

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2014/3258/P	Nicola Shears	78 Camden Mews London NW1 9BX	25/06/2014 18:40:25	OBJ	<p>Following careful study of this application and having spoken to the owners of the property about their proposal we wish to record the following.</p> <p>We understand and sympathise with the owners desire to extend and increase the usable space of their property. However, this should not be at the expense of the properties around them.</p> <p>Our main concern is the extension of the existing building line at roof level. This factor was cited to us as must be observed, critical consideration by Camden Planning when we applied for a recent roof extension (application 2012/2867/P). After a pre-planning consultation we were granted permission conditional on having a scheme that followed the existing building line precedent and that did not materially impact on neighbouring views and light fall.</p> <p>The application is totally inconsistent with the current precedent. It seeks to bring the established second storey building line significantly further forwards towards the Mews. The impact of which would be to obstruct and restrict the aspect of all the houses up the Mews from no 74.</p> <p>The proposal will irreversibly change our outlook as well as causing us to suffer a loss of light at ground floor level where natural daylight is already severely restricted. In respect of the latter, if you take into consideration the direction in which the sun travels, you will see how the proposed construction will cut out light for us, our neighbours at 76 and 80 and also those residents behind us on North Villas.</p> <p>We assume that the building line, loss of view and overshadowing criteria remain relevant. The proposal does not appear to be in line with previous planning decisions. To ignore these now would be inconsistent and at odds with Camden Mews' conservation status. Our roof terrace is an established amenity that affords our family invaluable, albeit very limited outside space and we would like to preserve its integrity.</p> <p>We strongly urge you to reject the application and ask that the applicant resubmits a plan consistent with the existing building line. Essentially this means removing and repositioning their proposed staircase. This would seem a reasonable and pragmatic compromise especially given our potential loss of light at ground floor level.</p>
2014/3258/P	Dom Maxted	76 Camden Mews	25/06/2014 10:00:12	OBJ	<p>Re the comment from Anne Mullins. Ms Mullins lives nowhere near the proposed development. (Street numbers in the Mews are confusing.) I can only assume that her comment has more to do with our previous objection to her wood burning stove, which we complained about when it covered the area with toxic smoke. It is a shame to see a response like this, especially given the use of her title.</p> <p>In my opinion, Mr Rodney Harris also seems to be letting personal feelings have an undue influence on his views. We previously had a dispute with him when he crashed into our car.</p>