

<b>Application No:</b>	<b>Consultees Name:</b>	<b>Consultees Addr:</b>	<b>Received:</b>	<b>Comment:</b>	<b>Response:</b>
2017/5313/P	Ginette Bone	99A Camden Mews London NW1 9BU	06/11/2017 16:55:09	COMMNT	Please note that the manhole access to 99a Camden Mews is located inside 99, in the proposed studio/bedroom. I hope that the developers provide a revised plumbing/drainage design.
2017/5313/P	Ginette Bone	99A Camden Mews London NW1 9BU	06/11/2017 16:54:53	COMMNT	Please note that the manhole access to 99a Camden Mews is located inside 99, in the propopsed studio/bedroom. I hope that the developers provide a revised plumbing/drainage design.
2017/5313/P	Margaret Harvey	95 Camden Mews NW1 9BU NW1 9BU NW1 9BU	06/11/2017 17:59:25	OBJEMPE R	I wish to object on the grounds of over-development (massing) and a lack of detailed design. The wooden cladding at the front is not in keeping with the brick work of other properties and looks quite out of character for the Mews.

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2017/5313/P	Jim Sturgess	82 Camden Mews London NW1 9BX	06/11/2017 23:10:08	COMMEM PER	<p>Comments.</p> <p>I live at 82 Camden Mews, opposite to number 99 Camden Mews</p> <p>1. Increased sense of enclosure, loss of outlook and amenity: The views from my first floor living and dining room, of the sky and tree will be completely obscured by the second floor addition being continued completely across the roof which will increase the sense of enclosure to my property and the Mews.</p> <p>2. Daylight and sunlight loss. I would like to see and have verified by an independent daylight and sunlight consultant the actual calculations on which this conclusion is based to ensure there is no negative harm on our amenity. There should be a 3D computer model on which the calculations and assessment are based . Any rights of light encroachments will be investigated separately.</p> <p>3. Proposed roof terrace The overlooking of my living and dining space at first floor level from the proposed second floor roof terrace of 99 will compromise and invade my privacy.</p> <p>4. NO pre-application discussions/consultations with neighbours as stated in the application The applicant mentions '.....local neighbours have been visited individually and there were no objections' and '...following extensive pre-application discussions with the Council and neighbours' This did not occur. One generic letter dated 10 August 2017 was delivered through the letterbox which did not accurately reflect the application. There was no discussion. My objections are founded on the submitted drawings which I only saw on the planning portal. Extensive consultation is not true. I can only see one pre application meeting held with Council when the applicant was informed their proposal was inappropriate (letter from Camden dated 26 August 2017).</p> <p>5. Conservation Area The proposal has no underlying conceptual idea or recognition and acknowledgement of the character and significance of the existing building within the conservation area.</p> <p>It is a generic design of the type that has no reference to the type or character of the existing building that results in an architectural blandness.</p> <p>97 and 99 Camden Mews creates a whole, balanced elevation that is the only surviving original building in this part of the mews.</p> <p>The removal of the connecting brickwork at ground level between 97 and 99 Camden Mews and its replacement with a timber infill not only introduces an alien material to this particular</p>

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

building but divides the building into 3 distinct parts, which were formerly two, destroying the integrity and the character of the original composition and is detrimental to the character of the conservation area and is certainly not enhancing it.  
There would be harm to the conservation area and no public benefit to the conservation area.

6. The windows to the rear boundary would need to be fire resisting and unopenable to maintain fire integrity of boundary wall . The extent of the openings to the external boundary wall should be checked with Building Control as to their validity and approval.

---

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2017/5313/P	john southall	84 Camden Mews	06/11/2017 20:35:00	OBJ	We live at 84 Camden Mews, opposite to number 99 Camden Mews

1 Increase sense of enclosure, loss of outlook and amenity:

The views from our ground floor open plan kitchen/ dining area, ground floor bedroom, first floor bedroom and second floor living space of the sky and tree will be completely obscured by the second floor addition being continued completely across the roof which will increase the sense of enclosure to our property and the Mews.

2 Daylight and sunlight loss.

We would wish to see and have verified by an independent daylight and sunlight consultant the actual calculations on which this conclusion is based to ensure there is no negative harm on our amenity. There should be a 3D computer model on which the calculations and assessment are based. Any rights of light encroachments will be investigated separately.

3 Proposed roof terrace

The overlooking of our bedroom and bathroom at first floor level and our second floor living space from the proposed second floor roof terrace of 99 will compromise and invade our privacy.

4 Conservation Area

The design is a poor interpretation of an attempt to use precedents as justification for a proposal that has no underlying conceptual idea or recognition and acknowledgement of the character and significance of the existing building within the conservation area.

It is a residential generic design of the type that has no reference to the type or character of the existing building that results in an architectural blandness.

Along with 97 Camden Mews, 99 creates a whole, balanced elevation that is the only surviving original building in this part of the mews.

The removal of the connecting brickwork at ground level between 97 and 99 Camden Mews and its replacement with a timber infill not only introduces an alien material to this particular building but divides the building into 3 distinct parts, which were formerly two, destroying the integrity and the character of the original composition and is detrimental to the character of the conservation area and is certainly not enhancing it. There would be harm to the conservation area and no public benefit that will accrue from this development.

5. The windows to the rear boundary would need to be fire resisting and insulating glass, unopenable to maintain fire integrity of boundary wall. The extent of the openings should be checked with Building Control.

6 The applicant mentions '.....local neighbours have been visited individually and there were no objections' and ...following extensive pre-application discussions with the Council

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
					<p>and neighbours'</p> <p>This did not occur. One generic letter was delivered through the letterbox. There was no discussion.</p> <p>Our objections are founded on the submitted drawings which we only saw on the planning portal. Extensive consultation is a complete exaggeration.</p> <p>We can only see one pre application meeting held with Council when the applicant was informed their proposal was inappropriate.</p>
2017/5313/P	Nicola Shears	78 Camden Mews NW1 9BX	07/11/2017 00:01:50	COMMEM PER	<p>I would like to record my objection to this application.</p> <p>It is oversized for the Mews in terms of mass and dominance and will be overbearing to neighbouring houses.</p> <p>It will also undermine the existing character of the conservation area. The scheme lacks any architectural merit and will actually lead to the loss of one of the few remaining gables that gives this section of the Mews some historic reference point.</p> <p>The Mews is steadily being destroyed with developments that are employing jarring materials and designs which are delivering an increasingly homogenous skyline. We are about to suffer a direct loss of amenity with the development of no. 97 - the sky and tree being obscured and all our living spaces directly overlooked despite our objections to planning. Please do not allow a similar mistake to be made here. These plans will make us feel even more boxed in.</p> <p>The site developer must be required to adopt a rigorous CMP and transport plan. They should also be mandated to coordinate their plans with the other projects due to start on the Mews at 97 and 85 in addition to the Ashton Court development which is already underway.</p>