				Printed on: 18/01/2024 09:10:08	3
Application No:	<b>Consultees Name:</b>	Received:	Comment:	Response:	
2023/5139/P	Alistair and Jayne Barr	17/01/2024 13:59:57	OBJNOT	OBJECTION to planning application 2023/5139/P . 81B Belsize Park Gardens , 24 Lambolle Place .	
				This strong Objection is from the owners of 8, Lancaster stables, NW3 4PH, Jayne and Alistair Barr .Our property is 25 metres from the proposed altered windows in Lancaster Stables.  Our Objection has two main headings.  1.Not "preserving or enhancing " the character and appearance here as required by the Belsize Park Conservation Area Statement.  2. Not supporting an Employment Site and Business Site as Camden's 2021 Report.  The Change of use and the elevation changes to the East elevation are accepted.  This objection is only for the four "Recessed terrace /bike store with 1.5 high trellis screen."  Details are below.  1 NOT PRESERVING OR ENHANCING a Conservation Area.  1.1 We believe that Paragraph 202 of the National Planning Policy Framework should be engaged here because harm is being proposed to this Conservation Area.  1.2 London Plan Policy HC1confirms that proposals in Conservation Areas should be sympathetic to their significance and appreciation within their surroundings.  1.3 The recessed terraces are an unusual architectural device for reasons of amenity, security, and privacy. In a traditional Mews the use is even more difficult to understand the logic.  1.4 In any Belsize Conservation Area mews there are ground floor large window solutions of various dates and styles but they all respond the character of history of these building. This is simple, robust screens, and cladding but never a recess solutions. The application says that this is a solution to privacy, "defensible space "and view which we strongly disagree with.  1.5 The applicant is happy for one window to be flush obscured glass which implies they would be happy with these on all the elevation.  1.6 A precedent study locally would reveal many other solutions to these issues which have been tested successfully ever since a residential mews was first converted.  1.7 Open ground floor terraces are discouraged by the Police security advice, "Secured by Design" as they	

- allow an intruder to work whilst hidden by the screen as well as allowing anti-social behaviour.

  1.8 This is an opportunity to redesign the existing ground floor windows to a strong and sympathetic ground
- floor solution and we urger the architects to explore this possibility which is more practical
- 1.9 This proposal gives the two flats back door access to which is unusual in flats of this size . This will compromise access arrangements for the garage opposite and creates unnecessary security issues here .
- 1.10 Ground floor inset balconies are not a common typology generally as they compromise security and privacy and encourage ani social behaviour. We have been unable to find any of this design in any Mews in this conservation area.
- 1.11 We support Camden's Cycle parking Policy but as the Pre application noted this is a two flat proposals which could be covered by a payment similar to as the affordable home requirement process.
- 1.12 The reports emphasis that the flats are above normal size so there is space for a wall hanging bike storage within the flat itself.
- 2. NOT SUPPORTING BUSINESS USE.
- 2.1 The Garage has been used as a business historically . This always involves the movement of vehicles waiting to be repaired and to be collected .
- 2.1 The Council employment report of 2021 says it "seeks to protect employment premises that meet the needs of businesses. These unusual ground floor balconies with back door features will hinder the everyday

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:	Printed on:	18/01/2024	09:10:08
Application No.	Consumes Ivame.	Receiveu.	Comment.	working of the garage .			
				working of the garage.			
				In conclusion there is no need for external bike storage and a back door in this size of development. The			
				design is tackling a non-existent issue in a way that is not sympathetic to the appea mews in the heart if the Conservation Area . In addition the proposal threatens a we			
				historical use of a working mews .			
				Thank you			