

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2016/1129/P	Chappell	Flat 3 20 Prince Albert Road London NW1 7ST	26/04/2016 19:37:32	OBJ	<p>We strongly object on the grounds of:-</p> <p>Noise and environmental impact.</p> <p>1) 20 Albert Terrace Mews is not a listed building but all the larger houses surrounding the quadrangle ARE Grade II Listed. They all face out onto busy roads and a bus route. Therefore the vast majority of people have their bedrooms to the rear facing towards this proposed roof terrace. As this is a conservation area, double glazing isn't allowed, most properties having the original sliding sash windows which have no acoustic qualities at all. Any talking or laughter etc can clearly be heard 'as if it is in your bedroom' - we are therefore sometimes kept awake for hours and continuously disturbed during the day as well. Also the configuration of the mews being in an enclosed space surrounded by tall houses on four sides; makes any noise travel very far and echo all around. This proposed terrace will also be within close proximity of the roof Velux windows of numbers 18 and 21 Albert Terrace Mews' bedrooms, so will be even more unbearable for those occupants.</p> <p>2) Re: Point 2.2 – Previous planning permission for application 2015/0485/P was granted for other works at 20 Albert Terrace Mews only last year – this application was only just about acceptable but nevertheless with some frosted screening involved.</p> <p>3) Re: - The previous roof terrace application 2015/3102/P that was withdrawn; whether the planning team and conservation officer considered this; this is irrelevant and inconsiderate on behalf of the applicant as the considerable objections from all neighbours are not even mentioned.</p> <p>Scale and Visual Impact</p> <p>4) The proposed roof terrace is effectively adding an extra storey. As the mews house is only circa 11m away from our rear windows, our views across the delightful mews quadrangle will be severely restricted. The quality of light on our north facing elevation will also be seriously impeded.</p> <p>5) The mews houses are all recent additions to the mid 19th century houses that surround the quadrangle. The height and scale of all the mews are similar, presumably restricted by previous Camden Council Planners to a certain scale. What is being proposed here is a significant increase to the habitable area. Not only would this tower over the adjacent mews it would 'dominate' the gardens and courtyards of neighbouring properties and tower over the lower ground and ground floor levels of the adjacent properties.</p> <p>6) The proposal will be 1800mm (6 foot) higher than the current structure. The proposal concentrates on angles from street level, not horizontal or higher views from neighbouring windows – which will be most affected. The finished product will still be considerably higher than the roof of 21 Albert Terrace Mews and other surrounding mews houses. (An unacceptable precedent)</p> <p>7) Re: Point 4.2 Planning Considerations. Item 1 states that it has no effect on amenities of neighbouring homes. Given the fact that all the larger surrounding houses are five floors this does not take into account horizontal and upwards visual impact i.e. those 5 storey houses having to look down upon this extra landscape and people impact.</p> <p>8) Most of the remainder of the roof terraces are a lot smaller than the proposal and are incorporated in the existing profile of the buildings EXCEPT for the illegal roof terraces of No 17. Many of the other roof terraces are historic and are not subject to the more recent stringent controls. Also some of the other existing terraces do not affect/are not seen by the Prince Albert Road houses.</p> <p>9) This proposal will also have a considerable impact visually and noise pollution wise on properties</p>

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

Comment: **Response:**

on Regent's Park Road, the rest of Albert Terrace Mews, Albert Terrace and St Mark's Square.
 10) Re: Design and Access – Photographs of the Mews: Why should this proposal match the same height of the ILLEGAL 3 x roof terraces at 17 Albert Terrace Mews – when that proposal was not legally passed?? (Similar design)

Disturbance

11) Re: Items 2 and 3 and 1) Amenities of neighbouring buildings: AN ILLEGAL 3 X ROOF TERRACES was built at 17 Albert Terrace Mews (completed around 2010). This was built WITHOUT Camden Council giving local residents the right to object. This resulted in noise and disturbance on SIX different occasions between May 2010-August 2010 – actual dates are documented to this day. This ILLEGAL action has caused immense suffering to all neighbouring properties.

12) No 23 Prince Albert Road Penthouse roof terrace is again ILLEGAL, apparently with retrospective planning permission applied for. It is a separate building in its own grounds and its roof terrace is not adjacent to other people's windows and skylights.

Loss of Privacy

13) Despite planting, neighbouring taller properties will be able to see clearly onto the roof terrace, and likewise those standing or sitting on the roof terrace will be able to see upwards into people's bedrooms, particularly if lights are on in the windows, residents undressing etc.

CONCLUSION

We would suggest that the three most recent roof terraces of 2008, 2009 and 2014 were either passed because insufficient notices/objections were filtered through or are ILLEGAL as in the case of No's 17 ATM and 23 PAR. All other terraces were passed before more stringent rules were implemented. The proposal will cause overshadowing to gardens and properties including residential rooms on Prince Albert Road. It will impose additional noise to all the neighbouring properties in Prince Albert Road, Albert Terrace, Albert Terrace Mews, St Mark's Square and Regent's Park Road as the area is enclosed by all these five roads and noise tends to echo and bounce around at all times, being much worse once night falls and children and adults alike are trying to sleep. (Noise disturbance)

As previously stated any references to the roof terraces at 17 Albert Terrace Mews and 23 Prince Albert Road whether they be about loss of amenity, planting or obscurity should be completely discounted as these terraces have been ILLEGALLY constructed.

The applicant already has a garden with adequate outside space, so why would they apply for more? With the advent of more and more terraces being built in this mews area, and terraces often being used for evening soirees, we have already passed saturation point. Whereupon most summer weekends there may already be two or three other terraces in use, disturbing people's quiet enjoyment and sleep especially as in the summer most people have their windows open and most of the bedrooms are backing onto the mews.

This is the third application to develop the property by the applicant which was only bought recently. Is it just to develop the property for selling on as we understand the applicant already has two other

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

properties in the area and has been known to employ the services of a property developer. It begs the question, if the property was not suitable for the needs of him and his family, then why did he buy it in the first place?

Similar proposals were submitted by a previous owner approximately 10 years ago. There has been no change of circumstances since then, so this proposal should also be rejected. The current owner is very recent; he has only recently put in for permission to enlarge his windows directly overlooking our property. Again the same argument could be used that previously Camden Council sized the windows at that size to protect the privacy of the neighbours. It seems to be the current owner is putting in piecemeal applications to turn this modest mews house into a much grander and scaled up property. He appears to have no regard for his neighbours' quiet enjoyment or privacy. It begs the question, if this house wasn't suitable for his family's needs than why did he buy it..... unless it was to overdevelop it to make a fast buck....
