


**Subject:** Re: 2021/3839/P - Howitt Close CMP



Dear Kate,

I know you have a meeting at 5pm about Howitt Close.

Please can you bear these final objections in mind.

1. The application was conceived pre Covid. It is now post covid and many people have to work from home.

I'm not sure if you are aware, but most of the flats in Howitt Close are studios, only a few one bedrooms, so people have to eat sleep and work in a small studio. That is their livelihood. They would lose their jobs if they can't work from home.


It would be impossible to work properly if the development is granted and Howitt Close would become a building site for a very long time. Such time framework is always under estimated. Therefore holding down a job in these circumstances, would become impossible.

2. I'm not sure if you are aware but as Howitt is very close to the Royal Free Hospital, as one can walk there in a few minutes, there are many doctors, nurses and other staff who live in Howitt. They often have to do night shifts and therefore sleep in the day. This would also be impossible and compromise other people's health in the hospital, if for example, doctors, surgeons, nurses etc, are too tired to do their jobs properly.

Please follow your common sense and conscience, and turn down this application which already has so much bad press and controversy.

Kind regards,

Josi Steinfeld



**Subject:** Re: 2021/3839/P - Howitt Close CMP



Dear Kate,

Today is officially the last day for objections to the proposed development as it is the consultation end date.

I therefore write to object to the planning application by Freshwaters to develop on the roof of Howitt Close.

The objections are so many, it's hard to know where to begin.

1. The first that the residents officially heard of the proposed development was by letter dated 27th October, not received till 27th October. We were not consulted by Freshwater beforehand, or since. Whereas everyone else, eg Camden planners had been consulted multiple times over almost two years.

2. You will be aware that this proposal is extremely unpopular, and you will have already received many, many objections (over 100 to date), not only from the residents, but many neighbours, historical societies and the press. It will ruin the quality of life for residents and neighbours, ruin any chance of rent or sale at a reasonable sum for a long time, and the traffic congestion, bad enough already in the area, would be off the scale.

3. I do not believe that Freshwater intends to go ahead with the development, should they obtain planning permission. We the leaseholders, had to fight very hard to obtain our RTM because the service charges were extortionate. All the tricks in the book were thrown at us not to succeed with the RTM, but succeed we did, and the service charges have been reduced by 30%, despite normal inflation. We think this application is just another ploy to try and obtain further money from the leaseholders.

4. I note that Camden is due to receive roughly £350,000 should the development go ahead, which is substantial and would go a long way for Camden to fund other projects. This would weigh heavily in favour of Freshwater's application despite the objections, unpopularity and bad press for Camden. However, I urge you to put aside this consideration as I do not believe Camden Council will receive anything out of it.

5. Documents dated some years ago, have just come to light late this afternoon, which seem to show that Freshwaters intend to attempt to bypass tenant's rights under the Landlord and Tenant's act in a manner that is probably illegal and unenforceable. As I have only just been informed, I cannot at this stage give further details until I have been able to see the documentation, but you should be concerned that Camden is being used as a pawn to increase the coffers of a large financial organisation, and Camden will not receive anything at all because we all have reason to believe that this is not a genuine planning application.

The fact that Freshwater's paperwork is incomplete, and that the development cannot go ahead in its proposed form is evidence that this is not a serious application. From what I understand, substantial amendments need to be made. The fact that the residents have not been consulted, apart from a letter of intent leads to the same conclusion.

6. Freshwaters intend to destroy the front garden. This outside space is an important and well used amenity, and although there is a back garden, it is very difficult to access, very small, overgrown, overlooked, in very bad condition and hemmed in between the back fence and the residents on the ground floor. Whereas at least the front garden is open space and an escape for those who otherwise have nowhere else to go.

7. The building does not justify the eyesore of a mansard roof. The art deco appeal would be ruined by it. The existing flat roof distinguishes the building and is a positive, not a neutral contribution. A mansard roof, they say, will put Howitt Close more in line with the other houses in the road, but that can't apply as Howitt Close is a block of flats and a mansard roof would destroy the art deco features. Blocks of flats are a rarity, and should be conserved instead of being destroyed. The development will harm the character and appearance of the CA, which is a designated heritage asset, and para 202 would be triggered. Furthermore the small additional housing, which would not be granted any parking rights, is negligible when compared with the harm the proposal would cause.

8. Where is the daylight and sunlight report? This proposed development will have a noticeable impact on light to the houses on Belsize Grove and Belsize Park Gardens that back on to the property. There is no report because Freshwaters know that there would be substantial impact on nearby residents.

9. There is also no noise report, which should outline in detail the harmful impact to residents and neighbours should the development go ahead. Again, you should ask the question why this has been deliberately excluded.

You will see that the objections are endless, and I am sure that others have detailed them better than myself. The legal implications however, of what Freshwaters have been doing and have just come to light, are of great concern, as they seem prima facie to be seeking to bypass laws Parliament has enacted to safeguard tenants. When I am in full possession of the facts, I shall write to you again so that you are aware of the true intention behind this application, that this is therefore not a genuine application to build, and therefore is unlikely to proceed.

Kind regards,

Josi Steinfeld

