

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2016/5492/P	azarian	11a acol road	05/04/2017 17:54:12	OBJ	Dear Sir/ Madam,

I object to the planning application for 10b Wavel mews 2016/5492/P.

I have considered all the new documents uploaded in February and March 2017.

I, Mariam Azarian, am owner of 11a Acol road and have objected in November 2016. My grounds are globally the same as before. I object on the grounds of:

- Privacy. Unfortunately the new plans do not change the first floor panoramic bedroom window that allows a full view of our garden, main room and bedroom. The removal of the dogwood trees results in a huge privacy loss for both us, 10b and 10a. The plans clearly show that replanting a similar screen is going to be impossible.
- Setting a precedent for allowing basements in the mews. Allowing the development of a basement in Wavel mews will set a precedent! All houses in the mews are small and it will just be a matter of time for one after the other to ask for a basement planning permission, which will destroy the quiet and peaceful mews environment.
- The noise and dirt for 9 month (in reality more a year if not more) 11 meters from our main room, not to mention our gardens which touch each other is a nightmarish prospect. The scale of this project with total demolition and a rebuilt with basement is absolutely disproportionate for the location it is in. I have 2 small girls and this oversized project might impact their health.
- Safety. The project is too big and doesn't fit in the surrounding houses. I have real concerns about the demolition and basement digging. Considering the type of soil (detailed in my previous letter) and the age of the houses around there is a risk of damage by movement and cracks.
- The traffic impact. The planning application for 1a Wavel mews has been granted (2016/6892/P) which means that there will already be a building site at one end of the mews. If you grant 10b there will be an overlap (as both projects take time) which will make the access to the mews impossible for a period of time. This is a short term issue but It might get rather annoying and disruptive for the traffic in the whole of Acol and Priory road. I did mention in my previous letter that the proposed traffic management was inadequate this has not been reconsidered.
- No space for the new bins. Camden has introduced new bins, bigger than what we had before as the collection is only every 2 weeks, the building plans to not allow space for these bins.
- the loss of sunlight for us. As mentioned in my previous letter we, 11a, are still in the BRE guidelines but we do loose sunlight in the afternoon and evening

I have a problem with the new BRE report. The first one submitted in 2016 was, from my own observations, close to reality. I mean that the loss of light and sunlight for 13, 15, 11 Acol road by the original project seemed a little underestimated but not by much. This new BRE report seems wrong. The roof terrace has been removed but the north facing wall of the project (which is the main responsible for the loss of sunlight and light) did not. However the sunlight/light seems all of a sudden to be able to flood 13 and 15 Acol roads gardens and houses. I am not an expert but, with the wall of the project being where it is, the numbers in the new BRE report cannot be right. Just removing the roof terrace and the other minor changes of the project cannot explain the enormous changes in the BRE report in favour now for the planning applicant.

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2016/5492/P	James Brick	13 Acol Road	05/04/2017 21:50:31	OBJNOT	Planning Application 2016/5492/P – 10b Wavel Mews London NW6 3AB

As an owner and resident of 13 Acol Road, which directly adjoins the subject property, I wish to object to the above application. My initial objections still stand unchanged in addition to my updated comments below.

I'm yet again concerned about the circumstances in which the new documents have been added and amendments to the planning application been made. It was my understanding that I would be notified with any developments regarding the progress of this application, including any changes. However, I received no email, postal or telephone notification, nor was there any noticed attached to lamppost outside my property as there should have been!!

My objection is based upon the following grounds:

1) Excessive massing and overbearing scale of the development:

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.

The proposed development will also lead to a loss of light to rear of 13 & 15 Acol Road, particularly at ground level.

April Update – The amendments to the application have made no noticeable difference to the scale of the development, which remains excessive and out of keeping with the area. Surprisingly and somewhat unexplained, the updated sunlight report shows a vast improvement despite there being no significant changes to the scale and massing of the development. The bronze clad first floor in fact seems extend out further than the previous plans.

2) Loss of privacy:

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 & 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.

