

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:
2024/1876/P	Richard Morgan & Monica Coombs	16/06/2024 17:15:23	OBJNOT

Response:

Introduction

1. The planning statement supporting this application fails to mention the listed status of the adjoining properties to the East of the site and fails to consider whether the proposals adversely affect the setting of those listed buildings. This is a material consideration in determining the application.
2. Further, the Planning Statement supporting this application is incorrect in stating that the existing buildings on the site were built post-war. As has previously been accepted by the applicants for planning permission between 2014 and 2022, the existing mews houses are original, as is accepted in the Applicant's own Design and Access Statement May 2024 (although that document fails to mention that the 2 mews houses are specifically identified as making a positive contribution to the Bloomsbury Conversation Area) (which is specifically also accepted in the Applicant's own Heritage Statement at page 13).

Specific Comments/Objections

3. The pitched photovoltaic cells proposed for the roof area are conspicuous, fail to follow the form and height of the roofline of the existing buildings on either side, are out of context in a conservation area and adversely affect the setting of the listed buildings at 23 and 24 John Street. See also Policies D1 and D2 (Heritage) of the LBC Local Plans and Policy HC1 (Heritage, Conservation and Growth).
4. The rear top floor dormer windows fail to observe hierarchy of size and location – they are not subordinate as they are not only too tall and wide (they should be much narrower and less high to adopt a more historical form in a conservation area), they are also not set back enough from the face of the first floor to acknowledge the subservient nature of the mews house to the listed buildings on John Street. They are not designed to minimise overlooking in accordance with CPG Amenity January 2021 para 2.2. See also Policies D1 and D2 of the LBC Local Plans and Policy HC1 (Heritage, Conservation and Growth).
5. The rooflights at roof level should not sit proud of the roof line as they adversely affect the setting of the listed buildings on John Street and there is no apparent reason for them not to sit flush with the proposed roof line.
6. The rear first floor windows should be smaller as they cannot be obscure glazed to minimise overlooking in accordance with CPG Amenity January 2021 para 2.2.

Essential Conditions in addition to Comments/Objections

7. There should be a permanent restriction on any use of the flat roofs in the future with that restriction secured by condition, and it should be a condition that the balustrade at first floor level at the rear should be erected prior to first occupation and retained thereafter.
8. The usual conditions on asbestos, contamination, etc should be imposed.
9. There should be a condition relation to tree protection on adjoining properties. A condition should be imposed to prevent tourists or short term lets unless permitted under a subsequent change of use application.

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

Additional points

10. The Application for Planning Permission states in response to the question “Does the proposal involve any of the following: ...Land which is known to be contaminated” the answer given is “No”. From documents submitted in support of previous applications, the land is known to be contaminated as was explicitly stated in a soil contamination report filed with Camden Council by a previous applicant.

11. The daylight and sunlight report fails to calculate figures for a fully glazed door at basement level at 24 John Street. For the avoidance of doubt, nothing in this response waives existing rights to light. It appears inherently unlikely that the existing area receiving 2 hours sunlight to Neighbouring Gardens figure for Garden G2 is only 1.07% from which it is to be inferred that the figure given is mistaken and the subsequent calculation is therefore also wrong.
