

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2022/3635/P	Duncan Webster	29/11/2022 13:52:23	OBJ	2022/3635/P- Planning Objection 29.11.2022):

Dear Kate Henry,

As many organisations, residents and neighbours have stated, and I concur, that the new application (2022/3635) is as the previous one fundamentally flawed and should be refused. It was evident from the Delegated Report and Decision Notice (specifically Items No 1 and 2) that the development is not suitable or practicable for such a unique building given its contribution to the Belsize Conservation Area. Clearly it must be in breach of Camden's Local Plan Item's No 1 (Design) and No 2 (Heritage).

Please find my comments and objections to the above application. For ease of clarity they have been provided as subsections.

Many thanks for your patience and hope they are clear and valid.
Best wishes D Webster (Howitt Close).

APPLICATION FOR LOCAL LISTING OF HOWITT CLOSE (HC):

Since application No's 2021/3839 and 2022/3635 were submitted it has come to light that in 2015 the Belsize Society collaborated with Camden to establish a local list of buildings, spaces and features that contribute to the local community. The list identifies parts of historic interest that were not already designated by other means, prioritising those not mentioned in the Conservation Area Plan. HC was already mentioned in the plan so was not included in the new list. Due to the current application(s) that will harm both HC and the Conservation Area, it is understood that the Belsize Society, with backing of the C20th Society, Heath and Hampstead Society, residents and neighbours, has made an application for HC to be awarded the status of 'local listing' providing protection and retaining both HC's and the Conservation Area's future integrity. It has also been brought to my attention, that other similar mansard roof / extensions under appeal within the local borough have been, rejected by the planning inspectorate. Surely this must further support the decision for this application to be yet again refused.

DELAYED POSTING OF OBJECTIONS:

It has been noted that there has been a phased posting of objections / comments, no doubt this is due to the amount of applications that Camden has to process, a very time consuming process. Many of the public once they have provided comment may not return to the portal. Although, the date for receipt of objections / comments has been moved on various times (currently 08.12.2022) there is no public street notification to inform the process is still ongoing. It is useful for observers to view the current information on the portal as it assists in how opinions on the application are formulated given what is posted or observed.

CONSERVATION, CAAC:

It appears there seems some confusion in information posted on the planning portal. CAAC posted their objections to the new resubmitted application in line with those of the previous one. However, it came as quite a surprise to read a copy of an uploaded email, stating that CAAC could support the resubmitted proposals. As stated above surly it is evident that the resubmitted application has ignored the conclusions of the original Delegated Report and Refusal Notice that basically surmises that development is not suitable for such a building causing harm to HC the Conservation Area and community as a whole.

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
				<p>RIGHTS OF LIGHT:</p> <p>As in a very early application, TP948-12543 (1961), the current one has omitted any analysis / report on the impact of reduced day lighting / rights of light. In the earlier application refusal was granted due to future loss of light to south eastern / western boundaries of the site. However, there is also the loss of existing light and sky views currently enjoyed by HC residents, other neighbours and occupants of surrounding buildings. Natural daylight / sky light is critical in reducing energy consumption; would not the application go against todays critical environmental agenda.</p>
