:

- Camden Council's PA advice: In both letters from Camden Council to the applicant they state:

##### 1. Letter dated 12.05.2020:

'To reiterate, you are strongly advised to consult with the buildings existing leaseholders throughout the process'.

##### 2. Letter dated 07.12.2020

'You are strongly advised to consult with existing occupants and involve them in the process'.

- THE ABOVE NEVER TOOK PLACE WITH ALL RESIDENTS TOTALLY IGNORED.
  - All residents: Occupiers and parties of interest have been totally disregarded and ignored. The first the occupants knew about application was when a yellow notification was posted outside the building at the end of September.
  - HC is an occupied and not empty / vacant residential block: The Applicant has treated the building as if it was entirely unoccupied. The existing roof appears to be treated as an empty site plot. There has been not contact or any inclusion as part of the applicant's intentions to either the HC Self-Management Group or as individual occupiers.
  - 'The Construction Management Plan- At the time of writing: The CMP has been omitted from the application, although it is listed both as part of the planner's requirements and within the applicants covering letter. This document is very important as it would highlight the impact of the proposals on the, existing building, occupants and neighbourhood, through from demolition to completion. The below list is only a small example, but has additional associated comments. The proposals would generally have a devastating environmental & sociological impact, not just to HC residents but to the surrounding neighbourhood:
1. Demolition (vibration, noise & dust etc.).
  2. Suspension or temporary disconnection utility services (water / electrics)?
  3. Suspension or temporary disconnection of water (water tank / boiler flue).
  4. Traffic Management (deliveries / refuse removal etc.).
  5. General noise and constant impact noise (whole building, but especially the 2nd floor).
  6. Vibration (potential for cracking in walls ceilings / party wall records would be required due to potential damage to existing flats).
  7. Dust (can only be slightly mitigated if the entire roof is fully enclosed. Any dust would no doubt end up being carried through the existing buildings windows etc.).
  8. Air quality (as part of the above).
  9. Reduced usage of the main and fire escape access (construction of new staircases would temporally require closure of staircase?).
  10. Site huts (Site office, welfare cabin, toilet & tool / plant storage etc.).

Application No:      Consultees Name:      Received:

Comment:

Response:

11. Loss of privacy.
12. Long term security risk (scaffolding or any high level lift etc.).
13. Loss of sky view and daylight. Wouldn't any scaffolding need to be twice as high? The roof would require weather proof scaffolding coverage as the roof would need to be stripped & reconstructed requiring a double height volume to enable works of the 3rd floor roof to be constructed? (The enclosure would surely need to be weather tight, basically requiring a temporary 4th floor aspirating the issue).
14. Etc etc.

- Traffic management: General and site vehicle deliveries / removals will cause local congestion / grid lock at the two way HC junction creating times of total seizure. Although there are normally permitted times for deliveries etc. (there is no guarantee that these will be kept too). The junction already causes jams with heated debate on a regular basis.
- Traffic management: additional acoustic matter: There is one additional acoustic observation with regard to HC. HC appears to form part of a geometry (90°) creating a form of sound box between HR and GR intensifying acoustic levels between all the buildings. On a daily basis the noise from construction operations and additional vehicles will most likely be higher than normally experienced. (a constant nuisance not just on a daily basis but for some years).
- Other existing current sites along HR: Even smaller residential developments & general deliveries vehicles are problematic in the area. Existing sites are always blocking parking bays with building bags & planks. The large delivery vehicles block the narrow HR causing many an unpleasant confrontation- would parking bays not have to be suspended for a few years?

Construction Management Plan (CMP) & Construction Design Management (CDM File).

- It is presumed that many of the above matters would have been identified & analysed as part of the process carried out using the CDM process, which would assist the formulation of the CMP.
- There are few additional aspects that also immediately come to mind:

1. No daylight sunlight report: The applicant has not provided a 'Daylight / Sunlight Report' which would highlight any issues with regard to HC & its neighbours on HR, BPG & Belsize Grove- No supporting comment.
2. Loss of sky viewed & natural light: It is observed that after completion, the additional 3rd floor may well reduce what is currently enjoyed by some flats located on the northern wing of the block. It would appear that there will be a significant loss of sky viewed and loss of natural light- south west, midday to evening.
3. Existing roof top services: The application has ignored the existing roof top services- water tank, boiler chimney & distribution. Temporarily the building cannot function without them. The proposals have not indicated any reinstatement on any drawings or render?
4. Building Occupation Retirees & Covid 19: The building works I'm sure would cause distress to the retirees who are basically at home virtually all the time. However, the building is probably more populated than normal during the day due to Covid 19, 'working from home' generally still the norm and still taking place- more frustration with consistent site operations, how can one work with the disruption?

#### PLANNING APPLICATION INFORMATION:

Omitted application information: Noted that the following information was not submitted as part of a full application as referred to in the applications covering letter dated 27.07.2021:

Application No:      Consultees Name:      Received:

Comment:

Response:

1. Dwg No 003 Existing Site Plan.
2. Construction Management Plan.
3. In addition, there is no existing Roof Plan to indicate the water tank, boiler chimney and roof top service distribution.

