

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2017/3355/P	Clare and Mustapha Leavenworth Bakali	25 Kings Mews London	17/07/2017 12:32:03	COMMNT	<p>Camden Council Planning-</p> <p>To whom it may concern,</p> <p>We are pleased to see that the owners of number 4 John Street/5-6 Kings Mews have applied to Camden for alterations on their current parking structure. The temporary permission for the structure expired in 2014. The original plan for this space was to build a mews house which would, from our point of view, be the best option. We understand from the owners that this is not fiscally feasible at this time.</p> <p>We would like to stress that we believe that any permission granted for the parking area should also be temporary only and for a short period, and that the ultimate outcome should be a mews house.</p> <p>We would like to make some important points regarding this application by referring to Quinn Architect's Design and Access Statement for the site dated June 9, 2017.</p> <p>1. 1 Site information 25 Kings Mews should be listed as a directly neighbouring property as we look straight onto the site from our lounge, first floor bedroom and roof terrace.</p> <p>1.2 Application Site and Surrounding Area This refers to Kings Mews as a mix of residential and commercial buildings. We find this slightly disingenuous as all the previous commercial buildings have been sold and have either been converted to housing or have permission to be converted to housing. At present 3 buildings are being converted, although number 27 will be offices and recently changed from it's original plan. Sometime in the next few years, all of Kings Mews will be residential and the site at 5-6 Kings Mews will be the only site that is not a home. This is not acceptable as it is not in keeping with the development of the mews and the conservation area. All of us on the mews have invested significant funds to build and renovate our properties and we therefore do not expect the council to make exceptions to 4 John Street/5-6 Kings Mews.</p> <p>1.3/1.4 Application History As the consent for a mews home remains live, we would like to stress that this should be the ultimate outcome and that any permission granted for parking alterations are temporary only.</p> <p>1.5 Proposal The owners need remedial works to the existing structure which they have not included in this plan. They have added to the existing structure but have not altered the existing to improve drainage from the terrace above, which pours through when it rains, nor have they added interior lighting which would seem a minimum requirement for safety and</p>

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

security of the site.

1.8 Existing Site Photos None of the photographs included are current. Some show 25 Kings Mews under construction, other show it as it was prior to 2014. The following is our completed home:

P5090219.JPG

2.1 Replacement of steel security gate The existing steel gate opens on to the public highway, which is illegal, first and foremost.

IMG_4053.jpg

2.2 New Timber Facade The new proposal includes 3 up and over doors which, again open onto the public highway, and are not a workable solution and also not legal. Instead there should be a roller or panelized roller door (also with a traditional timber board finish). The three doors could be replaced by one large opening. In addition, we feel that the entire structure should be painted in the same grey colour as it is incongruous for the rearmost wall of panelling to be a different colour from the street fronting facade as we look directly onto it from multiple rooms. The existing timber facade does not appear to be high quality and shows a marked difference as compared with the delightful formal garden behind. Another solution might be to cover the existing wood with a green wall of plants. There does not seem to be any provision for lighting on the exterior. The lighting that was added onto the back of the structure last autumn is on 24 hours a day and is extremely bright and harsh and shines into our lounge. Something more modern and subtle above the garage door and the pedestrian opening should be required.

2.3 Roof design Although we understand that polycarbonate is a wholly modern material which can be used to great effect, in this case, we feel that it is not in keeping with the existing street materials which are generally wood, brick and metal. Perhaps a slate roof with velux windows or steel mesh would better fit in. Polycarbonate is also noisy in rain.

Although we welcome this proposal to improve the site from its current dilapidated state, we feel that it does not go quite far enough. We are incredulous that such a fine example of a Georgian Grade 2 listed home with palatial, formal garden would lack all consideration for

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
					<p>the street behind which is now taking shape as a fully residential street. We accept that the street has changed since their temporary planning was put into place. This reflects a lack of care for the surrounding community because it is not something they have to look at.</p> <p>One of the most distressing things for us at number 25 Kings Mews is the fact that as many as 25 cars/vans per day use this driveway as a place to turn around posing a threat us as we leave home and to the front of our building which sits directly on the road.</p> <p>Finally, all of the owners on Kings Mews have had to meet very stringent standards on our various materials with pre-approval and samples of each material submitted and we feel that this criteria should be applied to this structure.</p> <p>This proposal meets minimum, temporary requirements for improving the site. It does bring the facade level with the buildings on either side thereby eliminating the setback. It also addresses the garage doors but this also leaves the same issue of opening onto the public highway. We feel that, per the words of the architect, this structure does indeed “improve the existing condition of the site” but alas we do not feel that it “enhances the appearance of the street”.</p> <p>We therefore welcome the proposed improvements but we cannot support it unless the above comments are incorporated into the final approval by the council.</p> <p>Kind regards, Clare and Staph Leavenworth Bakali</p>
