

Printed on: 11/10/2023 09:11:15

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2023/3257/P	Allen Hanouka	02/10/2023 10:11:29	OBJ	not affected in terms of privacy but there may be a party wall issue here

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2023/3257/P	Belsize Mews (Residents) Limited	02/10/2023 16:50:53	OBJ	<p>We are writing to you as the two serving directors of Belsize Mews (Residents) Limited, a company established to manage the freehold properties which collectively form Belsize Mews. This communication should be taken to represent the views of all freeholders, excluding the owners of No 3 but including the tenants currently residing at No 3.</p> <p>The purpose of this communication is to provide our formal objections to the planning application referenced above.</p> <p>Background</p> <p>We are a private, gated mews community consisting of 12 freehold houses, numbers 1-12.</p> <p>Historically, similar Belsize Mews planning proposals have been rejected by the Council on the basis that they were deemed to have failed to preserve, let alone enhance, the character and appearance of the Belsize conservation area.</p> <p>We have reviewed the documents relating to this application online and we believe the submission to be limited, lacking in detail in some important areas and containing a number of inaccuracies and inconsistencies.</p> <p>Commentary and observations:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ✦ The windows are certainly not aluminium as stated in the redacted statement. They are hardwood and, when originally installed in 1981, were single-glazed. Some of the properties have upgraded their windows to double-glazing, although this was achieved (after liaison with Camden) by modifying but retaining the existing windows and frames to look exactly the same but perform better in terms of energy conservation and noise. ✦ The existing ground floor plan, as drawn, is confused/incorrect against the existing section BB elevation. ✦ Whilst the plans show section lines AA, BB and CC, there are no such noted section lines. There are three sections but the critical section is missing. Two of the sections are both entitled 'Proposed North Elevation' with the same drawing Number 105-GF-DR-203. ✦ The rear wall of No 3 has had structural damage for some time, of which the agent and owner have been made aware, but it remains untreated externally (see current photograph attached showing significant cracking on the brickwork). This is usually a sign of subsidence which may require underpinning. It may of course, after structural review, be solvable but would beg the question, with this defect already in existence, whether the existing foundations could take the weight of another storey without significant ground works. ✦ How would the brickwork mortar be matched to the existing to ensure no breaks? Samples would be required. ✦ There are no dimensions and this is particularly important to the boundary ridge line on the southern wall in that it was a specific planning consideration and requirement for the original consent for the development. That line is the datum for a consistent height when viewed from the houses behind Belsize Mews in Belsize

Application No: Consultees Name: Received:

Comment: Response:

Avenue. Our concern is that, without dimensions, we cannot be certain of the height.

- ✦ We would request dimensioned drawings and also a photographic render of the proposed development when viewed looking down the mews from the entrance gates as an accurate update to the existing photo in the DAS. Without this information, the overall plan for the roof structure appears uncertain.
- ✦ The new proposed top-floor punched hole windows are shown larger than the other existing second-floor punched hole windows in the Mews and appear proportionally too large.
- ✦ The additional storey would impact line of sight and sunpath rights of light.
- ✦ The proposed new top floor of four windows and a roof terrace, if built, would directly overlook the adjacent bedroom and living room of No 4. This isn't the case with any other Mews property.
- ✦ The boiler flue position is not specifically shown although it would indicate it is to be on the front of the house where it shows 'Gas' on the plan. It would need to be positioned such that it is compliant with the openable windows in the Mews. The original flues went up from roof level at the rear.
- ✦ The construction process would, of necessity, be required to take place from within the Mews and as such would be a concern as it is a private, gated community and roadway which is very quiet and secluded. The limited company which exists, in part, to safeguard freeholders' interests has its own memorandum and articles of association that includes, for example, constraints re:
 - no noisy works before 10am or after 5pm
 - no storage of materials within the Mews
 - no parking of commercial vehicles within the Mews at any time.
- ✦ We would question the timescale advised of 12 weeks for completion of the works; we believe it would be in the order of six months and that any construction of this significance would impact the amenity and quiet enjoyment of a very peaceful and secluded Mews.
- ✦ Our overriding concern is that the application doesn't contain enough information and as such is ill-considered.

Summary

We object to this proposal and request that the Council rejects it on principle. We would welcome a public consultation, both to encompass the further information requested and to allow sufficient time for all Belsize Mews freeholders fully to consider it.

Could you please also advise as to the next steps you would propose and any other related consultations? Please also confirm safe receipt of this communication.

Thank you for your consideration and, on behalf of the Mews, we would be delighted to receive you at the location to review the application in context and show you around.