Information submitted as part of the Application:

- Application of artistic licence: The existing elevation 005 and 006 are graphically treated entirely differently to the proposed elevations 014 and 016. The drawings cannot truly be compared as this changes distorts the way the building is visually read. The existing displays simple brickwork & render, whilst the proposed indicates no brickwork, but introduces dark grey bands of shadow making the 3rd level look lighter. The dark shadows try to and fails to tie the buildings together as it is not a true representation. It should also be noted that HC never gets projected shadows as indicated on the drawings.
- It is not possible to see the proposals in true setting as materials are not truly represented in monochrome drawings. It can clearly be seen from the 'DSA' renders that proposal would be visually heavy & architecturally over complex in relation to the existing building. It certainly would not be a positive addition to HC & the conservation area.
- Existing HC services not Indicated: Both the existing dwg No's 005 & 006 and proposed elevations dwg No's 014 and 016 do not indicate the water tank, boiler flu, SVP's & RWP's, which are quite a feature on the building. The 3Rd floor would have the existing SVP's extended above new window heads. The water tank / flue is omitted and needs reinstatement as it would form a prominent local 4th level structure. Where are these installations? Drawings & renders have omitted these entirely.
- The proposed 3rd floor dwg No 013 shows extensions to the staircases. There is no 2nd floor plan to show the impact on the existing building. As previously stated the common parts are generally original & intact. Although interiors don't form part of the application remit, I'm sure these will not be treated with the respect they deserve with works disfiguring the existing and new been complete different causing detriment to these interiors.

Information that would be Expected / Comment?

1. Detailed Elevation Bay Study: As previously mentioned as you would have thought there would have been some form of sectional / bay study. This would provide evidence of the proposed construction, materials & heights / levels. Without inclusion as part of the planning application the proposals heights can easily increase and details change well beyond the outline currently drawn.
2. Section 017 Proposed Section: It can be seen from the section the profile of the roof is not a mansard. It is a sloping roofline with a flat roof that is surely not true as described in the application. As stated above it is noted that in general the applicant has not confirmed finished levels which can easily rise after any application gains approval.
3. Daylight / Sunlight Report: Impact on HC, HR, GR, BPG & Belsize Grove.
4. Acoustic / Noise Report: Impact during the construction and when in occupation.
5. Structural Statement: Has an assessment been undertaken with inspection with holes to assess existing structure against proposals (foundations, wall and roof?).

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2021/3839/P	LORI ROSENWASSER	18/10/2021 21:42:27	OBJ	<p>I live in a 2nd floor flat at 42 Belsize Park Gardens, which sits directly behind Howitt Close. The proposed mansard roof extension and higher elevation of the building to accommodate 7 new flats would negatively impact me directly and personally, in the following ways:</p> <p>1) I would be completely overlooked by the proposed new flats on a 3rd floor of Howitt Close, which would have a direct view into my bedroom window, and I in turn will be looking directly into, and at, a (not particularly attractive) building. Currently the window line of the 2nd floor flats at Howitt Close is low enough so that my flat is not directly overlooked, and the privacy of the flats below me is ensured by the existing trees between our garden and Howitt Close.</p> <p>2) the proposed higher elevation of Howitt Close will also block the light that currently comes into my flat, removing much of the 'sky' from my view - making the rear of my flat much darker.</p> <p>In addition, ALL the residents in my building will be negatively impacted if this higher elevation is allowed at Howitt Close, because:</p> <p>1) the morning sunlight into our communal garden would be blocked, probably so that it would entirely sit in the shade rather than getting at least the morning sun which it currently does. This will cause our flats to lose value.</p> <p>2) In addition parking on this area is already very difficult, and this proposed addition will exacerbate it. The neighbourhood is very densely populated as it is, and allowing for more residents will not be beneficial in any way, other than to make money for the developers (and actually take money away from us, the residents, most of whom have been living here for many years).</p> <p>I am very strongly opposed to this development and hope these considerations will be taken seriously into account.</p>
2021/3839/P	Jason Coates	17/10/2021 18:00:37	OBJ	<p>We object to the proposal for a number of reasons, all of which relate to the negative impact the changes would have for us as residents of Manor Mansions.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Our views to the back of our flat would be impeded and light materially reduced.</li> <li>2. We have had a significant issue of subsidence (which is still not resolved) and these substantial works in the near vicinity risk further subsidence that could materially affect our property.</li> <li>3. The local conservation area of Belsize Park should not be subject to such an increase in the height level of properties, which would negatively impact the quality of the whole area and enjoyment of all residents.</li> <li>4. Further flats would negatively impact the available parking spaces for all residents in the area when they are already at a premium.</li> <li>5. Noise of works would be a nuisance to all of us who now work at home regularly following COVID.</li> </ol>

