

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2016/5492/P	N. Sajjadi	12 Wavel Mews	02/12/2016 01:59:43	OBJ	<p>Date: 1 December 2016</p> <p>Objection by N. Sajjadi, 12 Wavel Mews</p> <p>RE: Objection to the planning application for a 2 surface storey and 2 basement storey building in place of 10B Wavel Mews, NW6 3AB, ref 2016/5492/P</p> <p>I am writing to express my objection to the planned changes as presented by application reference 2016/5492/P. I base my objections on the following grounds:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Overlooking and Loss of Privacy to no. 12 Wavel Mews, but also adjacent dwellings</li> <li>2. Loss of character to the Mews and wider (conservation) area</li> <li>3. Loss of value to 12 Wavel Mews</li> <li>4. Precedence – other occupants undertaking similar projects, destabilising the old Mews structures further</li> <li>5. Impact from noise and disturbance to residents from excessive building work required</li> <li>6. Impact from traffic nuisance</li> <li>7. Impact on wildlife from excessive building work and changes to existing nature</li> <li>8. Miscellaneous observations and comments: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o Misleading presentation within the application</li> <li>? Drawing</li> <li>? Unrealistic traffic management predictions</li> <li>? Unrealistic timing of the project</li> <li>o character of applicant and impact on future prospect of ‘community spirit’ within the Mews</li> </ul> </li> <li>9. Effect on Conservation Area, national Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) policies, and guidelines and Camden Council Conservation Area policies</li> </ol> <p>Detailed comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Overlooking and Loss of Privacy to no. 12 Wavel Mews (and other adjacent dwellings)</li> </ol> <p>The proposed height of the roof structure will lead to an immediate assault on our privacy; our bedrooms are diagonally facing number 10B, no matter what material is placed on top, as it would never be as high as an average person. The proposed roof height and terrace are unreasonable and I would legally challenge the impact on our right to privacy.</p> <p>A roof terrace would also be completely out of character with the surrounding houses. Furthermore, as owners of 12 Wavel Mews, we have made our own applications in the past to have a dormer placed in our attic. These pl</p>
2016/5492/P	Mr Christos Malialis	11 Wavel Mews NW6 3AB NW6 3AB	01/12/2016 15:03:18	COMMNT	<p>I am the tenant and authorised attorney of the owner of 11 Wavel Mews, London NW6 3AB. My client Mr Peter Bibangamba (the owner of the property) wishes to object to the above planning application and I shall be doing so on his behalf. However as I have just returned from holiday, I shall be submitting my client's objections by the 8th of December 2016</p>
2016/5492/P	Malcolm Brown	11a Acol Road Mondon NW6 3AA	01/12/2016 20:15:43	OBJ	<p>I submitted my objection by email this morning. Please see that for full details. I am recording a comment here just so that I can be sure to flag that I wish to know about the planning meeting and to talk.</p>

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2016/5492/P	Stephen Abram	15A Acol Road London N19 3BE	29/11/2016 17:34:09	OBJNOT	<p>I write in connection with Planning Application 2016/5492/P, 10B Wavel Mews, London NW6 3AB. I have examined the plans and, as owner of Flat A 15 Acol Road, know the site well. I wish to object strongly to the proposed development of this house in this location, on the grounds of:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Loss of light</li> <li>2. Overshadowing</li> <li>3. Loss of trees and risk to trees within the conservation area, protected by law</li> <li>4. Overlooking and loss of privacy</li> <li>5. Overbearing nature of the proposal</li> <li>6. Layout, density, design, appearance and character of building</li> <li>7. Detrimental effect of the excavation on other buildings</li> <li>8. Public visual amenity</li> <li>9. Noise and disturbance from the scheme</li> <li>10. Loss of ecological habitats</li> <li>11. Adequate parking and servicing</li> <li>12. Effect on Conservation Area, National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) policies and guidelines and Camden Council Conservation Area policies</li> </ol>

In detail:

1. Unacceptable loss of light to adjacent properties. Sunlight to garden of 15 Acol Road will fall 28% BELOW THE BRE guidelines if the development goes ahead:

