

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2021/3839/P	Mr Sebastian Gonzalez Ramirez	16/11/2021 19:32:15	COMMNT	<p>I would like to register my extreme objection to the proposed roof extension development at Howitt Close. It would be very detrimental to maintaining the character of the area which is part of a conservation area and the property is actually listed on page 31 of The Belsize Conservation Area Statement under the title 'Buildings and Groups of Buildings that Make a Positive Contribution to the Conservation Area'. This seems to clearly demonstrate Camden Council is contravening its own policies for granting planning permission. Developments in a conservation area must preserve or enhance the areas character. Howitt Close is an exemplary flat-roof art deco building, similar to many others in the area, and a flat roof is very characteristic of art deco developments - a mansford roof is not. It would completely change the aesthetics of the area and ruin a historically valuable building and thus the heritage of the district. Howitt Close was built so that its roofline matches the nearby houses. A further upward extension would dominate the road uncharacteristically. The development would have a significant impact on the daylight and sunlight experienced by the neighbouring residents on Howitt Road, Belsize Grove and Belsize Park Gardens. Despite Camdens policies requiring the applicant to file a report on this, none has been.</p> <p>To my knowledge I am still yet to receive a letter from Freeth's informing leaseholders, of which I am one, of Freshwater's Planning Application. Were it not for the community at Howitt Close I probably still wouldn't be aware. All this seems to again contravene Camden Councils Planning procedures and I feel is an attempt to push through the application without due consultation and in a covert manner in order for the personal gain of Freshwater to the detriment of the existing leasehold owners. This is just not acceptable. It seems many of the documents on the Planning Portal were submitted later than the prescribed schedules and again I suspect an attempt to push the application through without due process. I am yet to be consulted by Freeths or Freshwater which is a legal requirement. I cannot state this strongly enough. I vehemently OBJECT to this planning application 2021/3839/P.</p>
2021/3839/P	Dr Francoise Shenfield	12/11/2021 12:38:03	OBJ	<p>Dear Ms Henry</p> <p>I object to this planning application on several material planning considerations.</p> <p>I believe that material planning consideration that support the refusal of this application include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>¿ The build overlooks other homes, causing loss of privacy</li> <li>¿ The build¿s appearance will be out of character with the existing property</li> <li>¿ Overdevelopment</li> <li>¿ It impacts on highway safety</li> <li>¿ Negative effect on nature conservation</li> </ul> <p>A development of this size needs to be assessed on a highly localised level not in a borough wide context. It is clear that the proposal would have a significant effect on the local environment by virtue of nature, size and location.</p> <p>Thanking you for your consideration,</p> <p>Francoise Shenfield</p>

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2021/3839/P	Mrs Sandra Gonzalez	16/11/2021 19:35:11	OBJ	<p>I would like to register my extreme objection to the proposed roof extension development at Howitt Close. It would be very detrimental to maintaining the character of the area which is part of a conservation area and the property is actually listed on page 31 of The Belsize Conservation Area Statement under the title 'Buildings and Groups of Buildings that Make a Positive Contribution to the Conservation Area'. This seems to clearly demonstrate Camden Council is contravening its own policies for granting planning permission. Developments in a conservation area must preserve or enhance the areas character. Howitt Close is an exemplary flat-roof art deco building, similar to many others in the area, and a flat roof is very characteristic of art deco developments - a mansford roof is not. It would completely change the aesthetics of the area and ruin a historically valuable building and thus the heritage of the district. Howitt Close was built so that its roofline matches the nearby houses. A further upward extension would dominate the road uncharacteristically. The development would have a significant impact on the daylight and sunlight experienced by the neighbouring residents on Howitt Road, Belsize Grove and Belsize Park Gardens. Despite Camdens policies requiring the applicant to file a report on this, none has been.</p> <p>To my knowledge I am still yet to receive a letter from Freeth's informing leaseholders, of which I am one, of Freshwater's Planning Application. Were it not for the community at Howitt Close I probably still wouldn't be aware. All this seems to again contravene Camden Councils Planning procedures and I feel is an attempt to push through the application without due consultation and in a covert manner in order for the personal gain of Freshwater to the detriment of the existing leasehold owners. This is just not acceptable. It seems many of the documents on the Planning Portal were submitted later than the prescribed schedules and again I suspect an attempt to push the application through without due process. I am yet to be consulted by Freeths or Freshwater which is a legal requirement. I cannot state this strongly enough. I vehemently OBJECT to this planning application 2021/3839/P.</p>
2021/3839/P	Beth Noakes	13/11/2021 15:34:02	OBJ	<p>I object strongly to the application to add another storey to the Howitt Close flats.</p> <p>In its Belsize Conservation Area Statement, Camden Council says:</p> <p>'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:</p> <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.' <p>All these factors apply to Howitt Close. The proposed additions would 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 would destroy the architectural integrity of a heritage asset, adversely affect the visual appearance of the neighbourhood and profoundly harm the Conservation Area.</p> </li></ul>