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2021/3839/P	Paul Devaney	01/11/2021 08:22:49	OBJ	<p>I strongly object to this ludicrous, grotesque over development in a conservation area. How does this development preserve or enhance the area's character. A mansard roof is not characteristic of an art deco for one. Howitt close was built to fit in with the existing skyline of the surrounding area, this development is completely over bearing and takes the height way above the surrounding buildings taking out sunlight and daylight and creating a shadow over the adjacent area and in fact dominating the road. The construction will take years and in a narrow and restricted access will create a living hell for residents while the building work of such an over development takes place. In addition, the parking situation in Howitt road which is already bad will be worsened considerably both during and after construction and again will make a misery for residents. Paul Devaney</p>
2021/3839/P	Jonathan Gatward	21/10/2021 16:35:21	OBJ	<p>I Object.</p> <p>The four villas 38-44 in Belsize Park Gardens, originally sat in large gardens, this series of villas is unique and this should be acknowledged with their outlook and surrounds protected as part of the conservation area.</p> <p>Existing.</p> <p>Howitt close, as it stands, fills up the original gardens of the villas. Although well designed the current 3 story building creates a cliff like wall, which overshadows and compromises the open gardens. The tall perimeter planting around Howitt close currently screens the building from its close neighbours.</p> <p>Proposal.</p> <p>The addition of a mansard roof (whether clad in red tiles or copper) is totally inappropriate and ruins the host building. The proposals are top heavy, bulky, with excessively high dormer windows. The additional height will cause even more overlooking and loss of light. it will also significantly diminish the long views from the four villas. The prosper drawings do not show consideration for</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- whether a double roof will be required, which will further increase the height</li> <li>- the fact that the foundations may need strengthening which will reduce planting in the garden</li> <li>- the consideration of perimeter planting replacement like for like or better, as the existing will have to be removed for building work and scaffolding erection.</li> <li>- for the sake of 7 flats the areas and in particular villas will be significantly devalued by this proposal, with their original character and current qualities compromised, as part of the Belsize Conservation area.</li> </ul>

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2021/3839/P	Tom Symes for Belsize Society	01/11/2021 12:07:40	OBJ	<p>Objection to Planning Proposal for Howitt Close, NW3 2021/3839/P</p> <p>The Belsize Society strongly objects to the proposal to add an additional storey to the very attractive and important block of flats at Howitt Close.</p> <p>The proposal would cause very significant harm to an important building within the Belsize Conservation Area. In the Belsize Conservation Area Statement there are a number of highly relevant statements:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Howitt Close is identified in the Belsize Conservation Area Statement as one of the 'BUILDINGS AND GROUPS OF BUILDINGS THAT MAKE A POSITIVE CONTRIBUTION TO THE CONSERVATION AREA'</li> <li>• A number of buildings are notable because of their value as local landmarks, or as particularly good examples of the local building tradition. Such buildings, whilst not statutorily listed, are nevertheless important local buildings in their own right and make a positive contribution to the character and appearance of the Conservation Area. The general presumption should therefore be in favour of retaining such buildings. Although not listed, the Government requires that proposals to demolish these buildings should be assessed against the same broad criteria as proposals to demolish listed buildings (PPG15, paragraphs 3.16-3.19).</li> <li>• Howitt Close is listed as one of the unlisted buildings which make a positive contribution to the special character and appearance of the area.</li> <li>• The Belsize Conservation Area retains much of its architectural integrity. Generally, despite the imposition of the motor car into the public realm and the insertion a scattering of buildings from the second half of the 20th century within the Conservation Area, the majority of the area retains the essence of the character and appearance that would have prevailed in the 1930s.</li> <li>• The majority of applications for planning permission within the Belsize Conservation Area involve minor alterations and extensions to existing dwellings. This can have a cumulative impact on elements that contribute to the character and appearance of buildings, streets and areas as a whole. The most noticeable changes within the area often result from one or more of the following: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Roof extensions - particularly the addition of overly large, inappropriately proportioned dormers, and the addition of mansard roofs</li> <li>• Alteration to, or replacement of windows, porches, doors, and other features. This includes the use of inappropriately scaled and detailed modern doors and window frames, in unsuitable materials</li> <li>• Addition or alteration to basements</li> <li>• Addition of roof terraces or balconies. The key issue being roof terraces with inappropriate railings that are prominent in the street scene</li> <li>• Addition of external services</li> <li>• Inappropriate design and materials</li> <li>• Inappropriate external painting (particularly of brickwork)</li> <li>• Loss of original features. (The classical ornamentation on the villa development and terraces has been particularly susceptible)</li> <li>• Extensions of excessive bulk, massing or height</li> </ul> </li> <li>• In the Belsize Conservation Area Statement, London Borough of Camden says: 'Planning permission is required for extensions and alterations at roof level. Roof extensions and alterations, which change the shape and form of the roof, can have a harmful impact on the Conservation Area and are unlikely to be acceptable where: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• It would be detrimental to the form and character of the existing building</li> <li>• The property forms part of a group or terrace which remains largely, but not completely unimpaired</li> <li>• The property forms part of a symmetrical composition, the balance of which would be upset</li> <li>• The roof is prominent, particularly in long views</li> </ul> </li> </ul>

Application No: Consultees Name: Received:

Comment:

Response:

Belsize Society believes that the current proposals, which change the shape and form of the roof, will have a harmful impact on the Conservation Area. They are unacceptable because the proposals would be detrimental to the form and character of the existing building, the property forms part of a group or terrace (Howitt Road) which remains largely, but not completely unimpaired, the property forms part of a symmetrical composition, the balance of which would be upset and the roof is prominent, particularly in long views. On this basis Camden should refuse the application.

