

Date: 5 December 2016

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

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:

1. Overlooking and Loss of Privacy to no. 12 Wavel Mews, but also adjacent dwellings
2. Loss of character to the Mews and wider (conservation) area
3. Loss of value to 12 Wavel Mews
4. Precedence
5. Impact from noise and disturbance to residents from excessive building work required
6. Impact from traffic nuisance
7. Impact on wildlife from excessive building work and changes to existing nature
8. Miscellaneous observations and comments:
 - o Misleading presentation within the application
 - Drawing
 - Unrealistic traffic management predictions
 - Unrealistic timing of the project
 - o character of applicant and impact on future prospect of 'community spirit' within the Mews
9. Effect on Conservation Area, national Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) policies, and guidelines and Camden Council Conservation Area policies

Detailed comments

1.

Overlooking and Loss of Privacy to no. 12 Wavel Mews (and other adjacent dwellings)

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.

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 plans were rejected due to privacy concerns from our neighbours and we would consider it completely

inconsistent and unjust for other neighbours being allowed to look into our bedrooms! **In conclusion, I vehemently object to this proposal on the grounds of our continued right to privacy.**

2.

Loss of character to the Mews and wider (conservation) area

I believe the new design is damaging to the character of the house itself (no 10B) as well as overall image within this short end of the Mews. No account has been taken of the careful design and smaller measurements of the original buildings (its front elevation and traditional flat roof) - nor the pattern of neighbouring buildings as a whole.

Destroying one half of two houses under one roof seems to me utter folly and an offence to thoughtful, mature design principles. The proposed changes to number 10B will no longer be 'homogenous' in scale nor character with the surrounding dwellings. Why indeed, are we talking of number 10 **A & B**? They share the same house number! **Will Camden Council guarantee a homogenous outcome both in scale and character?**

In addition, it presents double standards, if this project were to go ahead as it stands, since both numbers 10A and 12 Wavel Mews have in the past made planning applications (on different grounds) and have both had their plans rejected on the grounds that these **joined houses could not be changed without the other house under its roof undertaking the same developments!** (Full details of these past applications and outcomes can be provided though should be on record with Camden Council). **Will Camden council be consistent in the application of their policies and standards?**

The current community spirit in Wavel Mews is that of a helpful, trustworthy one. We look out for each other. I would like Camden to bear in mind any future dealings that they may have with Wavel Mews residents, from any ensuing nuisance, anti-social behaviour or other possible negative consequences as a result of the changed character and nature of number 10B Wavel Mews (e.g. waste disposal issues, heavy traffic, too many cars from too many occupants, no parking spaces left, and (god forbid), more animals that bark all night, etc., as there is nothing to say that this house is not intended to be sold off afterwards as independent apartments for a quick 'buck' by the current applicant. The Mews is small; overcrowded multiple occupancy dwellings will not do the mews any good what so ever. **Has Camden Council got a right to impose on the intended use of the restructured dwelling to avoid a multiple occupancy disaster?**

3.

Loss of value to 12 Wavel Mews

It is likely that there will be an impact on the value of number 12 Wavel mews, should an opposing dwelling look straight into our bedrooms from the top floor or roof terrace of their house, or indeed an ugly bulky multiple occupancy dwelling be facing it's front door. We have recently had our house revalued and are worried for the impact the proposed changes to number 10B will have on the character of our house, and the Mews as a whole. **How will Camden Council guarantee that the value of our house will be untainted?**

We have been informed that the risks to the structure of our house will increase our house insurance premium, to counterbalance to potential of future claims e.g. following subsidence. **Will Camden Council take responsibility for this?** Our premium has not gone up for decades.

4.

Precedence – other occupants undertaking similar projects, destabilising the old Mews structures further

This does not need further clarification. It is well known that London as a whole, and West Hampstead is no exception, is under siege from basement developers (in fact, the current applicant has a record of previous such developments, placing his 'personal' intentions of his family eventually occupying the house, in serious doubt). **What will Camden Council do to stand by its pledges to keep a conservation area as is?** It is a disaster waiting to happen. West Hampstead only has 10% of 'single family/occupancy houses' left (according to one of West Hampstead's leading Estate Agents); we do not need to ruin the Mews by extending a 'chain' of 'broken-up' houses without character or charm.

5.

