

- 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.

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.

13 North Villas London Ltd (Freeholder)