The proposal will damage a well-preserved, unique 1930s building of considerable architectural merit and significance. The bulking-up of the building by the addition of an extra storey will destroy the architectural integrity of a heritage asset, adversely affect the visual appearance of the neighbourhood and profoundly harm the Conservation Area.

Howitt Close was very carefully designed in 1932 to suit its specific location and, internally and externally, it remains fundamentally undamaged and unaltered by changes since construction. It has maintained its architectural integrity over the best part of a century and is unspoilt by major additions or changes. After surviving intact the second world war, unlike some Howitt Road properties, and escaping infelicitous developments in the post WWII era, it would be deeply ironic if the building were to be desecrated in the 21st century whilst defined as a building making a positive contribution to the special character and appearance of the Belsize Conservation Area, and apparently subject to the protections of a Conservation Area.

This L-shaped building was clearly designed to make optimal use of the space available, but without dominating its prominent position at the junction of Howitt Road and Glenilla Road, with Belsize Park Gardens a stone's throw away. Aesthetically it was designed to blend with the earlier Edwardian terraced housing in the neighbouring streets that predated it, whilst proclaiming its era of construction through its overall form and Art Deco flourishes. The proposal to add a fourth level and mansard roof would destroy the proportions of the building and make Howitt Close, at present perfectly adjusted to its vicinity within streets of terraced Edwardian houses, an over-prominent and jarring presence.

Camden Council in its 12 May 2020 preplanning advice to the applicant acknowledges the architectural skill, integrity and appropriateness of the building in its present form:

"The existing building is constructed as two brick storeys topped with a white roughcast one. This two-plus-one composition, with the use of a pale storey above a darker mass below, combined with the topography of the street which gently declines

towards the site, means that although at three full storeys above ground it technically contains a storey more than the surrounding houses, it does not appear more bulky. In addition, the scale has been carefully designed, with the use of setbacks and tripartite "bay windows", giving a plot width akin to that of a house, and through the use of domestic materials – red brick and roughcast – as seen on houses across the street. As it stands, it is considered to be a complete composition of considerable charm which, through good design suits its context well."

The same document goes on to describe the adverse effect of any alterations to the building's height:

"The site is prominent, being adjacent to a T-junction and addressing a curve in the road. This means that it is visible in long views along Howitt Road from the north-east and along Glenilla Road from the north-west. It is also freestanding, set apart from surrounding buildings, particularly to the south-west, and this means it is highly visible. Any alterations to its height would therefore be visually prominent from various points in the streetscape. The building is terminated with overhanging eaves and a flat roof; a unique feature of the building...

Any extension would also have to be mindful of the prevailing height of surrounding buildings. The relevant streetscape to the building, is less the larger buildings of Belsize Park Gardens as shown in the drawings, but the smaller scale of Howitt Road which the building addresses."

Application No:      Consultees Name:      Received:

Comment:

Response:

The Heritage Statement commissioned by the applicant implies that the flat roof of Howitt Close is something of an aberration in Howitt Road but, rather than an aberration, the flat roof should be seen as a conscious choice by the architect to restrict the height of the building. As described by Camden Planning above, at three full storeys above ground the building technically contains a storey more than the surrounding houses (two storeys plus an attic level within mansard roofs) but, due to the flat roof coupled with other design features (such as two brick storeys topped with a white roughcast one – i.e. a pale storey above a darker mass below) described above, it does not appear too tall. But, at three storeys, Howitt Close is already at the maximum height to blend in aesthetically with the neighbourhood.

The applicant's Heritage Statement downplays the architectural uniqueness of the building and makes no mention of the excellent state of authenticity and preservation of the building. Belsize Society strongly disagrees with the statement in the Heritage Statement that "the addition of the mansard storey would be considered to represent an overall enhancement to the character and appearance of the Conservation Area". It considers that the flat roof, coupled with the deep eaves, comprise distinctive and attractive features of Howitt Close. The building in its present form is highly valued in the neighbourhood and the addition of a fourth storey and mansard roof would be inflicting substantial harm on a heritage asset. Howitt Close is the only mansion block in its immediate vicinity and the extra storey would add bulk to what is now a well-proportioned and not over-dominant building. The closest visible mansion block to Howitt Close is Sussex House, a short distance away on Glenilla Road, which is singled out in the Conservation Area Statement as a negative feature: "an oppressively large block" and "an overbearing flat block significantly larger than the other buildings in the street". The proposed works would make Howitt Close into an oppressively large block, significantly larger than the other buildings in the street.

The applicant's Heritage Statement discusses the blocks (Glenloch Court, Wimborne Mansions, Banff House and Moor Court) on the junction of Glenloch and Glenmore Roads, although these are completely out of sight from Howitt Close and its surroundings. These blocks are four storeys high with flat roofs. The implication is that these blocks are classified as "neutral contributors" to the conservation zone as a result of their flat roofs. In reality it is not the lack of a mansard roof that makes these blocks less attractive and emphasises each building's bulk and height but the fact that they are four storeys high and tower above the surrounding terraces - as Howitt Close would do with the addition of a fourth storey. Part of the visual unattractiveness of these blocks in their context is because they are disproportionately tall for the width of the streets in which they are located. An extra storey on Howitt Close would have a similar effect at the bottom of Howitt Road: the block would loom above the street making it over-dominant in contrast to its current harmonious presence.