Please refer to the Daylight & Sunlight Study by Right of Light Consulting, dated 18th August 2016, commissioned by the applicant. This clearly indicates an unacceptable loss of light to a number of the surrounding properties, the worst affected being 15 Acol Road. For Flat A, 15 Acol Road, Appendix 2 "Sunlight to Windows" publishes a before:after ratio of 1:0.72 to the kitchen window and 1:0.6 to the living room window / patio doors. The data further publishes an unacceptable reduction in the total area of the garden of 15 Acol Road receiving at least 2 hours of sunlight per day. This reduces from 31.33m<sup>2</sup> (49% of the garden) to 14.13m<sup>2</sup> (22% of the garden) and a before:after ratio of 1:0.45. The plan in Appendix 3 shows what this actually looks like. A hugely significant 72% of the garden area and 100% of the lawn area will receive under 2 hours of sunlight a day if the development goes ahead. This is 28% beneath the BRE guideline / recommendation of at least 2 hours of sunlight for 50% or more of the garden area. I have sought the opinion of daylight/sunlight expert and they agree that the results are not compliant with the BRE Guidelines and therefore there will be an "unacceptable adverse impact to the amenity of the neighbouring garden". I am astonished that Right of Light Consulting are prepared to gloss over this in their report, seriously calling into question their integrity in this matter.

2. Overshadowing. See above.

3. The proposal represents a significant risk to nearby trees:

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

**Comment:**    **Response:**

Please refer to the Arboricultural Impact Assessment (AIA) Report by Landmark Trees, dated 15th July 2016 and the Basement Impact Assessment (BIA) Report by Southern Testing, dated October 2016, both commissioned by the applicant. Point 3.3, page 8 of the AIA correctly reminds us all that it is a criminal offence to prune, damage or fell trees within the South Hampstead Conservation Area (SHCA). This applies to all of the trees on and around the development site. In particular, I wish to draw your attention to tree T5 (as labelled in the AIA), which sits within the garden of 15 Acol Road, a matter of under 2 metres from the proposed development site. The AIA determines it to be a Category B Lime tree (Moderate quality) of approximately 16 metres in height, and concedes that “moderate quality trees and above are significant material constraints on development” (point 4.1.8, P11). It goes on to assert that T5’s offsite location (I remind you that it is less than 2m from the development site) means that “these constraints are likely to be limited.” However, there is no substantiation whatsoever as to how this conclusion is reached. The AIA goes on to report that during site investigations limited to excavation of 3 trial pits - only one of which is within the Root Protection Area (RPA) - a “significant” root has been found (4.1.4, page 9). The partisan nature of the report interprets this as “only one significant root” being found. We see this differently. In fact, out of only one pit excavated within the RPA, a significant root was found. It is reasonable and probable to assume there are others that will be affected by the proposed works. The report further seeks to apply a reduced RPA to strengthen its case, but provides no valid reason as to why a reduced RPA should be considered. Page 7 of the BIA clearly states within Question 6 that “there is also a semi-mature tree (of unknown species) within the rear of 15 Acol Road to the north that is very close to the site; which may be affected by the proposals”. I consider it to be highly improbable that an excavation of this scale and nature can be undertaken at this proximity to the tree without causing damage to the tree - a criminal offence and contrary in every way to the principles of protection afforded to trees within a conservation area.

Prior to the commencement of any works, large or small, affecting the RPA, I will expect tree protection conditions to be attached to the permission, confirming tree protection methods and a commitment that the development will be monitored by a qualified arboriculturalist.

4. The proposal will result in substantial and significant overlooking and loss of privacy for adjacent and surrounding properties:

The proposed roof terrace will overlook surrounding gardens, in particular, the gardens of 13 and 15 Acol Road. It will further give line of sight into flats on all 4 levels of 15 Acol Road and surrounding properties on both Acol Road and Wavel Mews. This results in an unacceptable loss of privacy for residents of Acol Road and Wavel Mews. It should also be noted that the layout of flats within 15 Acol Road means that this will result in loss of privacy from key living quarters including living rooms, kitchens and bedrooms.

Furthermore, The unnecessarily large size of the terrace would be able to facilitate a number of people, increasing the incidence of overlooking and potentially causing noise disturbance for neighbouring properties.

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

5. Overbearing nature of the proposed development:

The plans submitted clearly indicate a proposed development which is dominant and overbearing, seeking to squeeze every inch out of the site by building up, down, backwards and forwards:

- Up: two stories across whole footprint, including over the current one storey garage, PLUS a roof terrace and a glass structure housing the access to the terrace. This is being justified by being tenuously benchmarked against another mews house which is a) the very tallest structure in the mews; b) has, as I understand it, been itself been objected against for being out of character for the area; and c) is much older with a very different style. The vast majority of the properties do not have similar roof terraces and do not have structures on top. It would be another step towards an unwanted shift in character of the area to permit the proposed roof terrace at 10b.

