

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2022/3635/P	Maria Stamoulis	01/10/2022 14:14:35	OBJ	<p>I would like to object to this planning permission request for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>* It does not address the original concerns that caused it to be rejected in the first instance.</li><li>* The scale of the building would create a dominance that is inconsistent with the designated conservation area.</li><li>* The proposed construction would be detrimental to the period architecture of then building</li><li>* To allow this dominant extension would lay precedence for other buildings in the area to extend upwards, at great detriment to the conservation area and community.</li><li>* Extensions of this kind will block light of already small garden spaces in the area.</li><li>* The increased living accommodation would add to the already untenable parking situation which has been severely worsened with the addition of bike lanes on Haverstock Hill and the new trend of working from home. When I come home now at any hour, I sometimes must park 2-3 streets away, with kids, groceries and late at night.</li><li>* The increased living accommodation will contribute to additional pollution.</li><li>* The increased living accommodation will add to the severe problem of school places that exists in Belsize.</li></ul>

---

**Application No:** **Consultees Name:** **Received:** **Comment:** **Response:**

2022/3635/P j alberge 02/10/2022 13:06:31 OBJ

Oct 2 2022:

I am writing to object to the Howitt Close development (application: 2022/3635/P). Just like their previous and recent application, it involves building an entire new floor on to the flat roof of the 1930s Art Deco block.

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. The amended roof extension being proposed still violates "reason 1" given by Camden Council in its refusal of the previous application, that the entire appearance and character of the host building is harmed, thus altering the whole nature of the surrounding environs.

The lease for leaseholder residents specifies a right to quiet enjoyment of the flat. So we are concerned about excessive noise, dust and vibration - disturbance for possibly years. In addition, the Party Wall Act of 1996 will surely be breached. Building up a floor may also restrict light for the flats below.

There will be a loss of privacy, too, with new flats looking directly into existing flats, on the opposite L shape part of the block.

Traffic and parking will be suffocating in such a narrow road, blocking emergency vehicles. The driveway will be obstructed, also leading to limited or no access for emergency vehicles.

Subsidence issues in the past will now be aggravated. Apparently the roof is not even strong enough to take another floor. Pipework is very old and fragile, was not designed to encompass another floor. What would happen to the water tank?

The proposed parapet is hideous and does not mitigate the visual impact from the street level, as claimed by the amendment.

At a time when environmental concerns are paramount, the plans indicate the loss of a rare green feature in this area - the wrap-around lawn may be impacted or destroyed.

As Camden so rightly pointed out last time, the proposal makes no meaningful contribution to affordable housing.

There is also a contradiction. The freeholder claims the amended proposal is simple and quieter, yet they estimate a total cost up to £100m, which suggests a massive project, changing the streetscape. Originally they were talking years, now suddenly a few months, how is that feasible?

There are also factual errors in their application: they call it a 1920s block, it is actually 1930s.

The new scheme is not "a replica of something that has always been there", as claimed by the developer.

They claim that "the proposed extension has been recessed in to reduce its impact on roof level.": no, it is still

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
				<p>very prominent. It looks as if a warehouse has been bolted on on top.</p> <p>Camden's original planning officer rightly criticised the architectural treatment around the window openings, which were too dominant. Freshwater's revised image is just as dominant.</p> <p>"The overall appearance will be contemporary", Freshwater claims: but that clashes with the conservation of the 1930s building.</p> <p>The impact will be far from neutral, as claimed, as this is a conservation area. Instead, it breaches the requirements of Section 72 of the Planning (Listed Building and Conservation Areas) Act 1990.</p> <p>Freshwater admits that the roof extension has "a greater overall size", but claims that that's "visually subservient to the neighbouring terraced houses", which is nonsense.</p> <p>Camden's well considered reasons for refusal have not been addressed: they still stand and virtually every criticism that Camden cited in its original refusal has not been adequately solved by the freeholder.</p> <p>Lastly, could Camden also please take into account the significant distress to the huge number of local residents who took the time to object to the original proposal, which was rightly turned down - only to have the freeholder immediately resubmit?</p>
2022/3635/P	Anthony Vickers	28/09/2022 11:10:04	OBJ	<p>The reason I bought property in area was that I loved that Camden were protecting it as a Conservation area and that would mean no one could build such extensions. They have been refused once, so I cant believe they have <del>corrected</del> all of the reasons for the refusal?</p> <p>I know lots of people will not want it just because it's in their <del>back yard</del>, but I think there are legitimate aesthetic reasons for not allowing it along with the incredible disruption. Watching similar projects in same area, it has taken a couple of years to complete, not months as Freshwater say. Along with parking on Haverstock hill now not available the back streets are already crammed to capacity. So once its completed we now have even more residents who will of course have cars.</p> <p>I know London needs more housing, but there really are options around that do not include a Conservation area, already at car capacity.</p> <p>MY flat is don't op floor, so how can they build another floor on top with people trying to live and work there too?</p>
2022/3635/P	Ben Noble	27/09/2022 18:02:26	OBJ	<p>This development does not preserve or enhance the character and appearance of the conservation area. The minor changes to the application do not change the substance of the design. I believe this will be destructive to the character of the neighbourhood, not to mention its many negative impacts regarding traffic, noise and air quality.</p>

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2022/3635/P	Carol-anne Turner	27/09/2022 21:10:24	OBJ	<p>This application was already refused in August 2022, and here it is again.</p> <p>I believe this will destroy the unique heritage of the area.</p> <p>Also, the extra parking, need of refuse collections to expand and other infrastructures in such a small street and a narrow road, make this very difficult and expensive for the council, with a knock on effect to residents.</p> <p>This is a conservation area where we cannot even put a satellite dish on our roof and yet, an expansion totally out of character is being considered.</p> <p>I hope you will look at why the original application was turned down and keep in mind the things that were stated by Camden are still relevant to this one.</p>

---