

Steven Beddow
Flat 1, 15 Acol Road
London
NW6 3AA

25/03/2017

Development Management
Camden Town Hall
Judd Street
WC1H 9JE

**To the attention of: Planning Solutions Team.
Application Number 2016/5492/P. 10B Wavel Mews London NW6 3AB**

Dear Sir / Madam,

Further to the uploading of updated plans for this planning application, I would like to reiterate my objection to the proposed amended development. Please read the below objections in parallel with my original objection letter of 25/10/2016. I have updated the comments with respect to the original objections as well as added two new important objections on the proposed revisions, objection numbers 14 and 15, at the end of the document, which deal with my concerns regarding the side elevation and the lack of clarity in the amended plans.

Objection ONE: The proposed extension of 10B would extend the property's dimensions in every direction, substantially increasing the physical impact of 10B over 13 and 15 Acol Road. 13 and 15 Acol Road would be unacceptably enclosed by a much larger, unacceptably dominant and overbearing structure. Flat 1, 15 Acol Road would lose its existing open outlook and after development would become enclosed behind the proposed structure.

Update March 2017: The elimination of the roof terrace is a necessary and welcome amendment, but we require assurances from the council / developer that this will be ruled out for good, and not subject to a future application.

Other than that the objection stands, as the amendments do nothing to reduce the physical impact of the building, its extension right up to the property line, and the overall overbearing / hemming in impact it will have particularly on the residents of 13 and 15 Acol Road. Note on the the Ground and First Floor plan the blue line showing the outline of the existing building and demonstrating the significant

proportional increase of the building size – the proposal remains a very large development that would overbear by extending in every direction and dimension.

Objection TWO: The proposed structure would create harm to a conservation area.

Update March 2017: The objection stands. The amended proposal is even worse given the proposed use of angled bronze cladding which looks like something off of a spaceship and even less fitting to conservation area. It would be outrageous for the council to approve such a design in the heart of a conservation area.

Objection THREE: The details of the BRE daylight and sunlight indicate that the proposed development would have a significantly detrimental impact on the daylight and sunlight reaching the 15 Acol Road flats and windows. The daylight and sunlight reaching my flat is both a significant source of enjoyment and a significant source of heat to my living room in the winter. The significant detrimental impacts on the daylight and sunlight on 15 Acol Road are not appropriately mentioned in the conclusion of the report.

Update March 2017: The objection stands. The report continues to be biased, makes a case based upon a non mandatory and flawed framework and continues to test acceptability in a way that is heavily and unfairly stacked towards the developer (particularly the sunlight availability to windows tests by designing a test that can only fail for the developer if three independent tests fail with no consideration for the extent to which each test fails – see my original objection letter for more details).

The impact on the living rooms of the basement flats of 13 Acol Road (window 9) and 15 Acol Road (window 4) remain significant:

-Vertical Sky Component: Proportional reduction of 11% for window 4, and 9% for window 9.

-Sunlight to Windows: After proposed development window 4 would only receive two thirds of it prior winter sunlight hours, and window 9 would only receive three quarters!

These significant reductions of sunlight to neighbours' living room windows are clearly unacceptable and a development could not be approved with such harm to neighbours.

Objection FOUR: The development would significantly overshadow the main back garden of 15 Acol Road and greatly reduce the portion of the garden receiving sunlight. The major increase in overshadowing is glossed over in the report by illogical and biased arguments. The loss of the beautifully kept, sunny garden that is the pride and joy of the residents at 15 Acol Road would have an

unacceptably detrimental impact on the residents.

Update March 2017: Again the report and proposed benchmarks are flawed and biased to the detriment of the surrounding properties. See my original objection letter for more details. The report states that 50% of a garden should receive 2 hours of sunlight on the 21st March, and yet it is acknowledged that the development would reduce the space in sunlight from 49% (so practically 50%, within margin of error of the required standard) to 39%, far below the required standard. This means that this development does not meet the standards it sets for itself as it would result in the 15 Acol Road garden being far below the very threshold the report states is the minimum standard! Relatively speaking the development would reduce the size of the 15 Acol Road garden receiving sunlight by 20%! Clearly such a harmful outcome on this natural space and on the neighbours at 15 Acol Road would be unacceptable and precludes the council from approving this development.