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2021/3839/P	Manuela Mulliri	16/11/2021 21:06:44	COMMNT	<p>To whom this may concern,</p> <p>The comments that will follow are an objection to the Application as detailed in the Description. These comments vary in nature and what sparked them is a strong feeling of indignation and injustice, both in relation to how the planning has been communicated (or has not, rather) and to the extent this will affect many of the residents of Howitt Close and the surrounding area.</p> <p>1. The history, architectural identity and position of Howitt Close make this building a unique gem and these factors have been defining when residents have chosen to rent or buy a property in the apartment block or in its proximity. Granting planning permission for the roof extension in question would translate in a complete lack of consideration from the council - allowing changes to such extent to be imposed on residents who did not ask for and strongly reject it. The building is part of a conservation area and as such needs to be preserved, not disfigured - and for no good reason other than one of a lucrative nature.</p> <p>2. A home in 2021 is not what a home used to be before the pandemic. Me and my partner have recently renewed our contract in one of the apartments on the top floor for another year, unaware of the prospect of our domestic future potentially filled with unbearable noise, scaffoldings and what used to be a beautiful view of the tree outside our window. All this whilst working from home, of course. The works would be an incredible disruption to our personal and professional lives, making it utterly impossible to live here. Going back to my first point, the definition of house/home has drastically changed since the pandemic hit, and this should be given the weight it deserves when allowing disrupting works to go ahead, especially if these works are not necessary.</p> <p>3. Howitt Close sits in a quiet, residential area away from the urban chaos and filled with wildlife, a deal breaker for many people who decided to move here and not to a main road in the city. The animals living in the trees surrounding the block will be deeply affected by the building site, a point that should not be overlooked in the name of profit and material gain.</p> <p>Ultimately all of us residents were gutted to learn about this planning application for many different reasons, mostly we share deep distress - and some of us great anxiety - at the prospect of a plan that will disrupt our daily lives if it was to go ahead.</p> <p>In the hope that you will give these words the weight they deserve.</p> <p>Best regards,</p> <p>Manuela and Luke</p>