The applicant's Heritage Statement attempts to downplay the impact of the additional storey on the views towards Howitt Close from the north-east, south and north-west but it does not make it clear that there will be an adverse effect on these views. Howitt Close is already visible for the length of Glenilla Road as far as Belsize Avenue but in its present form it could be taken at a distance for a terrace of houses. It fits perfectly in its setting at present, the height and width of an extra storey would make it over-dominant.

The applicant's Heritage Statement refers to the "utilitarian style of the western elevation" but this is highly subjective and unjustified. This façade is entirely in harmony with the rest of the building and its slightly simpler design complements the glimpse of the front and view of the eastern wing, which can be seen simultaneously from the north-western approach. Again from the north-east Howitt Close can be seen from a considerable distance up Howitt Road but, as from the north-west approach along Glenilla Road, it could be a view of terraced houses until one approaches fairly close to the mansion block. From Belsize Park Gardens and the southern approach along Glenilla Road, Howitt Close is already a significant presence and an additional storey would harm the streetscape along this stretch of the road.



Application No: Consultees Name: Received:

Comment:

Response:

The statement in the application 'the existing eaves present an almost unfinished appearance' is meaningless given that the building was completed in the 1930's by a highly regarded architect who clearly intended the building to appear as it still does, a beautifully designed block which makes a very positive contribution to the Conservation Area.

Belsize Society notes that the applicant has refined its proposal on three occasions to try to make it less obtrusive. It is clear from the illustrations in the application that it is impossible to make a proposal of this kind acceptable in design terms, the proposed dormers and vast extent of tiling ruin the subtle gentle appearance of the existing building design.

Historic significance of Howitt Close

Howitt Close was constructed between 1932 and 1934. A 'Notice of new buildings, drainage works, and apparatus in connection therewith' dated 27 October 1932 was filed with the Borough of Hampstead. This Notice was signed by Henry F Webb & Ash and the same business is shown as the owner of the site/building. Howitt Close first appears in the General Rate book for Belsize Ward made 6 April 1934, which shows that the 46 flats in the building were fully occupied by tenants as at March 1934, by which time the building was owned by London Mayfair & District Properties Ltd.

The applicant's Heritage Statement incorrectly dates the property ("represents a 1920s addition," "constructed in a single phase, between 1920 and 1935" and "possibly indicates that the building was constructed in the early 1920s") and, as such, the statement cannot

interpret correctly either the individual significance of the building or its importance within its historical context. A construction date between 1932 and 1934 means that Howitt Close was contemporaneous with the (Grade I listed) Isokon flats, located less than half a mile away on the east side of Haverstock Hill. The design of the Isokon flats was developed 1929-1932 and they were officially opened in July 1934, shortly after Howitt Close was first occupied. A huge amount has been written about the Isokon building – a project "to design an apartment building and its interior based on the principle of affordable, communal and well-designed inner-city living... But it was not a working class building – it was aimed at intellectual, working middle class people." The Howitt Close flats were also intended to provide compact living spaces for the middle classes. The original plans for the building were titled 'Proposed Block of Small Type Flats.' Howitt Close had a restaurant from the very beginning in the lower ground floor, with 'Ash & Fitch' (presumably the caterers) occupying the restaurant and associated accommodation at April 1934. The famous Isobar restaurant in the Isokon building was not opened until 1937, when the communal kitchen in the block was converted into a restaurant. The impetus behind Howitt Close was similar to that of the Isokon building and, with its contrasting architectural style, it provides context for a modernist building like the Isokon flats. Without good comparable examples like Howitt Close, which remains very close to its 1930s state, the significance of the Isokon flats is diminished.

It is notable that the business 'Henry F Webb & Ash' was the original owner and developer of Howitt Close. There can be no doubt that the Henry F Webb concerned was the architect Henry Frederick Webb (1879-1953) who designed Elm Park Court, Pinner, constructed in 1936 and now Grade II listed. Elm Park Court is considered one of the icons of the form of modernism which took hold in 'Metro-land' in the 1930s, a form of modernism which owes more to Art Deco than to the later 'brutalist' strand of modernism. Whilst the green and white colour-scheme of Elm Park Court gives it a very distinctive character, its Art Deco heritage is apparent and the development has a number of features in common with Howitt Close. Over and above its intrinsic architectural merit, Howitt Close is significant as another building designed by HF Webb, an architect important to north-west London as the designer of the iconic Grade II-listed Elm Park Court.

