

[REDACTED]

From: dominica maxted <[REDACTED]>
Sent: 28 July 2014 11:12
To: Planning
Cc: Max SLC
Subject: RE: 74 Camden Mews - 2014/3258/P - [REDACTED]
[REDACTED]

Hi
I sent this email to Fergus Freeney, however he is now on leave.
Please could you ensure that the following email is passed on to the planning officer dealing with this proposal.
The member's briefing meeting is **today, 28/07/2014**.
Thanks very much.
Dom Maxted

[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]

Subject: RE: 74 Camden Mews - 2014/3258/P
Date: Mon, 28 Jul 2014 10:40:16 +0100

Hi Fergus
First of all, thanks so much for the obvious work that you have done to reduce the impact of this development. However, it would be much better for us and the people of North Villas if it didn't happen at all.

I still have some concerns:

1. There are no definite measurements. In fact the diagrams seem to change from picture to picture. Could the measurements be tied down please?
2. The use of full height opening windows to the front of the property are supposed to be for maintenance only. This will be impossible to police. The Llowarchs are already able to access the roof, as can be seen from the photographs. Can these be changed to normal sized windows?
3. I don't really understand what you are saying about the 1st floor window. If this is built out we will lose light from our living room and back bedrooms. They seem to be adding to the brick wall at the second floor level too. (See Revisions to second floor extensions diagram.)
4. The sunlight study. I assumed that the study took place *after* the Llowarch's changed their plans. The fact that they had a study from March in their back pocket to pull out at the last minute only convinces me that the first plan was a 'straw man'. Council policies should be changed if developers are allowed to do this – especially as it is now outside the period for comments.
5. Your report notes only 4 objections to the plan. I counted 7.

Nevertheless we really appreciate the work that has been done by you and the council.
Thanks again.
Dom and Pete Maxted

Dear Dominica,

Thank you for your email, I do apologise for being hard to contact. I have been out of the office regularly over the past few days on site visits.

The proposal was substantially reduced in size from the initial proposal following on from the applicant reviewing the submitting objections online and after discussion on site. An analysis of the light levels was provided following concerns raised with regard to light levels on your terrace.

The analysis provided follows BRE guidance by assessing sunlight levels based on the 21st March (which is the recommended day in the guidance), the assessment indicated that there would be a 19% reduction in light levels to the terrace on this day from 9:30 to 3pm 5.5hrs). This is in accordance with the BRE guidance to retain at least 50% of the existing sunlight levels for a period of 2 hours on this date. It should be noted that the sun is not at its highest point on the 21st March (this is around the 21st June), therefore during the summer months the terrace will receive more sunlight than outlined in the assessment.

I note that the sloped glazing at rear first floor level will be replaced with a wall/glazing running straight up the rear elevation by approx. 1.8m against an existing projecting boundary wall. The new built out 'extension' at first floor level would not project out further than this existing first floor wall and will therefore not cast any additional shadows above that currently cast by the projecting wall.

As your roof extension does not in itself contain a 'habitable' room we can only afford it limited weight when it comes to impact on light levels. However, even if it did contain a habitable room it is likely that the proposal would not so impact upon light levels entering the room as to justify refusal. The BRE guidance method for assessing light levels to habitable rooms advises that if the development were to cut through a 25degree line when drawn from the centre of the window affected then it may affect light levels. This proposal would not cut through a 25degree line drawn from the centre of the full height glazed door. Furthermore, there is also a rooflight and windows to your living room to allow extra light in. Details on this method can be found in section 6 of [CPG6: Amenity](#)

Following discussions with my senior colleagues it is considered that the scheme is now acceptable in design terms and with regards to impact on amenity (i.e sunlight/daylight, overlooking etc) and we will be recommending it for approval. It will be presented to councillors at a [member's briefing meeting](#) on evening of Monday 28th July, these are closed meetings, however if councillors are unhappy with the proposal they can choose to send it to a public development control committee.

I have attached details of the report and assessment which will be presented to councillors.

Kind regards,
Fergus Freaney
Planning officer

Hi

I have tried to call you a couple of times today with no luck. I have tried to call you several times previously to this.

I am now very concerned that we are not getting advice and information that we need. The one time that I did manage to speak to you, you said that you had not had a chance to look at the application.

Now the application has been changed at the last minute and outside the consultation period. I feel that the first application was a 'straw man' and that my neighbours may be 'playing the system'. I am not an architect and I could really use some advice.

Please can you tell me:


- When will you be available for me to talk through my questions?
- Will the application go through another consultation period?
- Will the other neighbours be informed?
- Why were the plans changed? Was this on the advice of the planning office? If so, can I see this advice?

I am getting very concerned that this application will go through without my having any guidance at all, and being kept in the dark about the progress of the application.

This application has a major impact on our home.

Regards

Dom Maxted


Date: Thu, 24 Jul 2014 15:25:30 +0100

Hi

I see from your website that the Llowarch's have updated their plans. As discussed during our phone conversation could you please inform me of any developments with this application via email? We are currently away from home and may not receive messages sent via the post.

Also - have the other affected properties been informed of the change? It would seem unfair to them if they are not given a chance to comment.

I have only, so far, had a cursory look through the amended plans. The only part of my objection (and the objection of other tenants) that the Llowarch's have even attempted to address is the issue of loss of light. Here are my initial thoughts.

- Their 'sunlight studies' were conducted on one of the brightest days of the year when the sun is at its height. Surely, to be of any use at all, such a study should be carried out at different points of the year including the depths of winter when the sun is at its lowest.
- Even considering the timing of their study they still have to concede that we will lose considerable light.
- As for the roof garden doors not providing light to a habitable room - this is untrue. The back bedroom doors have to be left open during the daytime to allow light to filter through from the hall.
- The living room door is glass to enable light to filter through from the hall.
- The new plan still includes the 'built out' 1st floor, which will deprive light from our living room window. Note the the plans do not accurately reflect the footprint of the Llowarch's house, which juts out at the back much further than is indicated.

I need to study the amended plans in more detail, with the BRE guidelines, and I will get back to you asap, however I wanted you to know our initial thoughts.

Please note: The updated plans do not address the many other issues outlined in my objection. Please refer to my previous letter for details.

Regards
Dom Maxted

[REDACTED]
Subject: RE: 74 Camden Mews - 2014/3258/P
Date: Mon, 23 Jun 2014 10:40:29 +0000
Hi Dom,

Thank you for your comments, they have been logged against the application and will be taken into account when I come to determining it.

Kind regards,
Fergus Freaney
Planning officer

From: dominica maxted [REDACTED]
Sent: 23 June 2014 09:51
To: Freaney, Fergus
Subject: 74 Camden Mews - 2014/3258/P

Hi
I wrote to you previously with our objections to this application. Please could you respond to let me know that you are considering our objections.
Also, the Consultation Documents link in the application details does not appear to be working.
Thanks very much
Dom Maxted

This e-mail may contain information which is confidential, legally privileged and/or copyright protected. This e-mail is intended for the addressee only. If you receive this in error, please contact the sender and delete the material from your computer.

This e-mail may contain information which is confidential, legally privileged and/or copyright protected. This e-mail is intended for the addressee only. If you receive this in error, please contact the sender and delete the material from your computer.