

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2023/2881/P	Simon Williams	08/09/2023 12:37:57	PETITNOBJ E	<p>The proposed development with its size and height is not in keeping with the area it will be a dominant addition which would harm the character and appearance of the host building and the mews terrace of which it is part, causing harm to the significance of this part of the Camden Town Conservation Area contrary to policies D1 (Design) and D2 (Heritage) of Camden's Local Plan 2017.</p> <p>The mews is a conservation area designated by the council in 2006 I cannot see how the development preserves or enhances the character or appearance of the area, it will also have an impact on the local mews community, adding an extra floor to the building that is already the tallest in the mews will have a negative impact resulting in overall loss of light and be a precedent for future development in the mews. The impact on the waste levels in the mews will be negative.</p> <p>The developer has been in disputes before with the council so expect the development to be of a poor standard. Historically he has been taken to court by Camden council for breaking planning regulations as far back as 2006 and more recently 2019-2020.</p>
2023/2881/P	Kate Jacobs	11/09/2023 11:40:31	OBJ	<p>Hello,</p> <p>I'm writing again to oppose this application. I live across Pratt Mews from the proposed extension. The reasons for this opposition are below:</p> <p>Light consequences: The Daylight and Sunlight Assessment submitted by the applicant estimates that my flat in 1-6 Pratt Mews will lose about 15-19% of light due to this extension. Seeing as this study was funded by the applicant and seems to have some flaws in terms of building-height estimation, I suspect this loss of light is underestimated. For example, the light from my living-room window would be completely blocked at 4pm in early September, judging from the sun's current pathway. Adding to this, the assessment seems to distract from the impact on the mews homes by focusing mostly on high-street buildings, which are not in the shadow of this property and thus not affected.</p> <p>Character of the area and precedent setting: The extension would make 8-9 the tallest building on Pratt Mews (judging from Google Earth and from simply looking down the street from my window). This precedent should not be set for a mews house. This street is already very narrow and cramped. I wish I could attached photos to show you all of this and how close 8-9 is from my home's windows.</p> <p>Track record of the applicant: I oppose this kind of planning permission in general, but I especially oppose it being granted to someone with a building-management record such as the applicant. Why should this questionable and controversial permission be granted to someone who has been sentenced for building mismanagement?</p> <p>Thank you for your consideration.</p>

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2023/2881/P	James Freeman	08/09/2023 17:30:50	OBJ	

Dear Sir/Madam,

I am writing on behalf of myself and the four other residents of Flat 4, Regent House, 1-6 Pratt Mews to strongly object to the proposed erection of an additional storey to 8-9 Pratt Mews. I have divided our grounds for objecting to the development into subsections below for clarity.

Light levels

We live directly opposite the site of the proposed development on the first floor (windows 18 and 19 in the Daylight and Sunlight Assessment). As a result, the proposed additional storey would obstruct the already limited natural light that is able to enter the property. We fear that this would have a detrimental impact on our wellbeing.

The BRE recommends that the "Vertical Sky Component should be no less than 27%, and if reduced below this, no less than 0.8 times the former value. The window should receive at least 25% of available annual sunlight hours and more than 5% during the winter months, or, where this is not the case, 80% of its former value". The Daylight and Sunlight Assessment reports that our existing VSCs are 19.12% and 10.89%, already significantly below the recommended 27%. According to the report, if the planning application was accepted, our VSCs would decrease to 15.88% and 8.97%, which is 83.05% and 82.37% of their former value respectively. The results on our annual and winter sunlight hours paint an even more dire picture. Our annual sunlight hours are currently 29.66% and 10.12%, which would decrease to 23.93% and 8.26% should the application be accepted. This is 80.69% and 81.65% of their former values respectively, concerningly close to the limit of 80%. Our winter sunlight hours are disastrously low at 0.83% and 0.62% and would also decrease with the proposed development.

I find it concerning that the results of the Daylight and Sunlight Assessment are both so borderline and based on plans "furnished by the design team". They have used "web-based mapping sources and photos used for location and size of neighbouring windows", rather than actual measurements and sunlight recordings. The margin of error could easily push our retained annual sunlight hours from 80.69% to below the limit of 80%, making the proposed development non-compliant with BRE guidance. Other tools suggested by the BRE and in the Camden Planning Guidance document on Amenity, such as Average Daylight Factor and Daylight Distribution, are not mentioned in the report, possibly because the development is non-compliant when these tools are applied. I strongly urge the council to seek an independent verification of the daylight and sunlight reports, based on actual measurements, before considering accepting this element of the application.

Overlooking and privacy

The proposed development would convert three mansard windows, currently set back from the street, to three full windows, bringing them closer to our property. It would also add three windows on an additional storey. These windows would directly overlook our property into both a bedroom and the living room area. We feel that this decrease in privacy could significantly reduce our quality of life. The additional storey would also exacerbate the sense of enclosure already experienced by those of us facing the tall buildings.