April Update – I am pleased to see that the roof terrace has been removed from the application, yet the proposed structure of the building remains otherwise unchanged. With the placing of a roof light covering the stairwell it suggests that a roof terrace could all too easily be added at a future date. I would ask the council to make it a condition of any planning approval that no future application may be made for the provision of a roof terrace.

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

Comment: **Response:**

3) Impact of basement excavation:

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.

Most of Acol Road, including 13 & 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.

I'm also concerned about the cumulative impact of consenting to basement development in the mews, 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.

April Update – Further to my concerns as stated above, which have not been addressed by any of the amendments. The proposed basement excavation goes against Camden's basement policy recommendations by extending beyond the footprint of the existing building by almost 30%.

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

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
					<p>without even spending one night actually living in the property.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>The development will also cause harm to surrounding trees, which are covered by the conservation area.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>April Update – The amendments have in no way sought to address the concerns regarding the development’s impact on the conservation area. In fact the proposed cladding on first floor is even further from being in keeping with the surrounding properties in the conservation area than the initial plans.</p> <p>Kind Regards</p> <p>James Brick</p>

2016/5492/P	Philippa O'Keefe & Robert Hampton	The Lodge 17 Acol Road NW6 3AD NW6 3AD	05/04/2017 10:00:45 APP		<p>We continue to object strongly to this proposed planning application & wish to know why there has been no response from Camden Council to neighbours who have previously objected to the plans?</p> <p>Our objections to the revised plans remain as before. These plans are no improvement, they are still completely out of keeping with the rest of the Mews. They will most certainly impact on the water table and unstable clay soil. We have already had extensive underpinning to our property on the corner of the Mews. These plans still impinge on the privacy of the immediate neighbours.</p> <p>If granted it will set a precedence for further similar developments and that would most certainly be disastrous.</p> <p>The disruption & noise that will be caused while the building work is going on would cause major problems and possible health issues especially for those of us bordering the entrance to the Mews but really the whole of Acol Road which is already a very busy road.</p> <p>In conclusion this proposed redevelopment would be disastrous for the Mews, its environment and its inhabitants.</p>
-------------	--------------------------------------	---	-------------------------	--	--

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2016/5492/P	N. Sajjadi	12 wavel Mews	06/04/2017 00:01:00	COMMNT	<p>Date: 5 April 2017</p> <p>From: N. Sajjadi, resident no 12 Wavel Mews</p> <p>Re: Objection to the planning application for a 2 surface storey building and 1 basement storey building in place of 10B Wavel Mews, ref 2016/5492/P</p> <p>Sent via email from sien-10@hotmail.com</p> <p>Summary</p> <p>I am writing to express my continued objection to the (updated) planning application for changes to this application on the following grounds:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • It does not provide any guarantee of a homogenous built and there is insufficient change to the front exterior of the built that brings it 'back in character' with the rest of the Mews and wider area – it remains out of character • It reflects inconsistent standards when compared to previously rejected applications in the neighbourhood • Impact from nuisance of multiple occupancy as currently evidenced from AirBnB business having been run from premises since it was purchased by the current owner • Overlooking and Loss of Privacy to no. 12 Wavel Mews & neighbouring houses • Loss of value to 12 Wavel Mews due to defacing, out of character built • Impact on insurance premium from potential structural damage • Impact on wildlife from excessive building work and changes to the environment • Precedence – other occupants undertaking similar projects, destabilising the old Mews structures further • Impact from noise and disruption to residents from excessive building work required • Impact from traffic nuisance causing possible damage to cars; property in tiny Mews • Wildlife and Countryside Act, 1981 • Unrealistic timing and visual presentation of the project • National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) policies & guidelines as well as Camden Council's own Conservation Area policies • Lack of personal consultations offered putting residents at unfair disadvantage in time and person (applicant has had opportunity for personal meetings unlike other residents in the Mews) <p>Detailed objections</p> <p>There is little to show in the updated planning application that indicates consideration has been given to proposed built being fully out of character with adjacent dwellings, not in the least with no. 10A! There has been no visible change provided in the updated application that shows a sufficient change to the exterior of the built; it continues to reduce the careful design and smaller measurements of the original buildings as well as stand in stark contrast to the pattern of neighbouring buildings as a whole. The updated application continues to offer destruction of one half of two under one roof, which defies belief from a 'keeping in character' description point of view.</p> <p>I remain of the opinion that the (updated) application does not provide any guarantee of a homogenous building plan, in respect of both scale and character. Number 10 A & B are one dwelling! They share the same house number</p> <p>Furthermore, the updated application continues to present double standards in judgement, should the</p>