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2021/3839/P	Martin Shenfield	12/11/2021 12:34:34	OBJ	<p>I object to this planning application on 2 main grounds – (i) the inadequacy of the planning application in legal terms and (ii) on several material planning considerations.</p> <p>The correspondence between the Council and the applicants and their advisers (the Applicants) indicates a minimum of 7 'consultations' with Council officers over a 18 month period. The Council in their 2 published letters (May and December 2020) sought detailed assessments in several key areas. As a professional in planning matters both at local, regional and national levels over some 30 years, I have never seen such an opaque set of support documents accompanying a totally inadequate planning application letter dated 27th July 2021 from the Applicants. Certainly, the officers of Camden will be unable to undertake a robust and legally competent assessment of this application based on the documentation to hand and hence will not be able to provide an unbiased recommendation to Councillors. Despite clear guidelines contained in the 2 published letters from Camden to the Applicants, there appears an unwillingness to undertake the necessary assessments by the Applicants – whether by design or default.</p> <p>Camden explicitly requests amenity assessments from the Applicants. For instance, from the letter dated May 2020, it is stated:</p> <p>The proposal is also likely to lead to a variety of amenity issues for local people (e.g. noise, vibration, air quality), especially those currently living in Howitt Close. The Council needs to ensure that the development can be implemented without being detrimental to amenity or the safe and efficient operation of the highway network in the local area. A detailed draft CMP should be submitted (using the Council's pro-forma on the website) at application stage to help inform consultation responses. Please see CPG Transport for more details.</p> <p>Initially, as the Council is aware, the Applicants failed to provide the draft CMP. The draft CMP was eventually provided well after the consultation period commenced after pressure from the residents of Howitt Close. The draft CMP is clearly an unprofessional document lacking in any detail and providing contradictory data. Furthermore, the Applicants have – again - either by design or default completely disregarded the requirement to undertake any consultation with either residents or other local people.</p> <p>On page 12 of pro forma draft CMP it states:</p> <p>A neighbourhood consultation process must have been undertaken prior to submission of the CMP first draft.</p> <p>A consultation process specifically relating to construction impacts must take place regardless of any prior consultations relating to planning matters. This consultation must include all of those individuals that stand to be affected by the proposed construction works.</p> <p>The Applicants response is:</p> <p>This draft CMP has been prepared for submission with the planning application and is intended to set out as much information as is possible for the Council's consideration prior to the determination of the planning application</p> <p>Following the granting of planning permission, it would be the duty of the appointed contractor or a professional company on behalf of the applicant to carry out Community Liaison.</p> <p>This is simply an avoidance of consultation – particularly with the residents. The Applicants started this process before 30th April 2020 as I note that a virtual meeting was held on that date between the Council and the Applicants. At no time in the following 15 months did the Applicants seek the views of the residents and</p>

Application No:      Consultees Name:      Received:

Comment:

Response:

others in the impact area and therefore are not able to claim that their application is informed in anyway by those most likely to be affected by this proposal. This is dereliction of their obligations. No doubt officers of the Council will note this failing.

It is evident that other aspects of a comprehensive amenity and transport assessment are completely lacking from the application. Failure to undertake any geological/structural engineering fieldwork leaves the potential construction subject to the possibility of subsidence – an issue of relevance in various parts of NW3. Without fieldwork involving the placing of test bore holes, the Applicants cannot provide evidence regarding the safety of this proposal. The transport assessment is threadbare and takes no account of other high transport generators within the impact area particularly as these projects will generate traffic well beyond the actual sites of construction. This failure of assessment analysis manifests itself further by a complete lack of any accumulative impact assessments.

Overall, this application fails to provide adequate and robust assessments that would allow the Council to undertake a proper forensic examination of the proposals and furthermore deny those most affected by the proposals to be able to provide comprehensive comments/objections given this lack of assessments.

Under section 38 of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act (2004), decisions on planning applications 'must be made in accordance with the [development] plan unless other material considerations indicate otherwise'. The courts ultimately decide what constitutes a material consideration. However, case law gives Camden a great deal of leeway to decide what considerations are relevant, and how much weight should be given to them.

I believe that material planning consideration that support the refusal of this application include:

- The build overlooks other homes, causing loss of privacy
- The build's appearance will be out of character with the existing property
- Overdevelopment
- It impacts on highway safety
- Negative effect on nature conservation

A development of this size needs to be assessed on a highly localised level not in a borough wide context. It is clear that the proposal would have a significant effect on the local environment by virtue of nature, size and location.

I request notification of the planning committee meeting that will address this application and reserve the right to make a short presentation (under 5 minutes) as well as the right to cross-examine officers and the Applicants (should they be in attendance).

Thanking you for your consideration,  
Martin Shenfield

---