[redacted]

PLANNING APPLICATION DETAILS

Year: 2014

Number: 3258

Letter: P
Planning application address: 74 Camden Mews

Title: Mr.
Your First Name: B
Initial:
Last Name: Stevens
Organisation:
Comment Type: Object

Postcode: NW1 9BJ
Address line 1: Flat D13 North Villas
Address line 2: LONDON
Address line 3:
Postcode: NW1 9BJ

[redacted]

Your comments on the planning application: We object to the proposals, please attached document.

IF YOU WISH TO UPLOAD A FILE CONTAINING YOUR COMMENTS THEN USE THE LINK BELOW

-
No files attached

ABOUT THIS FORM

Issued by: Camden Council
Customer feedback and enquiries
Camden Town Hall
Judd Street
London WC1H 9JE
Form reference: 9473432

Date: 18/06/2014

Objection to Planning Application 2014/3258/P

1- The design and Impact statement makes no consideration of its relationship to the rear of North Villas properties, and in particular No 13 North Villas which shares the rear boundary.
2- The description of the proposal as a single storey **roof** extension is misleading. This is a **second floor addition** to a two storey Mews house which when viewed from the rear will visually form a full three storey height elevation.
3- 13 North Villas comprises four separate leaseholds which means that the lower units (flats 13A, 13B and 13C will suffer considerable loss of amenity and daylight by the mass of this proposed extension.
4- The reference in the Design and Access Statement to other recent developments along Camden Mews as a potential precedent is also misleading as it does not acknowledge that other developments have all attempted in some way to ameliorate their impact on the rear by reduced eaves height, and/or setbacks of the building line.
5- It should be noted that the rear building line of No 74 also projects forward from the building line of the Mews properties to the north such that the impact of any upward extension of the property will have a greater adverse impact on North Villas. This would appear to have been recognised in the design of the **existing** No 74 roof edge line which has sloping glazing to a set back of the roof edge, but entirely ignored in their proposal. Refer to their drawing EX_GA17 Section AA-Existing.
6- It should be noted that the sections AA EX_GA17-existing and PR_GA17- proposed which both show an outline of buildings beyond do not identify that these are higher in elevation due to the slope of the Mews, which therefore has the effect of appearing to make the height of the No 74 extension appear less onerous.
7- It is clear from inspection of the second floor proposal plan Ref PR_GA12 that the proposal has aimed for the easiest solution without regard to its impact on neighbours to the rear.
8- Whereas no extension is preferable, it is clearly possible to provide this accommodation without locating it to the extreme rear building line. It is possible to locate it more central to the footprint and also reduce the height of the roof edge/eaves to the rear.

We object to the proposals as currently designed for the reasons stated above, and which in principle have ignored its impact on neighbouring properties to the rear. We ask for the Planning Officer to recommend rejection, and for members of the Planning Committee protect the amenity for the North Villas residents by rejecting this proposal.

[redacted]

PLANNING APPLICATION DETAILS

Year: 2014

Number: 3258

Letter: P
Planning application address: 74 Camden Mews

Title: Mr.
Your First Name: Norman
Initial:
Last Name: King
Organisation: Leaseholder
Comment Type: Object

Postcode:
Address line 1: 13b North Villas
Address line 2:
Address line 3:
Postcode: NW1 9BJ

[redacted]

Your comments on the planning application: See Attached

IF YOU WISH TO UPLOAD A FILE CONTAINING YOUR COMMENTS THEN USE THE LINK BELOW

-
PDF Comments on Application 2014/3258/P:
https://forms.camden.gov.uk/cus/servlet/ep.getImg?ref=13960661528&print=Y&st=&auth=100001300

ABOUT THIS FORM

Issued by: Camden Council
Customer feedback and enquiries
Camden Town Hall

Judd Street
London WC1H 9JE
Form reference: 9473152

Comments regarding Planning Application Ref 2014/3258/P 18th June 2014
74 Camden Mews

1- The design and Impact statement makes no consideration of its relationship to the rear of North Villas properties, and in particular No 13 North Villas which shares the rear boundary.
2- The description of the proposal as a single storey ***roof*** extension is misleading. This is a ***second floor addition*** to a two storey Mews house which when viewed from the rear will visually form a full three storey height elevation.
3- 13 North Villas comprises four separate leaseholds which means that the lower units (flats 13A, 13B and 13C will suffer considerable loss of amenity and daylight by the mass of this proposed extension.
4- The reference in the Design and Access Statement to other recent developments along Camden Mews as a potential precedent is also misleading as it does not acknowledge that other developments have all attempted in some way to ameliorate their impact on the rear by reduced eaves height, and/or setbacks of the building line.
5- It should be noted that the rear building line of No 74 also projects forward from the building line of the Mews properties to the north such that the impact of any upward extension of the property will have a greater adverse impact on North Villas. This would appear to have been recognised in the design of the **existing** No 74 roof edge line which has sloping glazing to a set back of the roof edge, but entirely ignored in their proposal. *Refer to their drawing EX_GA17 Section AA-Existing.*
6- It should be noted that the sections AA *EX_GA17-existing* and PR_*GA17- proposed* which both show an outline of buildings beyond do not identify that these are higher in elevation due to the slope of the Mews, which therefore has the effect of appearing to make the height of the No 74 extension appear less onerous.
7- It is clear from inspection of the second floor proposal plan *Ref PR_GA12* that the proposal has aimed for the easiest solution without regard to its impact on neighbours to the rear.
8- Whereas no extension is preferable, it is clearly possible to provide this accommodation without locating it to the extreme rear building line. It is possible to locate it more central to the footprint and also reduce the height of the roof edge/eaves to the rear.
9- The rear elevation proposed presents a bland and brutal exterior with no attempt to articulate in anyway the general character and scale of Mews developments

I object to the proposals as currently designed for the reasons stated above, and which in principle have ignored its impact on neighbouring properties to the rear. We ask for the Planning Officer to recommend rejection, and for members of the Planning Committee protect the amenity for the North Villas residents by rejecting this proposal.

We note that when the notice of the application was received that the website was showing 'error' and preventing access to the relevant documents for inspection.