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

Comment: **Response:**

building project be allowed to proceed, since both numbers 10A and 12 Wavel Mews have made planning applications in the past but had their plans rejected on the grounds that the adjoined houses could not be changed without the other house under its roof undertaking the same developments! Does this imply that inconsistent standards are being applied to favour one neighbour over another? My previous objection included the risk from overcrowded occupancy at this short end of the Mews, due to the potential for multiple households being created at no. 10B. In fact, the experience of multiple occupancy has been a fixture over the past year and is in now indeed proving to be a true nuisance. Ever since no. 10B has been 'empty', it has in fact been continually occupied through an AirBnB business which intermittently causes disruption in the mews from customers' litter, early or late night taxi pick-ups and drop offs, and the house alarm going off without people knowing how to switch it off. I am not satisfied that the current owner actually cares about his neighbours' experience of the impact of the AirBnB business. Will Camden Council be in a position to include a clause in the proposal to prevent the intended use of the restructured dwelling to become a multiple occupancy one or business unit?

Although the proposed height of the roof structure has been somewhat amended, I am convinced that the updated application - still referencing a 'roof terrace' – does not preclude the potential for a roof terrace to be developed in future, by simply extending at a later stage, post initial planning permission. I would be happier to find evidence from such planning descriptions that indicates permission shall NEVER be granted for a roof terrace to be created at any (later) stage. As it stands, therefore, there remains the likelihood of it causing an immediate risk to our privacy; our bedrooms are diagonally facing number 10B and any increased opportunity for occupants at no. 10 B to directly look into our bedrooms will not be in keeping with our right to privacy.

The updated application does not explain how previous plans by other residents in this end of the mews have had applications rejected due to privacy concerns from neighbours and yet No. 10B should be allowed to have such extensions built. I consider this to be wholly inconsistent and negligent thinking, given that the extension to a terrace at a later stage remains feasible. In conclusion, I continue to vehemently object to the current proposal on the grounds of the implied potential for there to be a terrace to be built at a future stage, will affect our right to privacy.

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 or an ugly bulky modernist structure stand opposite the other original characterful houses in the mews.

I continue to worry about the impact the changes will have on the character of not only our house but also those of my neighbours, since all will lose character due to one eye sore in its environs. I would expect for Camden Council to reflect on the impact to the value of our house(s) as well as loss of privacy to our own house, when considering this application, as a result of the out of character designs applied for by no. 10B.

I understand that there is the extensive excavation is likely to impact the structural integrity of neighbouring houses and streets, due historic structural instability of surrounding properties, the soft clay in this area as well as presence of water underneath this part of London. This is likely to have an impact on our house insurance premium. I would like Camden to strongly consider such risks from occurring in considering the updated application.

This does not need further clarification. My initial objection will not have changed. What will Camden Council do to stand by its pledges to be protective of its conservation areas? There is a disaster waiting