In contrast to the well-publicised and dramatic history of the Isokon Building with its celebrity tenants – "Very few pre 1945 tenants do not have a Wikipedia entry" - Howitt Close has had a quiet history, and remarkably little has been written about it. It is understood that it was used as residential accommodation for civil servants

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
				<p>at some point and further research could reveal an interesting story of an early example of inner city, partly communal living for the middle classes. In contrast to the Isokon Building, which fell into an appalling state of disrepair under Camden Council's ownership and required total refurbishment, Howitt Close has remained in a reasonable state of repair over the past 90 years, partly because it lacks some of the structural design faults which contributed to the Isokon's deterioration. Howitt Close, as a pleasing and highly suitable presence in its location, has been taken for granted over the best part of a century, at least until the threat to the architectural integrity of the building posed by the current planning proposal. It forms a highly valued and important part of the Belsize Conservation Area and should not be altered as proposed. Belsize Society believes that it is only a matter of time before Howitt Close becomes highly valued and rightly appreciated for its distinctive architecture and its well-preserved authenticity, leading to listed status – unless, that is, the current planning proposal succeeds in desecrating the building before then. It is vital that the building is preserved unviolated for posterity.</p> <p>It would be a breach of the terms and principles of the Belsize Conservation Area if a unique, extremely well-preserved architectural gem like Howitt Close is wantonly desecrated for the sake of a few additional flats.</p> <p><b>BELSIZE SOCIETY</b></p> <p>The Belsize Society (registered charity 1180842) is an amenity society covering Belsize ward, its adjacent areas and historic environs. The Society has over 500 members. It does not make profits and is non-political. Recently becoming a charitable incorporated organisation, the Society has been a feature of the Belsize area since the 1970s.</p> <p>Belsize is a vibrant and historic part of London, and the Society seeks to preserve and enhance this. Our activities depend on volunteers. Membership is open to anyone with an interest in the Belsize area, with members living in the area between Lyndhurst and Adelaide Roads from north to south and between Fitzjohns Avenue and the approaches to Fleet Road from west to east.</p> <p>The Belsize Society's objectives are:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. To promote for the benefit of the public high standards of architecture, conservation, planning, design, and use of buildings and infrastructure in and/or affecting Belsize Ward, its adjacent areas and its historical environs, and to promote the protection, development, and improvement of features of historic or public interest in that area.</li> <li>2. To encourage and promote for the public benefit high standards in urban planning, infrastructure, and transport including in the identification of traffic solutions, the maintenance and improvement of streets and public places, the protection of the environment, and improvement of air quality in Belsize Ward, its adjacent areas and its historical environs.</li> <li>3. To foster interest amongst the public in Belsize Ward, its adjacent areas and its historical environs, and to educate the public in the history, including natural history, and architecture, of the area by organising lectures, visits, and other events.</li> </ol>
2021/3839/P	Daniel Fortune	19/10/2021 20:24:02	COMMNT	<p>I strongly object to this application as the intended flats will over look my windows, terrace and garden. This is an invasion of privacy and will take away light from my flat. There is no need for additional apartments in this area and we already live next door to a hostel which provides a fair amount of noise pollution, we do not need more residents in such close proximity.</p> <p>Please reject this application</p>

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2021/3839/P	Giancarlo Albasi	01/11/2021 12:59:28	COMMNT	<p>The application is contrary to the conservation nature of the street and area. Further it will increase strain on council and local resources and amenities such as parking, schools and the library (not to mention the additional refuse and recycling needs of additional residents). The proposal will permanently reduce light for next door neighbours at a time when more people are working at home and spending more time locally. Further as more people are working at home the additional noise, pollution, dirt and disruption from any major building works would be considerable.</p>
2021/3839/P	joe alberge	18/10/2021 16:10:52	OBJ	<p>I am writing to object to the Howitt Close development, which involves building an entire new floor on to the flat roof of the block (application number: 2021/3839/P).</p> <p>The lease for leaseholder residents specifies a right to quiet enjoyment of the flat.</p> <p>The Party Wall Act of 1996 will be breached.</p> <p>We are concerned about excessive noise, dust and vibration - disturbance for possibly years.</p> <p>Security concerns from permanent scaffolding and doors being left open by contractors.</p> <p>This is a strict Conservation Area. Allowing this to go ahead would breach Camden Council's own definition of 'Negative Features', which includes 'oppressively large' blocks.</p> <p>Building up a floor will restrict light for the flats below.</p> <p>Obstructions of the driveway, leading to limited or no access for emergency vehicles.</p> <p>Traffic and parking will be horrendous in such a narrow road.</p> <p>Subsidence issues in the past could now be aggravated. Is the roof even strong enough to take another floor?</p> <p>Pipework is very old and fragile, and was not designed to encompass another floor. What would happen to the water tank?</p> <p>Loss of privacy, with new flats looking directly into existing flats.</p> <p>At a time when environmental concerns are paramount, the plans indicate the loss of a rare green feature in this area - the horseshoe-shaped front lawn may be destroyed.</p>