Objection FIVE: There is a large mature lime tree in the back garden of 15 Acol Road (named T5 in plans) which adds to the aesthetic value of 15 Acol Road and to the entrance to Wavel Mews, of benefit to the whole community. The tree is very close to the proposed development. The development and excavation of a basement put that conservation area tree and its root system at risk. This is unacceptable to the residents of 15 Acol Road and the surrounding area. Further the proposed infill above the existing storey garage would result in the tree needing to be cut back substantially and loss of tree crown and room for growth, hemming in the tree horribly against the extended structure.

Update March 2017: Objection stands unchanged – see original objection letter for further details.

Objection SIX: Unacceptable Risk to the stability of surrounding properties from a basement excavation in soils that are highly shrinkable clay and known to be prone to movement: subsidence and heave. A small amount of subsidence / heave could have a significant impact on the integrity of the surrounding period properties. The submitted BIA only provides predictions about likely impacts based mostly upon a series of assumptions and models and gives little assurance. It would be outrageous for the Council to put at risk the various surrounding period homes when the actual impact of the basement excavation is unknown and highly unpredictable.

Update March 2017: Objection stands unchanged – see original objection letter for further details.

Objection SEVEN: The proposal would reduce the garden area at 10B and have an unacceptable impact on trees, the environment and bird and animal wildlife. It would have an unacceptable impact on the overall large, level garden area located between Acol Road and Wavel Mews, that is a distinctive feature of the conservation area.

Update March 2017: Objection stands unchanged – see original objection letter for further details.

Objection EIGHT: The proposed roof terrace would overlook the flats (including directly into living rooms) on Acol Road. This is a major invasion of privacy and the privacy screening is likely to be ineffective. We could also be disturbed by noise at close proximity, particularly given the proposed size of the terrace.

Update March 2017: The elimination of the roof terrace is a necessary and welcome amendment, but we require assurances from the council / developer that this will be ruled out for good, and not subject to a future application.

Objection NINE: The proposed design is out of keeping with the surrounding properties, and the scale of the property would be inappropriate for a Mews property.

Update March 2017: Objection stands – see original objection letter for further details. The amended proposal is even worse given the proposed use of angled bronze cladding which looks like something off of a spaceship and even less fitting to conservation area. It would be outrageous for the council to approve such a design in the heart of a conservation area. The proposal does not seek to replace an existing structure with a similar one. Instead it proposes a massive overdevelopment (especially relative to the existing building) in a small plot.

Objection TEN: Loss of views from my flat in Acol Road. As a raised ground floor flat Flat 1, 15 Acol Road currently benefits from superb views. The proposed development would restrict these in multiple directions. Further there would be a loss of views from Wavel Mews for all the community of period properties and the garden area between Acol Road and Wavel Mews.

Update March 2017: Objection stands unchanged – see original objection letter for further details.

Objection ELEVEN: The construction of the proposed development would create significant disruption for the numerous surrounding residents in close proximity and the passing of large construction vehicles along Wavel Mews would be dangerous and risks damaging the distinct cobblestone road.

Update March 2017: Objection stands unchanged – see original objection letter for further details.

Objection TWELVE: The proposed project is broadly resisted by the surrounding neighbours and would be disruptive and stressful for the local community. The residents of 15 Acol Road are outraged that the application has reached this stage without consultation of us. This shows a lack of respect for the social fabric of the neighbourhood.

Update March 2017: Objection stands unchanged – see original objection letter for further details.