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
					<p>to happen.</p> <p>Again, nothing in the updated application refers to the negative impact from noise, dirt and disturbance to our peace and our health and wellbeing. The prospect of this built horrifies me, especially as houses in this Mews are so closely opposite to each other. There will be no escape.</p> <p>Again, nothing in the updated application indicates that there shall be no blocked streets and our parked cars protected from potential damage as a result of larger vehicles and possibly skips being manoeuvred through the tiny Mews.</p> <p>I am not satisfied that the nuisance from building work impacting on the local natural environment has been taken into consideration. As previously stated, over the past 10 years, there has been a decline of sparrows in our neighbourhood however, of recent, 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? I would like Camden to respond to my concern that a proper inspection in the area of the current wildlife in the context of the Wildlife and Countryside Act, 1981 be undertaken, to ensure the continued protection of animals and habitat in the area.</p> <p>I am still not convinced by the level of realistic representation of the drawings supplied with the updated application. I feel these continue to give a false impression of spaciousness that is not really existent, as portrayed in the drawings of the Mews. Building outwards will not benefit the overall picture of the Mews; it should make it look more cramped in fact. Nor am I convinced that the timing of the project is a realistic one; projects never end on time.</p> <p>As previously stated, Mr. Enikeev, does not appear to be showing any concern for his neighbours wellbeing, as evidenced by his ongoing use of no 10B as an AirBnB, with resultant nuisance (see above) I continue to dread his presence or even influence over our friendly community as he has continued to show zero respect or interest towards our experience of his running an airbnb business in the Mews.</p> <p>I do understand that this may still not be an admissible complaint; I continue to feel strongly however that Camden Council should clearly express itself in a way that shows it taking responsibility for potential conflict in the neighbourhood due to anti-social neighbours and overpopulation in the Mews. Finally, I would like to reiterate my plea for Camden's to closely consider their duties and obligations within National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) policies & guidelines as well as Camden Council's own Conservation Area policies.</p> <p>There still has been no personal consultation offered by Camden to its neighbours. Given the disadvantage neighbours are at in terms of timing and means of notifications of Camden's planning applications (since it changing from paper based to electronic) I feel such a meeting should be offered given the considerable concerns that remain ill addressed, in my opinion, with the updated application. I remain keen to respond to an opportunity to voice my objections further in person, should the opportunity be made available, such as at a committee meeting with all parties involved.</p> <p>Thank you for considering my objections.</p> <p>N. Sajjadi 12 Wavel Mews sien-10@hotmail.com</p>

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

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2016/5492/P	Stephen Abram	11 Dresden Road London N19 3BE	05/04/2017 18:57:53	OBJ	<p>I submitted my objection in full as a PDF document, via email on 2nd April 2017. It does not appear to have been uploaded onto the portal, so I am summarising the key points here:</p> <p>Further to the posting of selected updated plans for Planning Application 2016/5492/P, 10B Wavel Mews, London NW6 3AB in February and March 2017, and a new deadline for comments of 6th April, I wish to reassert my strong objection to the proposed development of this site in this location as currently proposed. Please read the below in parallel with my original objection letter, dated 29th November 2016, which I include in its entirety in the appendix.</p> <p>I have examined the new plans and can confidently assert that the alterations made are almost entirely superficial and don't attempt in any way to properly and materially address the concerns and objections raised in the first round of public consultation, by myself nor the many other residents of this cherished neighbourhood and Conservation area who have felt compelled to speak up. My objection is on the same 12 grounds as in my original objection and should be read in conjunction with these and the detail in that full objection. Further comments pertinent to the new documents uploaded by the applicant are as follows:</p> <p>1. Unacceptable loss of light to adjacent properties. Sunlight to garden of 15 Acol Road will STILL be 11% BELOW BRE GUIDELINES if the development goes ahead. The windows will also receive significantly reduced sunlight.</p> <p>Please refer to the newly issued Daylight & Sunlight Study by Right of Light Consulting, dated 3rd March 2017. While there appears to be an improvement in the numbers*, they continue to clearly indicate an unacceptable loss of light to a number of the surrounding properties, the worst affected being 15 Acol Road.</p> <p>For Flat A, 15 Acol Road, Appendix 2 "Sunlight to Windows" now publishes a before:after ratio of 1:0.83 to the kitchen window and 1:0.67 to the living room window / patio doors. Both represent a material reduction that is unacceptable.</p> <p>Their data further indicates 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 31.33m² (49% of the garden) to 25.38m² (39% of the garden). This is 11% beneath the BRE guideline / recommendation of at least 2 hours of sunlight for 50% or more of the garden area.</p> <p>While the before:after ratio has increased from the original study, from 1:0.45 to 1:0.8 it is still hugely detrimental to the amenity of the garden and is noted as such by an independent daylight/sunlight expert I have consulted.</p> <p>Right of Light's argument that the garden sunlight pre-development already falls beneath the percentage guidelines (by 1%), therefore it doesn't matter if it is reduced further, is a disgrace. Their use of new, questionable data and calculations* to improve the ratio to land on the line of the ratio guideline is cynical at best, particularly as they were more than happy to support the original planning application anyway, citing "flexible" application of the guidelines to accommodate site constraints. I maintain that the site constraints are driven by the fact it is not right for a small site, so close to existing buildings (in what would have been the full garden of 15/13 Acol Road originally) to be so grossly overdeveloped. It contravenes BRE guidelines, Conservation Area best practise guidelines and the spirit of the agreement for 10a Acol Road to sell the garage to 10b, which was done on the clear understanding that development upwards would not happen.</p> <p>Accordingly, it is clear that any development that decreases the total area of the garden of 15 Acol Road receiving at least 2 hours of sunlight per day should not be permitted on the site of 10b Wavel</p>

