

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2016/5492/P	James Brick	13 Acol Road	02/01/2017 23:18:03	OBJ	<p>Planning Application 2016/5492/P – 10b Wavel Mews London NW6 3AB</p> <p>As an owner and resident of 13 Acol Road, which directly adjoins the subject property, I wish to object to the above application.</p> <p>Firstly I would to make it clear that the applicant, who claims to be sympathetic to his neighbours, has made no effort to contact myself and as far as I'm aware any of the other residents in 13 Acol Road. On top of this I would find it hard to believe that the submission of this application within a matter of days after the council changed it's notification policy is merely a coincidence.</p> <p>My objection is based upon the following grounds:</p> <p>1) Excessive massing and overbearing scale of the development:</p> <p>The proposed development seeks to extend the property in every single dimension on what is already a very tight plot. The proposed scale is also out of character with the mews.</p> <p>The proposed development will also lead to a loss of light to rear of 13 &amp; 15 Acol Road, particularly at ground level.</p> <p>2) Loss of privacy:</p> <p>The extension seeks to build up over the existing garage and create a roof terrace. I'm not aware of any other property within the local area that has been developed as close to an opposite property as 10b Wavel Mews will be to the rear of 13 &amp; 15 Acol Road. What's more the proposed roof terrace will be near enough the same height as my windows. There have been some historic applications for roof terraces elsewhere in the mews, however these are much further away from any adjacent overlooking property.</p> <p>3) Impact of basement excavation:</p> <p>I have concerns that the BIA report has been conducted merely to satisfy the needs of the planning process and has ignored or failed to pick up on issues that have been noticed by neighbouring owners, such as ground water levels and structural stability.</p> <p>Most of Acol Road, including 13 &amp; 15 was built in circa 1880 and would have been constructed with only shallow footings. Several nearby properties also show signs of structural repair such as wall ties. I'm aware that 10a Wavel Mews had previously submitted an application for a basement in 2009 - prior to current and more stringent policy taking effect. Despite the fact that planning consent was granted in this instance, the applicant sought further expert advice and came to the conclusion that the site is not suitable for the excavation of a basement.</p> <p>I'm also concerned about the cumulative impact of consenting to basement development in the mews,</p>

Application No:    Consultees Name:    Consultees Addr:    Received:

Comment:    Response:

which could become a catalyst for other owners in the mews to similarly apply for a basement extension.

CRASH's Neighbourhood Basement Survey raised the following concerns and issues related to basement excavation within the conservation area:

- Numerous reports of damage as a direct result of neighbouring excavations
- 30 respondents told of changes to their property during neighbouring construction work ranging from minor cracking to serious flooding
- 29 reports of similar further destabilisation and damage following completion of construction, as well as numerous stated problems with noise, vibration, dust and traffic chaos while those works were in progress.

4) Conservation area:

10b Wavel Mews is listed as a positive contributor to the conservation area and Wavel Mews is itself is described as having subservient properties. The proposed plans seek to demolish the existing property and it does not seem right that a positive contributor to a conversation area should be permitted to be demolished. The plans also seek to replace the existing property with an overbearing development that is out of scale and character with the rest of the mews.

I have no doubt that all of the residents in and around the mews, chose to live here because of the existing character of the area and would not seek to change its appearance so drastically. I believe it would be wrong for the council (who act on behalf of the existing residents and are supposed to act in our interest) to support someone such as the applicant who has submitted his unsympathetic plans without even spending one night actually living in the property.

For such elaborate plans within a conservation area to be permitted would be an insult to all those residents who face stringent criteria when carrying out minor alterations to their properties such as pruning trees or replacing windows etc.

The development will also cause harm to surrounding trees, which are covered by the conservation area.

It is clear to me that this development is for profit and nothing else. I would ask the council to take notice of the neighbouring residents concerns and to protect the existing character of the mews.

Kind Regards

James Brick

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2016/5492/P	Stephen Abram	11 Dresden Road London N19 3BE	03/01/2017 14:48:00	OBJ	<p>RE: Planning Application 2016/5492/P, 10B Wavel Mews, London NW6 3AB</p> <p>Following the submission by the Applicant of a revised Arboricultural Impact Assessment (AIA), I write to reassert my previous objection in its entirety, but also to add that the revised AIA provides no further data to materially challenge this.</p> <p>Focusing on the trees element, the proposal still represents a significant risk to those which are nearby. Point 3.3, page 8 of the AIA still correctly reminds us all that it is a criminal offence to prune, damage or fell trees within the South Hampstead Conservation Area (SHCA). 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, is still at risk based on the development proposal. The AIA still conveniently provides a reduced Root Protection Area (RPA) to support the application, as this brushes under the carpet the clear risk posed. The standard RPA should be applied and the report should be altered accordingly.</p> <p>Please note, this arbitrary convenience of a reduced RPA sits alongside a similarly spurious argument around the light impact of the development, where an unacceptable reduction in the total area of the garden of 15 Acol Road receiving at least 2 hours of sunlight per day plummets 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 – against a clear guideline of at least 50%. You need only read the other reports and, indeed, other objections posted on the planning portal to see that guidelines, professional recommendations and policy are being manipulated throughout the application. Individually they should be taken seriously. Together, they add up to a serious subversion of the process.</p> <p>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.</p>

---

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2016/5492/P	Steven Beddow	Flat 1 15 Acol Road London NW6 3AA	04/01/2017 22:17:17	OBJ	<p>Sir / Madam,</p> <p>Further to my earlier objection letter:</p> <p>I note that two new supporting documents have been uploaded on 16/12/2016 and 21/12/2016 leaving an unacceptable and unfairly short window for comment over the holiday period given that the deadline for comment is 05/01/2017.</p> <p>I further note that the new submissions do not address the concerns expressed in my original objection letter, and wish to reiterate all of those objections. The reduction to a one story basement does not address my concerns with respect to the numerous risks and uncertainties regarding the proposed basement construction. The revised tree report continues to ignore the fact that the proposed basement would extend into the root protection of the tree at 15 Acol Road. It also continues to fail to demonstrate impartial and adequate testing of the roots on the proposed construction site, notably by failing to test at the part of the construction site closest to the tree trunk.</p> <p>Please see my original detailed objection letter for full details of these and all my other objections.</p> <p>It remains incumbent on Camden Council to appropriately consider and respond to the numerous and serious objections letters which have been received at this stage. It must also carefully consider the various inconsistencies, bias and failed logic in the misleading submission from the applicant. These are described in full in my original objection letter.</p> <p>Thank you, Steven Beddow</p>

---