

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2022/3635/P	Alan Selwyn	10/10/2022 11:18:46	OBJ	<p>1. This proposal does little to address the points leading to the refusal of the previous application. It does not enhance or preserve the character of this conservation area in which it sits, 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 the previous application and heritage statements. As such it requires protection from development which will damage this contribution.</p> <p>2. The building is sensitively designed to deal with a tricky sloping corner site It ends the low point in the road in an understated, friendly and cozy manner. As emphasised in the Heritage Statement Addendum, despite the large mass of the existing building it is carefully and quietly subservient to the existing Edwardian houses. The new design ruins that and therefore does not preserve or enhance the Conservation area.</p> <p>3. We can currently also view the roofline of the larger, earlier 'white' houses on Belsize Park Gardens from the upper and middle parts of Howitt Road. The new additional storey would obliterate this visual orientation with the local area.</p> <p>4. The existing building has some interesting Art Deco features which add interest and variety to this area, yet also cleverly merges with the Edwardian feature of the adjacent roads. The proposed clumsy and anachronistic additional storey detracts from these design features. 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>5. The proposed additional storey would be out of keeping with the building, as was previously determined: it was deliberately designed with a flat roof with heavy, overhanging moulded eaves that determinedly finalise the elevation. To build above that line would destroy the unity and the character of the building. An additional storey destroys the architectural premise of the building. The additional plant and solar panels on the roof of the proposed extension introduces additional visual mess.</p> <p>6. The current height of the building neatly aligns with the dormer level of the mansard roofs of the existing terraces on Howitt Road - the natural eye line – the second level of the existing mansards are, by their nature, secondary and of no architectural weight – therefore the proposed additional storey to reach the level of the upper parts of the mansards would indeed introduce a heavy, jarring element, visually appearing higher than the existing buildings on Howitt Road. To build higher would introduce an over-bearing element at both levels. The 'chamfered design' and set back does nothing to mitigate this effect. The current 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. 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 naturally buy cars (anything up to 14 vehicles might be possible with 7 apartments as well as intermittent visitors, delivery vehicles etc) and the already intolerable parking situation for existing residents - recently worsened by the Haverstock Hill cycle scheme- would be exacerbated.</p> <p>8. This major development would bring noise and disruption to local residents for some considerable time</p>

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
				<p>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>9. We worry that the mature and important trees bordering this site would be damaged by contractors' vehicle and plant access. This is a very tight site for such a major development and damage would be inevitable.</p> <p>10. The contractors would take valuable parking spaces out of use for several months putting more pressure of local residents' amenities.</p> <p>11. The additional information provided in the Heritage Notes Addendum throws interesting local history information on the architects F Webb and Ash and this gives greater weight to the importance to preserving this building as planned and makes a case for local listing.</p> <p>12. 7 additional apartments (23 people) makes a significant impact on the existing building infrastructure and local amenities and represents over-development.</p> <p>13. Not enough notices locally - just 2 seen on lamp-posts - this is a MAJOR development affecting many residents. There needs to be more obvious consultation – many local residents seemed unaware and are horrified by the proposals when discussed.</p>
2022/3635/P	Camilla Quint	07/10/2022 13:20:49	OBJ	<p>I strongly object to this planning application 2022/3635/P, especially as it does not focus on the architectural design and historical integrity of Howitt Close and does not preserve or enhance it in any. It will also add to the population density and pollution of the area; local small gardens will be overshadowed by adding and extra floor to this building; parking, which is already difficult will become impossible; access to water, which is often problematic in this area will become even more difficult; the design is very intrusive and unsuitable for a block built a long time ago; the construction noise and building pollution will be unbearable for those living in the area or nearby, like myself. This is a Conservation Area and making such a drastic alteration to this building will be an eyesore and totally unsuitable for an area that is meant to be preserved in its current form.</p>

