

Hi - please find attached the photo omitted from my previous email.

Regards,

Catty Hannam



> On 25 Sep 2024, at 12:23, Catherine Hannam wrote:

>  
>

> Dear Obote,

>

> Following our meeting I would like to add the following comments on the above noted planning application.

>

> The overall design of the building will have a negative impact on the conservation area. It is mentioned in the conservation document 'the terrace to the south-west retains more of its

original character'. Whilst only nos 15-19 are mentioned specifically as buildings that contribute to the conservation area, allowing the entire other side of the mews to go up a floor with ugly modern mansard roofs (which are mentioned within the conservation document as having a negative impact throughout Belsize) can only detract from the overall character of an original mews.

>

> The scale of the building would no longer be in keeping with the mews setting, being the only four storey building on the road. Within the application mention is made of the height of buildings on the other wing of the mews, which is located on the other side of primrose gardens (the north-east terrace of Elizabeth mews, as mentioned in the conservation document), without acknowledgement that this is a separate and much wider road - approx a third wider - which allows for less of a sense of enclosure than on the much narrower south west side, which has traditionally had two storey houses, one side without any additional upward building until the last few years (no 26).

>

> Furthermore, on the primrose gardens side, no 27 adjoins a two storey building. This will be left as an odd looking dip next to the large Englands lane building. I note in the application they attempt to obfuscate this point by only showing the low building. I illustrate this with a current photo at the end of this email so that you can see how this would be. I note this is not the only area of less than full honesty in the applicants documents. Please note a photo dating from between 2008-2011 has been used to illustrate the mews, perhaps to suggest the road is more in need of updating than it currently is.

>

> On the matter of light, the light surveys seem to have been presented only with angles from directly behind Englands Lane. Elizabeth Mews receives very little sunlight. No 27, being on the corner with Primrose garden, allows additional light into no 15 particularly, and the whole mews generally, as the sun passes via primrose garden. If a further storey is added to No 27 this would cut this limited sunlight and I believe the applicant should provide a more honest survey from that angle for consideration.

>

> In addition to my comments on the design, I believe the disruption allowing this application to go ahead would have for all residents of the mews would be unacceptable. During the building the digging of a basement would make the mews all but inaccessible to most motor traffic whether they dig from the mews side, or primrose gardens. If they dig into the mews side the road would have to be closed off as it is simply too narrow to accommodate the work, which is obviously unacceptable. If they dig into primrose gardens, a pedestrian access in the road would be required as the pavement would have to be shut. The corner of the mews is already extremely difficult. Even though it is double yellows on all corners, indeed because of this as no regular parking can occur, delivery vans frequently park on the corners, or indeed over the road and the hire bike station often means bikes are left to the very corner. With one corner largely shut off, the mews will often be inaccessible. This will include for rubbish collection (rubbish lorries drive onto the pavement to reverse down the mews and when they can't drive down the mews will often not collect rubbish. This was the case throughout the recent construction at number 26), residents' vehicles, deliveries and services and equally for emergency services should they be required at any time. Any scaffolding on the mews for the extra floor would be problematic for access for the same reasons.

>

> If the application is allowed this would mean a precedent set for building up and down a floor along the mews. This would result in many years of building disturbance and access issues. This has already been the case in the mews where permission was granted for an extra floor at no 26. There unsafe scaffolding was put up without any application, making access very difficult

and rubbish uncollected. Despite residents complaints and an order to take it down, it remained up until the work was complete. As there seems to be no way of curtailing this sort of behaviour once permission has been given, it would seem best not to set the precedent for allowing basements as well as extra floors which would guarantee many years of anti social construction. Should permission be granted I would expect a management plan to be circulated to all mews residents with contact details given to address any such issues.

>

> Finally I believe that doubling the capacity from an office to an office and a residence would impact on the already stretched capacity of the mews. Double the deliveries, double the rubbish. I note in the application it states rubbish provision would not change, but this is simply untrue. The residence and office will unlikely share the same bins. Even if the initial occupants do, when the flat is sold to separate owners they will inevitably acquire their own bin and recycling bin. The space for bins is already over capacity, with most of the frontage taken up with bins. Even two more will be hard to accommodate, particularly on the corner where navigating a vehicle can be difficult with all the already noted issues.

>

> In conclusion this scheme is out of scale and keeping with the mews and conservation area. Is to the detriment of the environment of the mews in terms of sunlight and a feeling of enclosure. It will in itself and in terms of a precedent, cause massive disruption to other residents, beyond what is reasonable and expected to upkeep the building.

>

> Regards,

>

> Catty Hannam

> 19 Elizabeth Mews