

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2024/5410/P	Andrew Llowarch	23/12/2024 14:27:38	OBJ	<p>My family and I live at number 74 Camden Mews, immediately adjacent to the proposed development at 72 Camden Mews.</p> <p>I have carefully studied the proposals. As this website does not allow for drawings to be added I will send drawings separately by email to demonstrate how the development would have a negative impact on various aspects of our amenity, and potentially that of other nearby properties along North Villas.</p> <p>We were consulted by the applicant and their architect during their development of the proposals, though some significant concerns remain.</p> <p>The development description includes the 'infil of existing rear conservatory at first floor'. In reality this would be an extension to the rear, comprising a significant increase in massing and built-form at the eastern corner of the site, immediately adjacent to our home (and some properties along North Villas). This proposed increase in massing as viewed from our home is represented by sketch drawing 241212_SK02 (sent by email).</p> <p>There would be a number of significant consequences of this proposed extension and increased massing that would impact negatively on our amenity:</p> <p>1. Daylight and Sunlight</p> <p>The design and access statement submitted with the application considers daylighting within the proposed development, though does not include any consideration of daylight and sunlight levels of adjoining properties and their amenity spaces. This lack of consideration seems to be contrary to the Camden Council CPG on Amenity, which states:</p> <p>'The Council expects applicants to consider the impact of development schemes on daylight and sunlight levels. Where appropriate a daylight and sunlight assessment should be submitted which should follow the guidance in the BRE's Site layout planning for daylight and sunlight: A guide to good practice'.</p> <p>Amenity CPG section 3.1 states that "...the council seeks to ensure that development does not cause unacceptable harm to amenity, including in terms of daylight and sunlight". Amenity CPG section 3.9 requires assessment, based on the above-mentioned BRE guidance, of levels of daylight and sunlight entering the windows of neighbouring properties and open spaces.</p> <p>Given the proposed extent of new development and the close proximity of neighbouring properties and their outdoor amenity spaces, we believe that it is appropriate and essential for Camden Council to seek an objective daylight and sunlight assessment in order to properly determine on this aspect of the proposals, and to ensure that the proposed development does not cause unacceptable harm to amenity in line with the Council's policy.</p> <p>74 Camden Mews has limited external amenity space consisting of a small garden of approximately 2.7m depth to the rear and small terrace at the front of approximately 4.5 sq. m.</p>

Application No: Consultees Name: Received:

Comment: Response:

The BRE guidance uses the equinox date of 21st March for assessment of overshadowing of gardens and open spaces. On this date, sunlight to the rear garden of 74 Camden Mews arrives just before 12.30pm when the sun emerges from behind the tall terraced properties of North Villas, and disappears around 2.10pm behind the existing rear part of 72 Camden Mews that currently projects approximately 1.3m beyond the rear wall of our home.

In this context, where sunlight is received over a small window of time, a small increase in the massing of nearby or adjacent properties can have a significant reducing effect on the amount of daylight and sunlight to the rear garden at 74 Camden Mews, and a corresponding increase in overshadowing.

Rear Garden & Rear Ground Floor Window:

As the application does not include a daylight and sunlight assessment, I have carried out my own studies, represented by scale drawing 241212_SK01 (sent separately by email) that contains a number of shadow & sunlight diagrams, demonstrating the additional overshadowing that would be caused by the proposed development on 21st March (as the BRE guidance).

These diagrams show that increased overshadowing from the proposed development reduces sunlight to the rear garden by almost 50% on 21st March which we believe to be in excess of the BRE guidance.

In addition, our ground floor rear window is within 90 degrees of due south and therefore meets the criteria set by the BRE guidance for an assessment of direct sunlight to windows.

Drawing 241212_SK01 demonstrates that the increased overshadowing from the proposed development would cause loss of direct sunlight to this window with a significant reduction on 21st March to approximately only 15% of existing levels - this is a very large and significant reduction of sunlight.

The scale drawings demonstrate that the increased massing of the proposed first floor rear extension to 72 Camden Mews would cause increased and significant overshadowing and loss of sunlight to the garden and window (and by extension to the living spaces inside Camden Mews). This would cause unacceptable harm to amenity in excess of the BRE guidance, and on this basis the proposals should be refused. I would ask that Camden Council seek an objective daylight and sunlight assessment, in order to properly determine on this aspect of the proposals, in accordance with their policies that are designed to protect the amenity of neighbouring properties.

2. Outlook

The increased massing associated with the proposed rear extension would have a negative impact on outlook by significantly increasing the degree of enclosure of this space and blocking off a significant part of the sky, resulting in an overbearing and dominating effect that would be detrimental to the enjoyment of our property. See attached drawing 241212_SK02. We believe this to be in contravention of the 2021 Camden Planning Guidance SPD on Amenity, sections 2, 2.13 & 2.14.

