

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2022/4488/P	Tim Herbert-Smith	23/12/2022 15:20:16	COMMNT	This is an additional comment on behalf of CRASH. The application refers to works enlarging the terrace on the 5th floor & building an extension at 6th floor level. However, the elevations show 6 floors currently exist so the work will be taking place at 6th & 7th floor levels. CRASH's earlier objection referred to the numbering used in the application.
2022/4488/P	Tim Herbert_Smith	23/12/2022 14:56:44	OBJ	<p>These comments are made on behalf of CRASH, the combined residents association of South Hampstead. Although Cecil Court is a modern building with no architectural merit, the proposal does nothing to enhance the building's appearance. The requirement set out in the South Hampstead Conservation Area Appraisal &amp; Management Strategy 2011 that roof extensions 'should not result in increased visual bulk to the roof' ( para 7.16 &amp; 12.19) is not met &amp; para 13.36 which states that 'proposals which alter existing roof profiles will generally be resisted unless to replace unsightly later additions with less visually disruptive alterations' should apply. The contention in the application that visibility from the street &amp; neighbouring buildings will be 'minimal' is not accepted. Nor is it accepted that the proposal respects /enhances the 'street aesthetic'. The building is already taller than others in the locality &amp; the 6th floor additions will exaggerate the height &amp; bulk of the building.</p> <p>The applicant's assertion that there will be no loss of privacy or overlooking affecting adjoining properties is not accepted. No drawings or sight lines have been provided to support this. Inevitably the 6th floor terrace will enable buildings &amp; gardens on the north &amp; west sides to be overlooked. The neighbouring flat appears to have access to the roof &amp; this will obviously be overlooked &amp; lose some privacy.</p> <p>Regarding materials, the proposed 'brick coloured lightweight metal cladding' is claimed to match the existing brick, but the drawing of the east side elevation (A105) shows a different colour &amp; pattern which is hardly in harmony with the existing building appearance.</p> <p>The proposed front terrace &amp; alterations to fenestration at 5th floor level in no way match the existing appearance &amp; will be very visible from Priory Road. The assertion that this will have minimal impact because 'spaces are already set back from the existing wall' is not agreed.</p> <p>There appears to be little attempt to provide environmental benefits at 6th floor level. Mention is made of a 'Green Roof' of 10sq.m. &amp; to place natural plants behind the glass balustrade &amp; prepare for 'almost roof garden to maintain natural visual links to surroundings', but no detail has been provided &amp; so this is meaningless.</p> <p>In the conclusion to the Design &amp; Access Statement it is said that the proposal meets the principle for extending upwards if premises are NOT within a Conservation Area as set out the 2020 planning order specified. However, this property IS within the Conservation Area.</p> <p>In summary, for the reasons set out the application should be refused.</p>