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2023/3257/P	Mike Harvey	02/10/2023 17:16:02	OBJ	Belsize Mews (Residents) Limited c/o 7 Belsize Mews London NW3 5AT



2nd October 2023

Sent via e-mail



Application address: 3 Belsize Mews NW3 5AT
Application reference: 2023/3257/P

Dear Jennifer,

We are writing to you as the two serving directors of Belsize Mews (Residents) Limited, a company established to manage the freehold properties which collectively form Belsize Mews. This communication should be taken to represent the views of all freeholders, excluding the owners of No 3 but including the tenants currently residing at No 3.

The purpose of this communication is to provide our formal objections to the planning application referenced above.

Background

We are a private, gated mews community consisting of 12 freehold houses, numbers 1-12.

Historically, similar Belsize Mews planning proposals have been rejected by the Council on the basis that they were deemed to have failed to preserve, let alone enhance, the character and appearance of the Belsize conservation area.

We have reviewed the documents relating to this application online and we believe the submission to be limited, lacking in detail in some important areas and containing a number of inaccuracies and inconsistencies.

Commentary and observations

The windows are certainly not aluminium as stated in the redacted statement. They are hardwood and, when originally installed in 1981, were single-glazed. Some of the properties have upgraded their windows to double-glazing, although this was achieved (after liaison with Camden) by modifying but retaining the existing windows and frames to look exactly the same but perform better in terms of energy conservation and noise.

Application No: Consultees Name: Received:

Comment: Response:

The existing ground floor plan, as drawn, is confused/incorrect against the existing section BB elevation. Whilst the plans show section lines AA, BB and CC, there are no such noted section lines. There are three sections but the critical section is missing. Two of the sections are both entitled 'Proposed North Elevation' with the same drawing Number 105-GF-DR-203.

The rear wall of No 3 has had structural damage for some time, of which the agent and owner have been made aware, but it remains untreated externally (see current photograph attached showing significant cracking on the brickwork). This is usually a sign of subsidence which may require underpinning. It may of course, after structural review, be solvable but would beg the question, with this defect already in existence, whether the existing foundations could take the weight of another storey without significant ground works.

How would the brickwork mortar be matched to the existing to ensure no breaks? Samples would be required.

There are no dimensions and this is particularly important to the boundary ridge line on the southern wall in that it was a specific planning consideration and requirement for the original consent for the development. That line is the datum for a consistent height when viewed from the houses behind Belsize Mews in Belsize Avenue. Our concern is that, without dimensions, we cannot be certain of the height.

We would request dimensioned drawings and also a photographic render of the proposed development when viewed looking down the mews from the entrance gates as an accurate update to the existing photo in the DAS. Without this information, the overall plan for the roof structure appears uncertain.

The new proposed top-floor punched hole windows are shown larger than the other existing second-floor punched hole windows in the Mews and appear proportionally too large.

The additional storey would impact line of sight and sunpath rights of light.

The proposed new top floor of four windows and a roof terrace, if built, would directly overlook the adjacent bedroom and living room of No 4. This isn't the case with any other Mews property.

The boiler flue position is not specifically shown although it would indicate it is to be on the front of the house where it shows 'Gas' on the plan. It would need to be positioned such that it is compliant with the openable windows in the Mews. The original flues went up from roof level at the rear.

The construction process would, of necessity, be required to take place from within the Mews and as such would be a concern as it is a private, gated community and roadway which is very quiet and secluded. The limited company which exists, in part, to safeguard freeholders' interests has its own memorandum and articles of association that includes, for example, constraints re:

- no noisy works before 10am or after 5pm
- no storage of materials within the Mews
- no parking of commercial vehicles within the Mews at any time.

We would question the timescale advised of 12 weeks for completion of the works; we believe it would be in the order of six months and that any construction of this significance would impact the amenity and quiet enjoyment of a very peaceful and secluded Mews.

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
				<p>Our overriding concern is that the application doesn't contain enough information and as such is ill-considered.</p> <p>Summary</p> <p>We object to this proposal and request that the Council rejects it on principle. We would welcome a public consultation, both to encompass the further information requested and to allow sufficient time for all Belsize Mews freeholders fully to consider it.</p> <p>Could you please also advise as to the next steps you would propose and any other related consultations? Please also confirm safe receipt of this communication.</p> <p>Thank you for your consideration and, on behalf of the Mews, we would be delighted to receive you at the location to review the application in context and show you around.</p> <p>Yours sincerely,</p> <p>Mike Harvey (5 Belsize Mews) Director David Scaife (7 Belsize Mews) Director & Company Secretary</p>