Objection THIRTEEN:

Before local residents were consulted and even informed of the proposal (by either the applicant or the Council), Camden Council has:

- (i) entered into a number of exchanges and multiple meetings with the applicant over a window of *at least* three months;**
- (ii) visited the site with the applicant (but not with the impacted residents of 15 Acol Road);**
- (iii) commented on the impact of the building of the surrounding residents such as the residents of 13 and 15 Acol Road;**
- (iv) confirmed, according to the applicant's submission, that they support the proposals**

The residents of 15 Acol Road (and others) have now been given just one month to digest hundreds of pages of professional reports and comment, because the applicant did not consult them prior to application.

Camden Council's role should be to fairly balance the interests of all parties involved. The extended opportunity that the applicant has had to influence the Council's views and thinking, before local residents were even informed of the project, is unfair and unbalanced. It is now incumbent on the council to demonstrate a thorough, fair and robust review of all the reasons for objection and to fully engage with local residents in the same way it has engaged with the applicant. Given the various reasons for objection I have laid out above, this can only logically lead to the rejection of the proposal.

Update March 2017: Objection stands unchanged – see original objection letter for further details.

NEW Objection FOURTEEN: The amended plans are unclear and provide insufficient certainty about the actual impact of the proposal. They are unfit for an application to be approved on the basis of these plans.

- The side elevation shows what is referred to as 'Bronze cladding chamfered to the front creating a setback with bronze fins in front of glazing'. This is thoroughly unclear what this is and what it would look like. The reference to glazing raises concerns that there may be windows or overlooking from the side elevation (today there are no windows on the side elevation above ground floor level, and any window would look directly into my first floor flat at 15 Acol Road and be entirely unacceptable). Further it is impossible from the plans to gauge what this feature would actually look like and my flat would look out directly onto this feature. I am opposed to the cladding and require assurances that there would be no new windows whatsoever, no exaggerated

sunlight reflection from the side elevation into my property and require details of what the side elevation would look like aesthetically.

- On the amended front elevation plan, the plans and the reference to a 'corner sculpted and chamfered back' are entirely clear. Reference to the proposed first floor plan does not provide sufficient clarity, and as such it is impossible to make a judgement on how this upper left hand corner of the front profile of the building round to the side elevation would actually look. The lack of clarity, detail and assurances are another reason for the council to reject these plans.

NEW Objection FIFTEEN: Ugly Side Elevation: Linked to the point above about lack of clarity in the plans: the bronze cladding on the side elevation plan looks unsightly, and completely out of keeping with the surrounding buildings, including the properties on Acol Road which are period properties.

SECTION 16. CONCLUSION: The proposed development has a significantly harmful impact on residents, daylight, sunlight, trees wildlife and gardens, the character of the surrounding area and the conservation area. It presents unacceptable and unknown risks to the surrounding structures. Its construction would be highly disruptive to local residents and the routing of construction trucks into the narrow Wavel Mews and Acol Road is not feasible and risks damaging the cobblestone street and putting human life at danger. The proposal is strongly resisted by the local community. The applicant has failed to engage with the community prior to application as advised by the Council in its recent letter to the applicant. Further the conclusions of some of the attached reports, most notably the Daylight and Sunlight report are clearly biased and misleading. For all these reasons, the only logical and fair response from a balanced assessment of the application is for it to be refused.

Update March 2017: The elimination of the roof terrace is welcome but the amended plans go no way to addressing the remaining 12 serious objections. The amendments to the proposal are very limited and do very little to change the substance of the application nor change how it should be dealt with. Further the amended plans are unclear and the vague proposed plans for cladding / the side elevation are particularly unsavoury and out of keeping. A qualified and objective assessment of the proposal can only result in it being rejected. As can be noted from the number and quality of the objection letters posted there is significant and deep resistance to these inappropriate plans by the neighbours and local community. At the time of writing the owner / developer has not contacted me directly to review / discuss plans and seek our feedback.

I would like to request to be invited to any meetings on the proposal. Please send your invites to my email address [REDACTED]

Sincerely, Steven Beddow.