

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2017/2794/P	Kim Catcheside	103 Camden Mews	13/06/2017 17:18:51	OBJ	<p>In addition to the comments submitted on the 11.6.17 I would like to add that although the developers claim that these substantial and material changes are intended to improve relations with the neighbours, they are likely to do the reverse. There is no-where for refuse to be put other than on the street on collection day, which will block the very narrow pavement and force pedestrians onto the road. If bags are put out overnight they will be ripped apart by foxes which will cause a considerable nuisance and environmental hazard. There is adequate space within the envelope of the property to provide properly designed refuse spaces that can be accessed by the refuse collection teams on collection day without the need to block the pavement.</p>

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2017/2794/P	Mr and Mrs Williams	90 Camden Mews London NW1 9BX	12/06/2017 17:06:42	OBJ	<p>We should like to object to the s73 amendment application for the above development. Our objections are of 2 categories:</p> <p>(i) Firstly it is our view that the changes are sufficiently material to be inadmissible for a s73 application and so should be subject to a new planning application and the associated review process; and</p> <p>(ii) Secondly the amendments sought are in contravention of the reasons that the planning officer gave for supporting the original application and so on balance the application should be rejected.</p> <p>Considering firstly the s73 process we do not believe that this can be applied for the following reasons:</p> <p>(i) Significant increase in massing of the proposed scheme – JLL highlight in their covering letter that a key determinant for an MMA is “amendments that would not substantially alter the scale/nature of the development”. In this case from a review of the plans it is clear that the amendments fail on both counts as the volume of both the basement and second floor (the controversial parts of the application) have been significantly increased (exact volume/areas cannot be calculated from the drawings supplied). Para 6.28 of the original officer’s analysis will for example need to be updated to take account of the additional area/volume now being excavated.</p> <p>(ii) Amendment to the nature of the development – whilst it is true that these are still 5x3 bed units the removal of all cut backs and external terraces materially alters the presentation of the units relative to the established streetscape in contravention of the originally stated design intent on which the planning analysis was produced by the case officer. The new façade is monolithic in nature and incongruous next to the established datum which cuts back for second floors so as to make them imperceptible from the street level.</p> <p>(iii) A corollary point to the above is that whereas the original application was matched in height to the adjacent property (a key metric in assessing the impact on the streetscape) the new proposals now significantly exceed these limits. Whilst we are still reviewing the formal impact of the changes with our rights of light surveyor it is notable that the officer’s analysis in Para 6.56 would now be invalid. I should suppose updated daylight/sunlight models would also be required by planning committee to make a proper assessment of the impact of these changes.</p> <p>(iv) Removal of terraces and cut backs – as the developer has sought to maximise the volume of the development they have removed all of the cut backs and balconies included in the original design. This has two major effects – it contradicts a substantial amount of the assessment of the design by the officer including in 6.50, 6.56, 6.23 – the latter in particular which references that, “the ground floor has large openings with smaller windows above, a consistent parapet height relates to the adjoining mews scale and a setback top floor is consistent with the majority of properties in this section of Camden mews”. I recall from our own discussions with the planning department that there was a very strongly held view (endorsed by the Camden Square Conservation Area Advisory Committee) that the established architectural vernacular of the mews is of ground plus one additional storey with any second floor development that is permitted required to be sufficiently set back from</p>

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
					<p>the edge so as to be invisible from the ground on the opposing side of the mews. Para 2 of the letter written by CAAC in response to the original application considered the original design to be somewhat overbearing when assessed against other permitted developments and I have no doubt that they would feel even more strongly if consulted on the new designs – see vii below.</p> <p>(v) Failure of the amended design to adhere to the requirements CPG 2 for 2 of the units – Para 4.26 of the policy notes that, “basements should be provided with either a door or suitably sized window allowing access to a place of safety that gives access to the external ground level, or with a protected escape route within the building leading to a final exit at ground level”. I am extremely unclear as to how plot 1 and 2 would comply with this requirement as they have no external access/roof lights anymore. I would suggest that this deviation from policy requires detailed assessment by committee.</p> <p>(vi) Relocation of bike storage – this is required to be a car free development and so Council policy requires the provision of suitable cycle parking to be included for all units as they are 3 bed. I would contend that the proposed cycle storage in the middle of the living room is a somewhat impractical solution in the real world and illustrates the developers approach of paying lip service to the policies and s106 conditions.</p> <p>(vii) Lack of consultation with residents/stakeholders – a key requirement of the development process is engagement with local residents. In this instance there has been no contact made to discuss any of the proposed amendments despite them contradicting the explicit verbal assurances made to us that the development height would not exceed that of the adjacent property (103 Camden Mews) and that it would include the cut backs at higher levels to reduce overlooking and overshadowing. For a consultation to be effective note needs to be taken of concerns raised and amendments which impact on those points proactively circulated to the relevant people, otherwise this process again becomes one of lip service rather than substantial engagement.</p> <p>In conclusion it is our strong belief that the nature of the amendments proposed are of sufficient magnitude that they negate much of the original supporting analysis that was done and should therefore require a new planning application to be submitted.</p>