

Printed on: 13/09/2022 09:10:07

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2022/3071/P	Dr Roger Hayward	12/09/2022 19:03:38	OBJNOT	<p>FLASK WALK NEIGHBOURHOOD ASSOCIATION NW3 (representing the interests of residents of Back Lane, Soades Mews, Flask Walk, Gardnor Road, Lakis Close, Lutton Terrace, Mansfield Place, Murray Terrace, New Court and Streatley Place)</p> <p>Development Management, Camden Town Hall, Judd Street, WC1H 9JE.</p> <p>10/09/2022</p> <p>Application 2022/3071/P, relating to 4 Lutton Terrace, proposes 'Erection of a roof extension with roof terrace at loft level, new boundary wall with iron railings, new double glazed timber windows to rear elevation, new double glazing to existing windows at front elevation.' It is estimated (we suggest, very optimistically) that the work would take 8 months commencing in October. Following Camden's comments at the pre-application stage, the proposal was substantially re-designed. In particular, there is no longer a basement proposed. That is welcomed by FWNA. The main item of external work is now the construction of a new roof which would be higher than the existing. A new suite of rooms is proposed within the increased roof space which necessitates mansard windows to the front and roof lights to the rear.</p> <p>The ownership of the highway of Lutton Terrace is uncertain. In 2003, there was extensive correspondence with Camden as to who was responsible for its upkeep. It was finally agreed that the residents of Lutton Terrace would make a £500 contribution to the cost of Camden installing York stone paving in the lower section of Lutton Terrace (from the junction with Flask Walk up to the set of steps just before 1 Lutton Terrace) and that Camden would adopt Lutton Terrace up to the steps. The work was carried out by Camden probably sometime in 2003 or 2004, but it is not certain whether Camden actually adopted that section of the road. We believe that the remainder of Lutton Terrace is in private ownership. In the case of 1 Lutton Terrace, there are vaults underneath the road that are in the ownership of that house. We suspect something similar pertains at 2 and 3 Lutton Terrace.</p> <p>FWNA objects to the proposed development on the following grounds:</p> <p>(1) Access</p> <p>Notwithstanding the fact that a basement is no longer proposed, FWNA believes that the observations of Camden's case officer at the pre-application stage continue to be apposite:</p> <p>'... the site is also severely constrained in terms of access by means of a narrow footpath, so this needs to be fully covered as well as construction hours. Given the close proximity to other sites, the lack of space onsite for construction processes and storage, and the proposed extensive basement under the whole site, the proposed development will require careful consideration and management.'</p> <p>We would also draw Camden's attention to the fact that, when New Court renovations were being undertaken, there was a requirement that Lutton Terrace flagstones be covered to protect them. Moreover, most materials had to be hand/wheelbarrow transported, save for the few occasions when small motorised trolleys were permitted. That was necessary to protect the vaults under the road. Below is a brief summary from minutes of 2005. Durkan were the contractors.</p> <p>'Material delivery/removal. All via Lutton Terrace. Durkan have employed a larger than usual labour force, because so much material has to be hand shifted, no cranes or large vehicles can be used. But there will be a</p>

Printed on: 13/09/2022 09:10:07

Application No: Consultees Name: Received:

Comment:

Response:

lot of movements, as there is a great deal of material to take in and out of the site. Wheelbarrows will be used, and possibly small motorised trolleys, when necessary. There will be every attempt to co-ordinate deliveries, with no lorry queuing. Deliveries will be made between 9-3pm. The hours of operation will be 8-5pm.)

In those circumstances, FWNA believes that the proposed development remains too extensive given the sites constraints. The Developer should be asked to scale down the proposals considerably. Alternatively, we suggest that Camden ought not to give permission until a fully worked-up CMP is produced. That would allow officers to understand precisely how the Developer intends to overcome the sites very obvious constraints. We are particularly anxious to understand how it is proposed to transport material to and from the site and where it is proposed to store materials offsite. Finally, we would remind Camden of the many other consented developments taking place, or due to take place, in this area.

(2) Sense of enclosure and overlooking

We agree with the case officer in his pre-application advice that the occupants of nos. 45-51 Flask Walk already suffer from a sense of enclosure which the proposed rear and roof extensions would compound by increasing the height, width and massing.

In addition, the proposed roof windows and the balcony would look across Flask Walk gardens to Lakis Close, where the facing wall is largely composed of large glass windows. That being so, we are concerned about overlooking.

(3) Impact on Hampstead Conservation Area

Finally, we object on the grounds that the proposal would introduce a new roof form and greater massing which would adversely affect the Conservation Area and the local streetscene.

Conclusion

For all these compelling reasons, the FWNA asks that Camden refuse planning permission.

Yours sincerely Marianne Colloms (sec FWNA)