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2021/3839/P	Natalia Groysberg	31/10/2021 18:51:42	OBJ	<p>Dear Ms. Henry</p> <p>I am Natalia Groysberg and I live in Straffan Lodge directly behind Howitt Close. I strenuously object to the planning application to build an extra floor for Howitt Close for the following reasons:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. When Howitt Close was built in the 30s it was built in the Art Deco style, which means that a flat roof is a part of the architecture and the building is not "unfinished" as claimed by the freeholder</li> <li>2. Adding another floor to Howitt Close will significantly reduce any sunlight that hits Straffan Lodge, and especially my flat, where I already have very little natural light</li> <li>3. Howitt Close is a very nice example of the Art Deco style, of which there are very few buildings in the area. As we are in a conservation zone, the "Belsize" conservation zone, we should maintain the artistic ethos the zone as much as we can</li> <li>4. The noise caused by construction at Howitt Close will significantly impact me for years. Especially as builders never follow commitments to restrict work to specific times. The pollution that will results from the construction will be very detrimental to me and other residents of Straffan Lodge.</li> <li>5. We at Straffan Lodge are fortunate to have reserved parking within the building, but builders simply park their vehicles here because they know that they cannot be penalised for using private property. This causes severe problems for us to use our parking spaces. When there was construction on Belsize Park Gardens the builders used Straffan Lodge parking and I foresee the same with Howitt Close.</li> </ol> <p>Kind Regards</p> <p>Natalia Grosyberg</p>
2021/3839/P	Nerea Iglesias	25/10/2021 10:49:41	OBJ	<p>I am living in the building and the decision to extend the building is complete nonsense. This work will cause noise, dust and nuisance for years to come which will affect the lives of those of us who currently occupy the building.</p> <p>I am totally against this project.</p>

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2021/3839/P	David Le Bas	26/10/2021 21:51:24	COMMNT	<p>I believe this is wrong and should not go ahead.</p> <p>The reason for my belief is the level of noise and disturbance that will be caused, alongside the ruining of the lovely view of the building whilst building is ongoing.</p> <p>I live in flat no1. I am therefore biased. As all stakeholders will be. I started renting here in July and moving to Belsize has been a long held dream. It would be such a shame if the joy of living in such a lovely peaceful setting was upset by months of building work. Especially given the high rent I am paying. Rent agreed in a scaffolded building would have been much lower and I did not have that knowledge at the time. I won't be the only one. I think building will punish people like me that have to rent, and benefit developers.</p> <p>The contract of my rent notes that I should enjoy quiet residence in my flat. This would be broken by the building works. I don't think this is fair. Given the significant speculation that the Government may ask us to return to working at home this would be doubly difficult.</p> <p>I really hope you make the decision to not go ahead. I believe it is the right thing to do, and I'd be very grateful if planning permission is declined on this occasion.</p> <p>I firmly believe we need homes built in Camden, but this is not the right place or time.</p>

---

<b>Application No:</b>	<b>Consultees Name:</b>	<b>Received:</b>	<b>Comment:</b>	<b>Response:</b>
------------------------	-------------------------	------------------	-----------------	------------------

2021/3839/P	John Corso	26/10/2021 19:19:33	OBJ	
-------------	------------	---------------------	-----	--

Dear Kate Henry,

I'd like to object in the strongest possible terms to the planning application of an additional floor to Howitt Close, on the points made below:

Howitt Close is an Art Deco building, and as such, was built with an appropriately fitting flat roof. To suggest it looks 'unfinished' is a play on words to work around core Conservation Area principles. An additional floor and mansard roof would completely ruin the aesthetic integrity of this historic Art Deco building, and contradict Camden's Conservation Area principles. Suggesting otherwise sets an awful precedent for what should be a conserved area.

The claims in the Planning Application that Howitt Close is not of a similar height to the surrounding buildings are totally incorrect. Any new additional floor would severely impact on light for nearby residents, whilst also significantly increasing overlooking into multiple rear gardens.

Howitt Close is a significant historical building, located in the heart of Camden Council's 'Belsize Conservation Area'. Developing it would deeply harm the character and appearance of the Conservation Area, and become an eyesore from not only Howitt Road and Glenilla Road, but also very much to residents in properties to the rear of Belsize Park Gardens and Belsize Grove. As stated in Camden's Conservation Area Statement, Howitt Close not only falls within the area, but is one of the named core properties of 'Buildings And Groups Of Buildings That Make A Positive Contribution To The Conservation Area' in Sub Area Four - Glenloch' – To permit such a building to be interfered with, suggests core Conservation Area principles are being unprioritized.

Considering the scale and disproportionate disruption, along with lasting negative aesthetic effects which would be caused by the proposed development, I was appalled to learn that the Planning Application was not communicated to any Howitt Close residents, or indeed the vast amount of would be affected neighbouring residents, other than by the smallest of lamppost signs. I find this extremely disturbing, as I strongly feel there is a bias towards the developers, and that Camden Council will not be looking to take objections seriously. I will further add that this smallest of lamppost signs was in the singular, and that Camden Council were hoping for a very small audience to notice it within the originally planned 2 week window, whilst also hoping to ignore opinions from the neighbouring properties in Belsize Park Gardens who are also extremely directly affected.

In addition to the above points, no consideration has been made to the risk of further subsidence to the property, or any consideration to where current roof top water tanks are to be moved to, or indeed if the relocation of the roof top water tanks would further elevate the development, or possibly even reduce the already minimal number of flats to below 7. In my view I find the whole project extremely disproportionate to housing gain, and instead very geared towards profit.

Howitt Road is already a hugely problematic area for simple day to day through road traffic and parking, and adding to this disturbance with this development, would be extremely damaging with the large number of lorries and builders having to be on site for extended periods of time.