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
				<p>In addition to the above, I have concerns about the potential for noise disturbance from the operation of the proposed Air Source Heat Pump (ASHP) plant at high level. Camden Council's Local Area Requirements for planning applications stipulates that an Acoustic Report is required where plant, ventilation, air extraction or conditioning equipment and flues are proposed. I would ask that Camden Council seek such a report to objectively and properly determine on this aspect of the proposals, all in accordance with section 6 of 2021 Camden Planning Guidance SPD on Amenity.</p> <p>In summary I believe that the negative impacts on amenity are a result of proposed overdevelopment to the rear of the neighbouring site.</p> <p>I am not against development in principle, though in this case would welcome further design development, supported by appropriate objective assessments or reports, to remove these specific negative impacts, or to ensure they are within acceptable limits such as those set by the BRE guidance and/or other relevant aspects of planning policy.</p> <p>There seems to be potential to amend the scheme to reduce the scale of development to the rear, to remove or reduce these impacts on amenity to acceptable levels.</p> <p>We followed a similar approach in the submission of our application ref. 2014/3258/P, through which we made adjustments to our initial proposals to reduce impacts on amenity and, importantly, provided supporting information by which the impacts could be scrutinised and assessed by the planning officers and others with an interest in the proposals.</p> <p>You and/or any other officers are welcome to visit our home if it will help you to better understand the impacts outlined above. Please let me know and we can make suitable arrangements.</p> <p>Kind regards, Andrew Llowarch, Architect</p>

2024/5410/P	Judy Camp	27/12/2024 12:22:38	JUST	<p>The revised plans are clearly a great improvement on the original plans and I congratulate the applicant on this. However, some concerns remain:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - the angled roof is still above the natural rhythmic slope of the Camden Mews properties - the high side wall abutting no 70 Camden Mews appears to be massive, towering over no 70; it also blocks an open view from our home across to the rear of North Villas - we still have concerns about the level and nature of the noise of the ASHP; we speak with some experience of owning one and the noise is a deep constant hum which is very irritating - the bright terracotta colour of the cladding, as shown by the example in the document, is out of keeping with the calm brickwork colours of the Mews
-------------	-----------	---------------------	------	--

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2024/5410/P	Nicola Llowarch	31/12/2024 15:53:32	OBJ	<p data-bbox="880 132 1727 154">Residents at No. 74 Camden Mews, immediately adjacent to the application site:</p> <p data-bbox="880 193 1995 247">From the initial proposals submitted, though amendments have been made, there remain some significant concerns which have not been addressed:</p> <p data-bbox="880 285 1077 308">Two key concerns:</p> <p data-bbox="880 346 1301 368">1. Sunlight, daylight and overshadowing</p> <p data-bbox="880 406 1995 461">Our Kitchen/dining space currently enjoys limited daylight and sunlight from a rear external yard at ground floor level.</p> <p data-bbox="880 467 2058 646">In the absence of any supporting information submitted with the application we believe the proposed extension to the rear significantly affects the extent of daylight and sunlight currently received (see preliminary assessment based on the Buildings Research Establishment (BRE) guidance - refer to drawings attached to email from Andrew Llowarch). The rear extension also impacts the gardens to the rear of North Villas. Without a daylight/sunlight assessment it is not clear of the extent of the impact however we believe this may be significant.</p> <p data-bbox="880 652 1995 735">We understand that the guidance allows for some loss of proportion of daylight/sunlight but believe that an assessment is necessary in order to inform the extent of development to the neighbouring property so as to avoid causing significant overshadowing.</p> <p data-bbox="880 774 2058 952">We again request this be assessed in line with the methods described in accordance with Camden Councils Local Area Requirements 'Any proposal where there is potential to negatively impact on the existing levels of daylight/sunlight of other land uses near the application site including gardens and amenity spaces', a daylight and sunlight impact assessment should be submitted with the application - The report needs to be prepared in line with the methods described in the Building Research Establishment's (BRE) "Site layout planning for daylight and sunlight: A guide to good practice" 2011.</p> <p data-bbox="880 991 1995 1045">This is also referred to in Camden's Local Plan Policy A1. f. Managing the impact of development, sunlight, daylight and overshadowing; Camden Planning Guidance - Amenity,</p> <p data-bbox="880 1112 972 1134">2. Noise:</p> <p data-bbox="880 1173 1865 1195">An Air Source Heat Pump is proposed, now located to the rear elevation at second floor level.</p> <p data-bbox="880 1201 2058 1444">In the absence of a noise or acoustic report to assess the impact, we note that, based on the noise report submitted for the Camden Road Hostel site (ref 2020/3737/P), that the plant required to be 10dB below background sound levels. Background sound levels measured for the gardens to the North West side of the Mews were 47dB during the day and 41dB at night, giving plant noise limits of 37dB and 31dB. According to the manufacturers literature for the unit specified in the Design & Access statement [see copy attached to email submitted with previous application] the unit is such that it will breach both the day and evening and night sound emission limits based on these background sound levels. As currently proposed, without further supporting information, the plant would appear to cause harm to neighbouring amenity.</p> <p data-bbox="880 1482 1995 1505">We understand that impact on amenity from noise are written into planning policy - Camden Councils Local</p>

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

Comment: **Response:**

Area Requirements; Section 4: Reports and Assessments, submission of an acoustic report if plant is proposed; Camden Local Plan Policy A4 Noise and Vibration, and Camden Planning Guidance - Amenity,

In addition, and as our previous comments:

Overlooking:

Overlooking from the front second floor terrace into our first floor external terrace at close proximity.

Planting & glass as screening to terraces:

This is a concern. This is reliant on maintenance of planting, which could either provide insufficient screening or become overgrown and further impact on overshadowing to amenity. Loss of light transmission through glass and any framing of the glass will contribute to overshadowing.

We believe the proposals need to be supported by appropriate objective assessments/reports in order to ascertain, review and remove any potential negative impacts and/or to ensure they are within acceptable limits such as those set out in the BRE guidance and other relevant planning policy.

Kind regards

Nicola Llowarch (Architect)