Traffic, noise and waste

An additional 3-bedroom flat in the Mews would place further stress on parking, refuse, noise and general traffic, which is already problematic. The mews is a narrow street which has reached if not already surpassed its capacity. It would be a shame if the operations of the local businesses and facilities of the Mews including: a dance and music studio, a food bank, two churches, a communication agency, a photography studio, a think tank, an artistic agency and a coffee maker showroom, were adversely affected by the development.

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

Integrity of the planning application

I wanted to highlight that the Proposed Street Scene Extended planning application document shows the additional storey on 8-9 Pratt Mews would bring the overall height of the building only to the same as that of the entrance building to the Mews (Units 14-15). One can clearly see from looking from the higher floors of the facing properties or on google maps that an additional storey on 8-9 Pratt Mews would be significantly higher than this. Misrepresentations such as this draw into question the credibility of the application. Furthermore, the applicant has three times previously been sentenced for housing mismanagement. Given that the new tenants would be at risk of becoming further victims of poor standards of building and management, the public benefits of the proposed development could not possibly outweigh the harm to both the amenity of the surrounding properties and the heritage of the conservation area.

The approval of this planning application would set a precedent, paving the way for further extensions along the mews. This would worsen all the aforementioned problems, eventually making the area unlivable.

Thank you in advance for taking our concerns into account when adjudicating on this planning application.

Yours sincerely,
James Freeman
Charlotte Freeman
Lily Freeman
Adam Samm

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2023/2881/P	Chris Turner	11/09/2023 13:55:24	OBJ	

The address for the planning application is incorrect and technically inaccurate. According to the developers plans I can see that it relates to the floors above 8-9 Pratt Mews. The floor and dwellings above 8-9 Pratt Mews are officially and presently known as 8a, 8b and 9a and 9b. The application for development is referring to these only and this should be made clear in the application, so there is no confusion as to what is being applied for.

We have a commercial long lease at 8-9 Pratt Mews of which 960 years are left. It is directly below where Mr Kaufmann is proposing to build another storey.

In 2006 he built flats above us to a very poor standard and erected illegal balconies on the roof which were not part of the initial plans and I complained to Camden council but they did not pursue the matter. This has resulted in a loss of privacy and light as the balconies are positioned beside my skylights.

Pratt Mews is a conservation area and should not be over developed destroying its character. We cannot see how the development enhances or preserves the area with its poor design and quality.

It will produce increased noise and waste which are two ongoing problems in the Mews

If this development is given permission to go ahead, it will set a precedent for further developments in what is supposed to be a conservation area.

Our business involves filming and we need the area to be quiet specifically for sound recording purposes. The development will generate unacceptable noise and vibration impacts during the building stage impacting our business detrimentally. The development will NOT be noise sensitive in an area that already experiences high levels of noise.

The noise levels will be exacerbated in an area that already suffers from HIGH vibration and noise because of the tube and tube tracks. There will be increased noise/vibration levels from the above floors as previous poor building design had zero sound insulation.

The proposed extra floor on top of 8-9 Pratt Mews will further impede our privacy and light. The height of the building will be taller than any surrounding developments and will effect the skyline in the Mews furthermore causing overshadowing and not contributing in its poor design to the local character of the Mews. It will also look over neighbours' recently built balconies and windows invading their privacy and blocking their light.

The height of the development will have a negative impact on the light we get through our skylights. This is the only natural light available to us and this will have an immediate detrimental effect on our photography and film business.

The layout and design of the guttering for the extension in 2006 was poorly conceived, It resulted in the

Application No: **Consultees Name:** **Received:**

Comment: **Response:**

drainage being covered by unauthorised balconies. When it rains water collects on the flat roofs and sits there stagnating, causing ongoing issues with roof leaks that affect me directly this will be worse with a bigger development.

I do not regard the developer as a good landlord.
Historically he has been taken to court by Camden council for breaking planning regulations as far back as 2006 and more recently 2019-2020.
Camden Council should be working with landlords that are responsible and have integrity.

In 2020 Mr Kaufmann was involved in a dispute with the council regarding his HMO license for 148 Camden High St and the flats within.

chrome-extension://efaidnbmnnnibpcajpcgglefindmkaj/https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/media/5e147500e5274a61a172c718/148_Camden_Street_Decision.pdf

Here is an article regarding Mr Kaufmann.

<chrome-extension://efaidnbmnnnibpcajpcgglefindmkaj/https://cfpt.org.uk/wp-content/uploads/2015/04/CFPT-Newsletter-Summer-Autumn-2007.pdf>

Comments made by Chris Turner of 8-9 Pratt mews, Camden Town, NW1 0AD,
Phone 07803207111
EMail chris@christurnerphotography.co.uk
Preferred Method of Contact is Email