- Down: Two basement levels, posing risks to the water piping, foundations of other nearby buildings and surrounding trees. It should also be noted that The council's basement policy guidance suggests that any basement should not extend beyond the footprint of the original building and be no deeper than one full storey. See below, point 7.

- Backwards: Building back from the garage that is currently only one room deep, resulting in loss of protected trees, more unsightly building at the expense of green space and greater loss of light to surrounding properties.

- Forwards: Cantilevered projection out over the pavement at the front. The argument that this will bring the projection of the building in line with the older mews houses around the corner is spurious and sets a dangerous precedent. The pavement area outside the older house, no. 10, on the corner is considerably narrower than the current pavement outside 10a and 10b and already represents a risk to pedestrians and, critically, children on foot. To overhang the wider pavement outside 10b, meaning people are unlikely to use the full width of it, pushing them closer to the road, with the argument it will line up with a narrower part of the mews, will only compound a problem that already exists. This projection will also have a further impact on light distribution. Having a cantilevered projection is described in the application as a feature and one that is in keeping with a mews house. We strongly refute this view. There is nothing to suggest it is a mews feature. It is also not in keeping in any way with this mews, evidenced by the fact that no one else has one.

By definition, a mews property should be subservient in scale. Pushing the development out to the boundary, with no "Green Buffer" and extending as far as is possible in all directions does not conform with this definition in any way.

6. Layout, density, design, appearance, material and character of building:

See above regarding the overbearing nature of the proposal. In addition, features like the glass enclosure to staircase roof terrace access, which will be clearly visible above the proposed screening on the terrace are out of character and keeping with the mews and the area in general. While glass is a preferable material from a light perspective, I strongly question the approval of any such structure. The

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

**Comment:**    **Response:**

bronze finishes to window frames and garage doors further indicate a design and aesthetic out of keeping with the mews. With regard to the privacy screen on the proposed roof terrace, it is not totally clear what material is being proposed or the agreed height. Given the level of detail the applicant has provided across the proposal, it is likely that the vague details here are carefully presented in this way to give scope for pushing this already unreasonable part of the development plan further.

Overall, the plan ignores the fact that 10b is essentially part of the same structure as 10a. By bringing 10b in line with a different mews house some distance away in terms of height and a different one in terms of projection, it will completely dominate 10a. This is not acceptable. The two houses forming two parts of the same building need to be handled in sympathy and respect for each other. The plans go so far as to exploit the fact that 10a and 10b are part of the same building by describing 10b as “adjoining” an older mews house, number 10, on the corner, and therefore justifying the cantilever overhang as it will align with the depth of 10. The result will be that 10a, in the middle, will be overshadowed on both sides.

7. Detrimental effect of the excavation on other buildings:

The council’s basement policy guidance suggests that any basement should not extend beyond the footprint of the original building and be no deeper than one full storey. The scale of the proposed basement exceeds both of these recommendations and is clearly excessive.

The excavation required for the proposed basement poses a risk to the foundations of neighbouring properties. The wall of 15 Acol Road is particularly vulnerable, and is identified as such within the Basement Impact Assessment Report. This risk also extends to the overall structures of 13 and 15 Acol Road, plus 10A Wavel Mews. The “highly plastic soils, prone to movement: subsidence and heave” (BIA) and relatively shallow foundations of these properties must be taken into account. The area is known for flood risk and this affects 10a and 10b quite substantially. The digging is going to have an impact on this and substantially weaken other properties around it too. An excavation of this scale is unprecedented and approval may give rise to pressure on the council to approve similar schemes in the future, leading to an undesirable change in character of the area and all the risks of collapse and foundational instability seen in areas where the overdevelopment of subterranean space has been permitted. I would be alarmed if Camden were keen to head that way, especially within a Conservation Area.

I have already pointed out that the sub-basement plant falls outside the Council’s own guidance for acceptable development proposals. In addition, it is not clear whether the room is linked to any external plant. If yes, this would require planning permission and the application should be accompanied by an acoustic report, manufacturer’s specifications and plans, sections and elevations to illustrate. Please provide these.

