

Application No: 2015/6170/P
Consultees Name: Jason Watkins
Consultees Addr: 212a Camden Road London NW1 9HG
Received: 07/12/2015 18:26:28 OJB
Comment:
Response: We are the owners/occupiers of the ground floor maisonette at 212 Camden Road. While we were relieved to learn of the withdrawal of the recent planning application for the conversion of 61 Camden Mews into 2 residences, we are now very alarmed at the resubmission of a largely identical proposal for that same property. We are adamant that this development is still detrimental to the amenity of neighbouring properties, and is neither in keeping with the local scale and density of prevalent housing, nor respectful of its context in terms of its likely impact. More specifically:

1. The existing rear elevation of no. 61 offers a 2.7m high brick wall facing our garden, above which the first floor is set back approximately 3.5m – a set-back which helps keep the two properties discreetly apart and largely private. From that upper level, our garden-facing kitchen, dining room and master bedroom are currently somewhat overseen via 2 windows and a single patio door. Given that this property is a single family dwelling, the overall condition offers a reasonable but not ideal, level of privacy for my wife and I and our 2 children but is at least in keeping with the language and density of the neighbouring properties.

2. The proposed development, however, seeks to push that first floor out towards us by 2m, lower the garden wall dramatically, and introduce substantial additional glazing. This is further compounded by the fact that the proposal seeks to shoehorn 2 'houses' side by side, into a space previously occupied by a mews house which epitomises the scale and density of these typical NW1 mews buildings. This effectively doubles the amount of windows overlooking our property (from 3 to 6), most of which will be substantially closer to our property, and worse still - doubles the number of people occupying the site.

3. Furthermore, as the proposed rear elevation is north-west facing, we would be left exposed, but also deprived of the current levels of light and amenity. Our bedroom, kitchen and dining room are low down (ground and basement levels) and all face south-east. These rooms can only ever directly receive daylight/sunlight during the first half of the day, yet with the proposed amount of overlooking windows, we would feel obliged to keep blinds and curtains drawn to secure our privacy, at the expense of light. Needless to say, the garden would become a less inviting place to spend time at too, knowing that we would be overseen across its width by twice as many people.

In summary, we believe this proposal is detrimental to our amenity and wellbeing, and those of other residents of surrounding properties. It is not in keeping with the original scale and density of this iconic stretch of north London, and we can only assume that the motive for the proposal is to seek to make quick financial gains through a short-sighted and excessive appetite for slicing the existing building fabric into small pieces.

Since the fencing was blown down on the terrace of 61 Camden Mews, our neighbours can look directly in to our garden and more importantly in to our main living area, which has been intolerable. This would be increased by the new proposed construction, with there being two families looking directly at us. This would have dramatic and extremely hurtful effect on our 3 year old son and 8 year old daughter. It would be an invasion of privacy in the worst possible context. I work in the public eye also and a sense of privacy with my family is paramount to me; which this new scheme would obliterate.

Application No: **Consultees Name:** **Consultees Addr:** **Received:** **Comment:** **Response:**

I find it inexplicable that a planning department would contemplate having a property like ours so aggressively overlooked, irrespective of the personal, family comments I have detailed above. I am also concerned, that despite my previous disclosure of [REDACTED], the plans have not altered in respect of this privacy issue. And of the gross innovation of our privacy that the development would produce.