Impact from noise and disruption to residents from excessive building work required

Time for the development is probably understated and is already unpleasant as it is (with the air bnb in place at no. 10B). I object to the level of noise and detrimental air quality we will have to contend with. Some members in our household are affected by significant long term health issues which I cannot fully specify for data protection reasons. **The negative impact from noise, dirt and disturbance to our peace on**

the health and wellbeing within our household is an alarming concern to us. The hours of work proposed are utterly unfair to hard working law abiding people (let alone with chronic ill health) who deserve a weekend of rest, a normal early awakening (from a clock, rather than a revving engine or pump), etc. The prospect horrifies me. Especially as our houses are so close to each other. There is no escape.

6.

Impact from traffic nuisance

Delivery vans, refuse trucks, bigger cars (e.g. 4x4) struggle to take a turn into the mews, or through the mews. How is it conceivable that heavy traffic necessary for the planned building work will possibly be able to manoeuvre through this tiny street without causing subsidence to our pavements and cobbled street; and without causing inconvenience from traffic not being able to pass through from one end to the other? This is not a mews for U-turns either. Once a van enters the mews and finds itself stuck, it will be hard for it to turn around to exit again. We know there is a risk of subsidence from increased heavy traffic running over our front pavement as this has occurred in the past, when there used to be insufficient space to park and people would park on our pavement instead. **How will Camden manage blocked streets and protect parked cars from potential damage as a result of larger vehicles and possibly skips being manoeuvred through the tiny mews?**

7.

Impact on wildlife from excessive building work and changes to existing nature

There are fewer trees in London and more cars. Nuisance from building work has an impact on nature. We have seen a decline of sparrows in our neighbourhood over the past 10 years. Of recent, however, Jaybirds have returned to the area, in particular the tree beside number 10B where the Jaybirds are often seen.

In addition, we depend on more consistent habitats for bees, especially within cities. What threat is posed to them from the building work? **Has Camden Council made a proper inspection in the area of the current wildlife in the context of the Wildlife and Countryside Act, 1981 to protect certain species of animals, such as the Jay Bird and bee habitat?**

8.

Miscellaneous observations and comments:

Misleading presentation within the application :

- drawings supplied with the application are unrealistic in that the mews is drawn without a single car in it. It gives a false impression of spaciousness that is not there in reality. Building outwards will not benefit the overall picture of the mews; it will make it only more cramped looking.
- The height of the terrace is distorted by showing a drawing from a 'profile' perspective, neglecting the presence of number 10A altogether. Number 10A will change in character considerably and my plea includes a plea on behalf of my kind neighbours of number 10A, as their situation will be affected considerably, in terms of a drop in the value of their home and overall beauty, with the traditional brickwork and smart yet modest style.
- Unrealistic timing of the project; Projects never end on time. I think the timing of this project is unrealistic.

Character of applicant and impact on future prospect of 'community spirit' within the Mews

Since speaking with my neighbours, it has emerged that Mr Enikeev, the applicant, has been economical with the truth towards his potential future neighbors... if not disrespectful of our presence, to say the least (digging into the pavement of it's neighbor without asking them for permission; falsely informing them of his plans prior to seeking an exchange of garages).

In a personal encounter with Mr Enikeev, he appeared to be kind and friendly at first, but it has emerged that he is more interested in keeping things quiet and keeping us in the dark about his true intentions. For example, he never informed us that the house was going to be an air bnb as soon as he had his hands on a key to 10B. Since that day we have nothing but experienced considerable nuisance from temporary midnight partying, rubbish in the street, noise from taxis dropping off or picking up clients, etc. Mr Enikeev never shared these plans with us. We had to find out for ourselves what was happening, from the nuisance we experienced. **I dread his presence and what he can do to the neighbourhood as he clearly shows zero respect for the community he has bought into.**

The fact that Mr Enikeev has never sought a friendly consultation or contact with his 'future' neighbours either on his planning application, raises sufficient **doubt** in me to actually believe that it is his intention to eventually move his family into number 10B (for which he requires 5 separate water meters?)

I understand, this is not an admissible complaint, however I feel strongly that Camden Council shares a certain responsibility given such advance notice of potential conflict in the neighbourhood; be it from one anti-social neighbour an overpopulated Mews. **What will the Council say/do in response to the prospect of such potential trouble or conflict?**

9.

Finally, I would like to raise your awareness of Camden's duties and obligations as linked to the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) policies & guidelines as well as Camden Council's own Conservation Area policies.

I would very much cherish an opportunity to voice my objections in person, should the opportunity become available, e.g. to attend a committee meeting on this application.

Thank you for ~~considering~~ my objections.

N. Sajjan

12 Wavel Mews