A staff room is shown at basement level which does not appear to have adequate lighting. Staff rooms should be subject to the same standard as other housing in terms of space and daylight.

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

Much has been made of the 2010 application granted for 10a to build a basement. We have spoken to the owners of 10a and they have confirmed that they did not proceed for a number of reasons including clear advice that it would be unwise to risk the structural problems that surrounding properties might encounter as a result of the digging and also the many valid objections from neighbours. They communicated this to the applicant when he purchased 10b and he clearly stated that he had no intention whatsoever of applying for a basement excavation.

8. Public visual amenity:

Wavel Mews is an historic and loved part of the South Hampstead Conservation Area, providing public visual amenity to many. This proposed development will have a negative impact on this through its overbearing architecture, out-of-character aesthetic and destruction of trees T1, T2 and T6 identified in the AIA, pages 12 and 13, from within the site. It also poses a significant risk to other elements providing visual amenity, including tree T5 (as noted in point 3 above) and the original cobble stones in the mews.

9. Noise and disturbance from the scheme:

Pre-development: The property is currently being rented by the applicant as an AirBnB. With frequent parties, this has brought a level of disruption and noise to what was a quiet mews.

During development: Time for the development is probably understated and is already very concerning: 9 months for 10 hours per day during week, 5 hours on Saturday starting at 8am. The extensive construction plan in such an enclosed space will be noisy, detrimental to air quality and disruptive to street access, traffic flow and parking for at least this length of time. Wavel Mews is part of a truly eclectic area with residents of all ages and many young families, all of whom will suffer as a result.

Post-development: There will still be excessive noise resulting from the scheme, with the pumps from the 2nd basement level active 24/7, disturbing the peace of the neighbourhood and young children living in adjacent quarters plus the abnormally large roof terrace potentially giving rise to people, noise and clutter on top of the building. The applicant's current willingness to use the property as a noisy AirBnB currently, together with this unreasonable overdevelopment plan suggests that a regard for noise will not be high on his agenda in the future either.

10. Loss of ecological habitats:

Removal of trees: will contribute to an already high level of pollution in the area. It will also affect the habitat for birds and bees, which can be observed in the area.

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

11. Adequate parking and services:

The scheme will result in the loss of one garage. Whilst I note that on street permits will not be granted, the plan does not show adequate cycle storage nor sufficient waste and recycling storage for a residential development of this scale.

During the development, the Traffic Management Assessment suggests that lorries and deliveries will use the curb (which belongs to 10a as well as 10b and, on the opposite side of the mews belongs to the owners of the adjacent houses). Even if they do try to use the curb, anything larger than a van will block the mews. The parking and deliveries assessment seems to be based on the assumption that the mews will always be empty and just waiting for large vehicles to come down it. This is not the case in the slightest. Whilst rather lovely, it is a functioning residential mews with cars parked on it plus pedestrians. Rubbish trucks don't come down the mews because of the shape, size and access. Big lorries will have the same problems. The traffic management assessment plan is highly questionable in this regard.

12. Detrimental effect on Conservation Area, National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) policies and guidelines and Camden Council Conservation Area policies. It is my view that the many departures from NPPF policies and guidelines and from Camden's policy statements, some of which, on their own, may be lesser departures, do in their totality constitute a major and hugely harmful attack on policy values, which will also set a dangerous precedent for the future. This includes breaches to heritage values, design considerations and constraints, policies to protect amenities, policies in relation to trees and bio-diversity and policies for the provision of cycle parking and refuse:

It is the council's job to protect the sanctity of the neighbourhood and the residents in this cherished Conservation Area. The proposals will clearly have a detrimental effect on the environment during and after construction.

10a and 10b Wavel mews – a semi-detached development of two mews houses, is expressly categorized along with all the other houses in Wavel mews, as providing a positive contribution to the South Hampstead Conservation Area (SHCA).

The proposal is to demolish 10b Wavel Mews, which is one half plus of the original development (10a and 10b) and replace it in a semi-detached format with 10a with an ultra modern piece of contemporary architecture, wholly out of keeping with and out of character with the local mews house typology. I fail to see how this can represent an enhancement of the Conservation Area.

In addition, the proposal will breach pretty much all the policies for protection of the SHCA and cause substantial harm to the integrity of the mews and to adjoining nearby buildings and land, all within the SHCA, by reason of:

- Mass and scale: The applicant / his architects say they wish to make the best possible use of the land.