Yours faithfully,

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
				John Corso 34 Howitt Close
2021/3839/P	Elantha Evans	30/10/2021 12:55:40	OBJ	<p>44 Belsize Park Gardens has been my family's home since I came home from hospital having been born in 1976. My bedroom looks out directly from its 2nd floor window, onto Howitt Close. The series of 4 white stucco, 'detached villas' that make up the streetscape of Belsize Park Gardens between Glenilla Road and Manor Mansions are unique to the area – both in their street frontage (not semi-detached half-villas like the rest of the street) AND most importantly in this case, in their relationship to the 'garden' to the rear – within which sits Howitt Close. There are not 'back-to-back' gardens as is common elsewhere. The 'villas', their outlook, and their surrounds (which includes trees, greenery, space and views) should be being protected as part of this 'conservation area'.</p> <p>The existing height of Howitt Close already forms a looming wall in the face of the 'villas', with its windows looking directly across; there is already significant overshadowing of the gardens and lower levels of the 'villas'. The notion of open gardens is compromised by its presence, as it sits tight to the rear of the garden walls and rises-up a full three stories. The additional height with this new proposed mansard roof exacerbates this and no mention has been made in the application, either of this impact OR of the impact of the inevitable destruction of the planting, landscaping, and only just maturing trees that are such an essential part of the environ of Belsize Park GARDENS.</p> <p>Howitt's Close – the building - in itself, is unusual architecturally and is well designed within its own style; elegantly detailed and complimenting the materiality of the area – linking the red brick and white stucco streets that it sits within. Its very thin-edged overhanging roof currently does good work in reducing its apparent scale, especially from the street side. The proposed new mansard will not only undo this good work BUT is not in keeping at all with the original design and intention of the building. In addition, it seems no consideration has been given to where the existing 'plant' (air handling / ventilation / tanks etc) on the flat roof, will move to? Likely ON TOP of the new mansard, adding yet another floor visually to the one for which planning has been applied. Surely this must be included as detail within an application such as this in a 'conservation area'?</p> <p>It is unclear from the application, where the need for these 7 small units has come from, within what planning policy it sits and who will inhabit them. It is however clear from the timing of the application that this is a reaction to the recent encouragement to 'add an additional floor' to existing buildings. Pretty much wherever possible. In a 'conservation area' this should not automatically 'be possible'. It is also clear that this proposal has not been thought through from any perspective other than financial gain. It's style, scale and impact, are not in keeping with the quality and regulation of this wonderful conversation area; the detail of its context ignored. There is also no mention of the need to improve local services with additional units proposed – potentially what 14-20 new residents? - with current, already strained infrastructure (overflowing rubbish, inadequate recycling bins, limited parking spaces for cars and cycles) to be further overloaded.</p> <p>For all these reasons, I am very much against this unnecessary and unsubstantiated proposal.</p> <p>Elantha Evans, Architect / Senior Lecturer</p>

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2021/3839/P	alan selwyn	23/10/2021 20:32:01	COMMNT	<p>1. Not enough notices locally - just 2 on lampposts - this is a MAJOR development affecting many residents. There needs to be more consultation - my neighbours were unaware yet will be affected.</p> <p>2. This does not enhance or preserve the character of this conservation area in which it sites, rather it would harm the appearance of the area and should be rejected on that basis. The building already makes a positive contribution to the Conservation Area as noted specifically by Camden in a previous application. As such it requires protection from development which will damage this contribution.</p> <p>3. A mansard roof would be out of keeping with the building, as was previously determined - it was designed with a flat roof (like other mansion blocks in the immediate vicinity Glenmore and Glenloch Roads etc) and a mansard roof would be an architectural anachronistic nonsense and would detract from the pure form of the elevations. It is a delightful building with Art Deco features. The new design destroys that design concept and the character of the building. To state that is is 'unfinished' in the application is plainly an incorrect and prejudiced value judgement and must be disregarded. The building is in an excellent state of preservation and is unusual and of character, which would be significantly harmed by this addition.</p> <p>4. To argue in the application that a mansard roof would complement others in the area is nonsense - this building (a mansion block) has its own unique form and to add something alien to this specific design simply to ape this feature which other totally different designs (terraced housing) have is nonsense. Those designs had this feature designed in from the start. This building was deliberately designed with a flat roof - it is a feature, not something to be obliterated. It is certainly not an 'appropriate design response to the existing building' or in any way 'sensitive to the building' as stated in the application.</p> <p>5. The building is totally in scale with its neighbours, not significantly taller or shorter. Being at the lower end of the street, it terminates the road and sweeps round the corner beautifully. It is a significant building in the landscape and to add another floor would significantly raise it and create an eyesore at the end of the street as well as taking light from neighbouring property. The scale is perfectly suited to the significant change in level from Glenilla Road climbing up the hill of Howitt Road.</p> <p>6. The design of the new floor is overbearing and unbalances the building.</p> <p>7. To describe this as 'car free' is nonsense - there is no possibility of creating parking on the site and residents would buy cars and the already intolerable parking situation for existing residents - shortly to be worsened by the Haverstock Hill cycle scheme- would be exacerbated.</p> <p>9. This major development would bring noise and disruption to local residents for some considerable time and there would be the usual mess, damage to pavements and trees and to parked cars from contractors' vehicles such as we suffer far too much in this area. This does not benefit anyone except the pockets of the freeholder. Local residents lives would be blighted once again.</p> <p>10. The contractors would take valuable parking spaces out of use for several months putting more pressure of local residents' amenities.</p>