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
					<p>Mews, period. The guidelines are there for a reason, despite the fact that the developer and his partisan team of experts are prepared to show such flagrant disregard for them.</p> <p>*I expect the council to protect the neighbourhood in this respect and also to commission their own light study on behalf of themselves and the adversely-affected community as it is not clear at all how Right of Light have got to their new figures with such small tweaks to the overall scale of the building proposal.</p> <p>2. Overshadowing. Please see and consider the above and my original objection in the appendix. All issues raised still stand and have not been addressed by the revised plans.</p> <p>3. The proposal represents a significant risk to nearby trees. Please see and consider my original objection in the appendix. All issues raised still stand and have not been addressed by the revised plans. Note also that the large lime tree in the garden of 15 Acol Road (T5) is still at risk despite the plan to limit the basement excavation to one storey. It will also be adversely affected by the proposed upward development where the garage of 10b Wavel Mews is currently located.</p> <p>4. The proposal will result in substantial and significant overlooking and loss of privacy for adjacent and surrounding properties.</p> <p>It is noted that the official roof terrace has been removed from the new plans. The plans do, however, retain certain elements including the skylight and parapet wall that provide for access to the roof and the possibility that, officially OR unofficially, the roof terrace becomes instated at some point in the future, with the very real possibility that overlooking becomes a significant and unacceptable issue. I respectfully request assurances that the council will take a dim view of, and actively seek to prevent, any roof area being used as an unofficial terrace and will put in place measures to ensure no future application for an official roof terrace will be approved.</p> <p>5. Overbearing nature of the proposed development. Please see and consider my original objection in the appendix. Almost all issues raised still stand and have not been addressed by the revised plans. While the new plans have tweaked the proposal, the neighbourhood is still faced with a proposed development which is dominant and overbearing, seeking to squeeze every inch out of the site by building up, down, backwards and forwards. In addition to the details in my original objection letter, the plans appear to show buildings overhanging the neighbouring garden boundary wall of 15 Acol Road. By definition, a mews property should be subservient in scale. Pushing the development out to the boundary (and possibly beyond!), with no "Green Buffer" and extending as far as is possible in all directions does not conform with this definition in any way.</p> <p>6. Layout, density, design, appearance, material and character of building. Please see and consider my original objection in the appendix. All issues raised still stand and have not been addressed by the revised plans. The proposal remains highly out of character with the mews and surrounding properties in scale and style, essentially ignoring how it complements the area and, in particular 10a Wavel Mews to which it is physically connected. There is limited clarity as to proposed materials, but the vague descriptions provided suggest a distinctly out of character outcome.</p> <p>7. Detrimental effect of the excavation on other buildings. Please see and consider my original</p>

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

Comment: **Response:**

objection in the appendix. Almost all issues raised still stand and have not been addressed by the revised plans. The single storey basement is noted. Significant concerns still remain regarding the projected movement and impact on neighbouring properties and walls. At the levels published in the reports accompanying this application, my understanding is that damage could go as far as undermining the stability of 10a Wavel Mews, other mews building and 13 / 15 Acol Road, if plans are progressed. What assurances and insurance provision are the council putting in place in the event of damage to nearby buildings caused by the excavation?

