

> Dear Camden Planning Team,

>

> Following the below I am keen to submit comments for application 2023/1409/P. The posted paper notice was 'roof replacement' which implied a simple replacement of the existing hipped roof which is misleading when reviewing the documents online show a very significant change in bulk, mass and height that look to be out of character with the existing second floors which are all well set back from the road side.

>

> We own and live in 99 camden mews which was originally connected to 99a and formed a single dwelling so share many characteristics and symmetrical qualities.

>

> I think the application needs to be looked at in very close detail, as the existing 2 stories of 99A are already more generous than its modern counterparts. No matter how many times I review the documents it does not make sense to me that the total mass will not be higher than 97/97A when the existing two stories are more generous. This concern is better articulated by CAAC. It is not clear to me how a second storey could be 'added' to the existing roof line that would produce a floor with usable head height. The photo on page 3 of the applicants design and access statement and the later added supporting document does not resolve this but instead highlights the very different architecture and differing floor heights between 99a and 97/97a. I am very concerned it would need to be built higher than the plans suggest as the second storey on 97a, which the applicant is using as a direct comparable actually starts lower than the brick line. It is the use of clever architecture that gives this illusion from the street but the proposed second storey in 99a will start higher than the existing second storey in 97a - so how can a useable second floor starting at the existing roof line not be higher?

>

> I have included a photograph of 97-99 camden mews taken from an opposite neighbour I hope will add a valuable perspective to your consideration.



>
>
>
>

> I would like to share further pictures - photos one and two are of our terrace looking out from our bedroom windows. Our terrace is our sole outside space and accessed from our bedroom on the first floor with all windows looking out onto the terrace across to the boundary wall of 99a.



>

>

> The proposed mass would box us in and damage our outlook. Due to the layout of 99 all the upstairs windows look out on to the roof terrace and the party wall of 99 (as seen above) At the moment we enjoy sky views from our bedroom (photo 2) which the new roof line would take away. The current roof line is sloped from at both the sides and rear which is far softer and allows sky views and sun throughout the summer. I had also understood applications in the past have been rejected on the mews on the basis that the second storey is not set back enough from the street. I understand this benefits not only the street view but also the neighbours as we would otherwise be boxed in by a double height wall.

>

> I hope the photographs help add some colour.

>

> All the best,

>

> Sophie Adams and Charlie Round

> 99 Camden Mews

> NW1 9BU