

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:**

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.

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.

Kind Regards

James Brick

---