8. Public visual amenity. Please see and consider my original objection in the appendix. All issues raised still stand and have not been addressed by the revised plans.

9. Noise and disturbance from the scheme. Please see and consider my original objection in the appendix. All issues raised still stand and have not been addressed by the revised plans.

10. Loss of ecological habitats. Please see and consider my original objection in the appendix. All issues raised still stand and have not been addressed by the revised plans.

11. Adequate parking and services. Please see and consider my original objection in the appendix. All issues raised still stand and have not been addressed by the revised plans.

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. Please see and consider my original objection in the appendix. All issues raised still stand and have not been addressed by the revised plans.

The applicant has done very little to address the concerns raised in the first round of consultation. Where amended plans have been submitted, they pay nothing more than passing consideration to objection grounds, choosing to find ways around guidelines rather than materially considering the reasons why the plans may be unreasonable, may indeed breach guidelines and are contrary to the spirit of joining and improving a community. Personally, I support the concept of positive development of Camden, but it is very hard to see this particular application as anything more than a commercial opportunity for the developer to flip a property (or create an even bigger AirBnB than he has already) with no regard for the impact the scheme will have on the area.

I remain strong in the belief that I have presented compelling planning grounds for this objection and, once again, respectfully request that the council fulfils its obligation and declines this development proposal in its current form.

Finally, I would like to express my disappointment that there was no formal notification made to me, nor, I understand, any other objectors to the original proposal, of the uploading of new proposals to the planning portal and the new objection deadline. We were all assured we would receive ongoing

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2016/5492/P	Peter Symonds	48 Canfield Gardens London NW6 3EB	06/04/2017 09:04:20	OBJ	<p>communications and the failure of the council to provide these is a breach of their duty. I was under the impression that notifications would be automated, so I am letting you know the system did not work on this occasion and giving you the opportunity to ensure it does not happen again. In the meantime, I have received verbal confirmation from Kristina Smith, Planning Officer at Camden Council, that this highly contentious application will be determined by a planning committee and not by officers through delegated powers. I would like to attend and address the committee hearing. Please notify me of the date.</p> <p>As noted throughout, this letter should be read in conjunction with my original objection in the appendix below.</p> <p>Yours sincerely, Stephen Abram</p>
					<p>FROM THE COMBINED RESIDENTS' ASSOCIATIONS OF SOUTH HAMPSTEAD</p> <p>Further to our earlier objection regarding this application and having reviewed the updated plans for this application - which have once again been submitted with absolutely no consultation of any kind with local neighbours who are likely to be seriously affected by them - CRASH remains vehemently opposed to this planned development.</p> <p>Despite the welcome rethink and withdrawal of the roof terrace element of the plans, this proposal, as it remains, will still disproportionately enlarge the property to the very limit of its property line. This will have a overbearing impact on the neighbouring properties at 13 and 15 Acol Road where overshadowing of the garden will result in a serious loss of sunlight and daylight inside and outside the properties. In addition the demolishment of the existing property cannot but have a very serious impact on the currently attached property at 10B Wavel Mews.</p> <p>Furthermore, the revised plans still cannot but threaten the large mature lime tree in the garden of 15 Acol Road which is situated very close to the site of this application, and the roots of which must reach beneath it. The loss of this tree, which adds character to the entire mews, must be the inevitable consequence of allowing this property to be developed as planned.</p> <p>The whole proposal remains - as did the original - likely to dominate and denigrate a mews which has been acknowledged as contributing to the charm and amenity of the South Hampstead Conservation Area. CRASH, representing the interests of its many members in the immediate area who are opposed to this development, respectfully requests that this application be refused.</p> <p>Peter Symonds Chair CRASH</p>