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

**Comment:**    **Response:**

The proposed 5 double bedroomed / 4 bathrooms / two additional toilets house with numerous other rooms and facilities, intended, we understand, to be used for holiday lets (e.g AirBnB) is totally inappropriate to the size of site available.

- Form and Grouping: The “attractive, simple elevations” and, as described in the SHCA and Management Strategy, and in particular the proposed front elevation, will be an eyesore in the context of the front elevations of 10a, 10 and 11 & 12 Wavel Mews.

- Nature: 10b and 10a Wavel Mews are constructed on an infill site carved out of the gardens of 15 and 13 Acol Road. 10b is therefore in very close proximity of these Acol Road properties. The proposal to increase the building height and size immediately on the boundary will severely harm the amenities that the Acol Road properties, also within the SHCA, enjoy, and will cause a loss to them of their relatively open aspect. Details are contained throughout this letter of objection.

The authors of the Design & Access Statement (DAS) have, without any justification, decided that Camden’s Conservation Area and Management Strategy document does not apply to Wavel Mews. They have therefore, to further their client’s case, written THEIR OWN description of Wavel Mews as part of the conservation area. I take issue with many elements of their description, including:

- That 11 and 12 Wavel Mews are three story buildings which enable the proposed new 10b development to match the height of 11 and 12. The latter are two story buildings with a pitched roof. All houses in Wavel Mews are effectively two stories.

- Much is written about the relationship between the buildings on Wavel Mews and the Street. But little about the relationship between the new development and adjoining land, particularly at 15, 13 and 11 Acol Road. This is despite saying that issues regarding overlooking, loss of light and loss of sunlight have been addressed.

- There are different forms of architecture within the mews, a key example being 14 Wavel Mews. However, this building is detached, white painted, being opposite 1 - 10 Wavel Mews, and sympathetic to the design of 1 – 10 Wavel Mews. The proposed new development of 10b offers no such sympathy to 10a Wavel Mews (to which it will be attached) or to 13, 15 or 11 Acol Road or to 10, 11 and 12 Wavel Mews, all its nearest neighbours.

- The concept of the proposed new building that “bookends” the side of Wavel Mews between 10 and 10b fails to consider the harmful effect on 15 and 13 Acol Road and in particular on their amenity space, of the higher and deeper development of 10b right up to the boundary. This increased volume in terms of scale, mass and height, will also cause harm to 10a Wavel Mews, sandwiching it between 10b and 10 Wavel Mews.

- The proposed basements, right up to the boundaries with adjoining land and buildings is likely to cause substantial harm and damage to adjoining structures, including 15 and 13 Acol Road’s boundary walls.

- The limited amenity space within 10b Wavel Mews and the huge increase in the scale, mass and height of the proposed new building again fails actually to consider or to seek to ameliorate the damaging effect on 13, 15 and 11 Acol Road’s gardens.

- The building forms within Wavel Mews (“uncomplicated, robust and with underlying simplicity and honesty”) are to be sacrificed because of the desire embodied in the proposal for 10b Wavel Mews to increase substantially and excessively the building volume on its site, including a full size basement and sub-basement. There is no evidence of the claimed / fabled “restraint and sensitivity” referred to in the

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

DAS.

The scale, mass and height of the proposed new buildings is said in the DAS to be linked to the scale and height (nb. Not the mass) of the buildings in Wavel Mews, but without regard to their damaging effect on 13 and 15 Acol Road and their gardens immediately to the north of 10b.

The descriptions of the façade of the proposed new building, including the cantilevered upper floor, bronze doors and fenestration are illustrated in the DAS together with 10a and 10 Wavel Mews, but in a way that totally misrepresents the actual front elevations of 10a and 10.

The applicant seeks to maintain in the DAS that the current architectural appearance of 10a and 10b Wavel mews is “detrimental to the Conservation Area”. This is their justification for the demolition of part of a terrace of houses and the construction of a “new, modern mews building”. This contradicts the Conservation Area Document statement that 10a AND 10b TOGETHER provide a positive contribution to the Conservation Area. In my view the proposal will destroy and/or severely harm the existing symmetry provided by the two houses, will overwhelm 10a Wavel Mews and overall will not improve the Conservation Area.