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2022/3635/P	Alan Selwyn	10/10/2022 11:21:59	OBJ	<p>1. This proposal does little to address the points leading to the refusal of the previous application. It does not enhance or preserve the character of this conservation area in which it sits, 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 the previous application and heritage statements. As such it requires protection from development which will damage this contribution.</p> <p>2. The building is sensitively designed to deal with a tricky sloping corner site It ends the low point in the road in an understated, friendly and cozy manner. As emphasised in the Heritage Statement Addendum, despite the large mass of the existing building it is carefully and quietly subservient to the existing Edwardian houses. The new design ruins that and therefore does not preserve or enhance the Conservation area.</p> <p>3. We can currently also view the roofline of the larger, earlier 'white' houses on Belsize Park Gardens from the upper and middle parts of Howitt Road. The new additional storey would obliterate this visual orientation with the local area.</p> <p>4. The existing building has some interesting Art Deco features which add interest and variety to this area, yet also cleverly merges with the Edwardian feature of the adjacent roads. The proposed clumsy and anachronistic additional storey detracts from these design features. 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>5. The proposed additional storey would be out of keeping with the building, as was previously determined: it was deliberately designed with a flat roof with heavy, overhanging moulded eaves that determinedly finalise the elevation. To build above that line would destroy the unity and the character of the building. An additional storey destroys the architectural premise of the building. The additional plant and solar panels on the roof of the proposed extension introduces additional visual mess.</p> <p>6. The current height of the building neatly aligns with the dormer level of the mansard roofs of the existing terraces on Howitt Road - the natural eye line – the second level of the existing mansards are, by their nature, secondary and of no architectural weight – therefore the proposed additional storey to reach the level of the upper parts of the mansards would indeed introduce a heavy, jarring element, visually appearing higher than the existing buildings on Howitt Road. To build higher would introduce an over-bearing element at both levels. The 'chamfered design' and set back does nothing to mitigate this effect. The current 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. 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 naturally buy cars (anything up to 14 vehicles might be possible with 7 apartments as well as intermittent visitors, delivery vehicles etc) and the already intolerable parking situation for existing residents - recently worsened by the Haverstock Hill cycle scheme- would be exacerbated.</p> <p>8. This major development would bring noise and disruption to local residents for some considerable time</p>

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
				<p>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>9. We worry that the mature and important trees bordering this site would be damaged by contractors' vehicle and plant access. This is a very tight site for such a major development and damage would be inevitable.</p> <p>10. The contractors would take valuable parking spaces out of use for several months putting more pressure of local residents' amenities.</p> <p>11. The additional information provided in the Heritage Notes Addendum throws interesting local history information on the architects F Webb and Ash and this gives greater weight to the importance to preserving this building as planned and makes a case for local listing.</p> <p>12. 7 additional apartments (23 people) makes a significant impact on the existing building infrastructure and local amenities and represents over-development.</p> <p>13. Not enough notices locally - just 2 seen on lamp-posts - this is a MAJOR development affecting many residents. There needs to be more obvious consultation – many local residents seemed unaware and are horrified by the proposals when discussed.</p> <p>14. Technically, the application is incorrect as this is NOT a Mansard Roof Extension in any definition of the term, it is an additional storey flat roof.</p>

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2022/3635/P	Mr Webster	10/10/2022 12:53:03	OBJ	<p>Planning and Design Summary:</p> <p>It comes as a total surprise, that a new application (2022/3635P) has again been submitted for the development of Howitt Close (HC), especially as it simply does 'not address' any of the objections raised in the Delegated Report (DR), (2021/3839P). The DR recorded comprehensive objections / comments by heritage experts, including the Conservation Officer (CAAC), Belsize Society (BS), C20th Society (C20) and local individuals, who have an interest in the Belsize Conservation Area (BCA) and the HC, such as residents and neighbours, who themselves listed numerous concerns.</p> <p>Although, the new planning and design access statements state that the new application has been developed in consultation with the planning and conservation officer, CAAC has already submitted formal objections, with BS and C20 to shortly follow. This is now the second time an application has been refused with earliest being back in 1961, TP948/12543.</p> <p>The application is fundamentally not justified or suitable for such an existing building and would constitute a serve adverse impact, direct loss and harm to both the essence of HC and BCA. It is noted the application is not supported by a full series of written documentation, but only a few addendums to the refused application, thus reducing the weight of material that could be used to reinforce the basis for objections.</p> <p>Design and Impact:</p> <p>HC's is a unique individual building of its time, own character, with its presence woven into the BCA. It is evident from the first point listed in the DR, that the application for development of HC within BCA is not suitable or justified as stated below:</p> <p>Reason No 1 of the previous refusal is clear, 'detailed design, bulk, massing, height, materials, undue prominence compromising the form, character and appearance of the host building and would thus harm the character of the street scene and BCA, contrary to the policies D1 (Design) and D2 (Heritage) of CLP 2017'</p> <p>The resubmitted proposals mirror and retains its predecessor's volumetric density (now masonry), but actually appears to have increased in height, with the leading roof edge heightened further, this being masked by introduction of a deceptive white parapet wall to reduce its impact. It retains its top heavy and crude appearance, distorting the existing building's unity and composition.</p> <p>As per the previous objections, the application has totally ignored confirming levels. It is therefore assumed, it has not technically been sufficiently developed taking into account existing roof top services (water tank enclosures, boiler flue, services distribution) and new construction build-up (floors, walls and roof etc). Not forgetting that the existing omitted services will have to be reinstated for the building to function. Again, the buildings height would increase as some of these functions are reintroduced- The drawings are thus not a true representation. Is this not further compounded as the previous construction management plan (CMP) appeared to be undeveloped, pushing many decisions further down the development line, until after any potential approval, leaving many technical, constructional and logistic issues unresolved for later, and further negotiations?</p> <p>Again, the applicant has not dealt with or commented on the rights of light and overshadowing, which previously formed part of the 1961 refusal. Any new addition would also increase the issue of overlooking and privacy, with the potential for the increase in transmission of sound and air borne sound to the building's</p>