The proposed cantilevered first floor of the new building is dressed up as “creating low level... subtle... intimate spaces” to the entrance of the (new) house, whatever that means. In truth, it is just another way of increasing the mass of the proposed new building. The applicant suggests that the proposed “side addition to the north” is subservient and subordinate the main mass of the new building. Again, the intention is to increase the overall mass / bulk of the new building, in this case much to the detriment of 15 and 13 Acol Road and their amenity space.

In my view, the proposed new building bears no relationship to, and is wholly out of keeping with, all the other buildings in Wavel Mews, and with the architecture of nearby parts of Acol Road, all part of the CA.

In relation to the streetscape, the applicant claims that the proposed new building would sit comfortably within the context of the existing mews buildings. I consider the opposite to be the case and think it will not complement the architecture of the surrounding main roads. The illustration on pages 22 and 23 of the DAS are idealized and bear no relationship to reality.

As regards materials, I consider that the degree of contemporary design is wholly out of keeping with the mews typology and the CA generally.

-----  
I would finally like to note that it appears the applicant clearly knows the proposal is over the top, evidenced by the sheer quantity (and, presumably, cost) of studies and reports commissioned, and the questionable conclusions drawn to support the application. Everything has been written to divert attention from reality and force through an unreasonable development plan, e.g. Plan 130 Proposed Front Elevation, showing a double lined heavy looking roof terrace on 10 Wavel Mews, yet a single

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

**Comment:**    **Response:**

lined, lighter looking proposed roof terrace on 10b; and Design and Access Statement pages 22 and 23, 5.6 Street Scape –where elevations of the mews show mums with children walking down the centre of the mews, with no parked cars.

This, together with the poor communication of the planning application in and around the local area, suggests rather underhand tactics in trying to mix a railroading approach to objections while also seeking to quietly push through approval under the radar.

Please note that neither the applicant nor his advisors have discussed the proposals with owners / occupiers of neighboring properties, despite having been advised to by the council.

I believe that I, and many other concerned neighbours, have presented strong planning grounds for this objection and respectfully request that the council fulfils its obligation and declines this development proposal in its current form.

I consider that this highly contentious application should be considered and determined by a planning committee and not by officers through delegated powers.

As noted in uploading my objection, I would like to attend the committee hearing. Please notify me of the date.

---

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2016/5492/P	N. Sajjadi	12 Wavel Mews	02/12/2016 01:58:22	OBJ	<p>Date: 1 December 2016</p> <p>Objection by N. Sajjadi, 12 Wavel Mews</p> <p>RE: Objection to the planning application for a 2 surface storey and 2 basement storey building in place of 10B Wavel Mews, NW6 3AB, ref 2016/5492/P</p> <p>I am writing to express my objection to the planned changes as presented by application reference 2016/5492/P. I base my objections on the following grounds:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Overlooking and Loss of Privacy to no. 12 Wavel Mews, but also adjacent dwellings</li> <li>2. Loss of character to the Mews and wider (conservation) area</li> <li>3. Loss of value to 12 Wavel Mews</li> <li>4. Precedence – other occupants undertaking similar projects, destabilising the old Mews structures further</li> <li>5. Impact from noise and disturbance to residents from excessive building work required</li> <li>6. Impact from traffic nuisance</li> <li>7. Impact on wildlife from excessive building work and changes to existing nature</li> <li>8. Miscellaneous observations and comments: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o Misleading presentation within the application</li> <li>? Drawing</li> <li>? Unrealistic traffic management predictions</li> <li>? Unrealistic timing of the project</li> <li>o character of applicant and impact on future prospect of ‘community spirit’ within the Mews</li> </ul> </li> <li>9. Effect on Conservation Area, national Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) policies, and guidelines and Camden Council Conservation Area policies</li> </ol> <p>Detailed comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Overlooking and Loss of Privacy to no. 12 Wavel Mews (and other adjacent dwellings)</li> </ol> <p>The proposed height of the roof structure will lead to an immediate assault on our privacy; our bedrooms are diagonally facing number 10B, no matter what material is placed on top, as it would never be as high as an average person. The proposed roof height and terrace are unreasonable and I would legally challenge the impact on our right to privacy.</p> <p>A roof terrace would also be completely out of character with the surrounding houses. Furthermore, as owners of 12 Wavel Mews, we have made our own applications in the past to have a dormer placed in our attic. These pl</p>