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
				<p>residents and surrounding neighbourhood.</p> <p>Also, the development has the perceived potential for loss off or reducing the value of the existing accommodation through, a lengthy constructed period (noise, dust' vibration, disruption to services, traffic congestion, damage to trees and planting etc.) and change to the exiting building, even once it is completed.</p> <p>Throughout the process, the applicant has continually not followed the planner's advice to engage with the HC's leaseholders or carry out any community liaison. In general, the whole process is causing much distress, especially as leaseholders are in the process of obtaining the freehold (on-going).</p> <p>Technical Impact on the Proposals / Visual Impact.</p> <p>Environment:</p> <p>Surely the introduction of visible standalone rooftop photovoltaic panels within the BCA, will set a dangerous unforgivable precedent. The proposal of these modern installations will entirely destroy the views locally, at height and from afar. They would be an alien insertion and entirely unsuitable for the HC and BCA. In addition, there is now visual representation of the impact of new services (Photovoltaic infrastructure and plant enclosures, service's inlets and outlets, SVP's, other service distributions required to make the existing building and potential addition function etc.) or required modification to existing ones (specifically SVP's, which will need to be extended above any new window heads). How are these dealt with without leading to a serve damage to existing buildings appearance?</p> <p>Structure / Construction:</p> <p>There is no technical statement regarding how the development would be undertaken and to what risk HC's external and internal fabric may be comprised. How are new structural loads transferred through the existing building. The proposed masonry walls are substantially set back from the main load bearing structure as indicated on the 1961 Section; can the existing shallow strip foundation accommodate additional loads? How do the new services puncture HC's fabric (roof development to ground and vice versa) In all cases would not any development cause serious disruption to HC's resident's, surrounding neighbourhood and BCA.</p> <p>Summary Response:</p> <p>HC deservedly and surely needs to be protected from excessive and opportunist developments. The previous DR refusal(s) summary states and records that the application is in conflict with the policy documents D1 (Design) / D2 (Heritage). Refusal will allow HC to continue contributing to, and enhancing the character of the BCA as it always has.</p>
2022/3635/P	David Percy	09/10/2022 10:23:08	OBJ	<p>I object. This plan would change the appearance of the building in the Conservation Area. It is out of keeping with the surrounding low rise houses, as well being out of keeping with the design and style of the original building. In addition the proposal sets a dangerous precedent for unnecessary and inappropriate ad hoc addition of floors to existing buildings.</p>

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

2022/3635/P	Bettina Metcalfe	07/10/2022 13:44:47	COMMNT	
-------------	------------------	---------------------	--------	--

Dear Sir/Madam,

I strongly object to the addition of another floor onto Howitt Close. I feel that the architectural integrity of the building would be compromised if anything were added to the top of the building. This is a conservation area and buildings of exceptional beauty like Howitt Close should be preserved in their entirety. An additional floor would ruin the building and is not in keeping with the existing architectural style. It would possibly set a precedent for a flurry of unwanted unnecessary additions of floors to existing buildings.

Parking in this area is already a challenging problem and the addition of more flats and therefore more cars would make finding a parking place simply a nightmare.

Belsize Park is already a very densely populated area with a lot of building work going on almost constantly, by houses being extended into the basement or the attics or by divided properties into small residential units. The recent installation of high-speed broadband caused weeks of disruption to the residents of the area. I would like to see less disruption in the neighbourhood! The suggested building work at Howitt Close would be highly intrusive in terms of noise and congestion over a long period of time. I work from home and am terribly concerned about the additional noise pollution from this massive building project. To be exposed to noise from building work on an ongoing basis has a debilitating effect on people's health and this should not be overlooked!

Many thanks for your consideration.
