Slightly modified version of previous objection.

I am very disappointed to see the return of this proposed structure to the front of our property. In the supporting documents, the application states: “It should be noted that there are already a number of rear garden buildings to properties on the South side of Dartmouth Park”. This is true, but they are genuine “sheds”, as one might expect in an urban garden, of modest proportions. What is proposed is an architect-designed, professionally constructed structure of considerable size. The “gable end” will in fact be visible along the length of the Mews, as we all turn in to reach our front doors – a significant impact on the aesthetic of the Mews and a constant reminder of this unwelcome new addition to our landscape.

The application says the “shed” will “cast no shadow” but it will give the feeling of encroachment of the built environment, despite any attempts at camouflage. There is no “existing trellis with climbing plants”, apart from a few remnants. These were removed because the ivy was causing significant light reduction plus damage to the boundary wall. It notes that “the existing rear wall and trellis to No 27 Dartmouth Park is higher still”. This is a diamond trellis that allows daylight through – not the solid rear wall of a building.

The application states: “The open space of the Mews is principally designed to enable access to the houses, including emergency vehicle access.” However, as it continues, it admits that we residents have a different idea of its role. “Residents state this area is also used as a communal space for play, sitting and other communal activities. However, the area in front is not the only amenity space available to residents.” The key word we used was “communal”. Our gardens and balconies are all self-contained. Being in are own gardens and yelling over fences is hardly communal. The frontage acts as a meeting and gathering place.

Plus: “Bellgate Mews is unusual in that properties enjoy rear gardens and terraces”. The “rear gardens “ are small - much smaller than suggested - paved or decked courtyards. There are NO terraces (the flat roof is not accessible except for maintenance and then only with some difficulty), but modest and very compact balconies – which certainly do not merit the use of the word “terrace” as in the application - that overlook the new building. (According to the diagrams, the structure would be almost invisible to line of sight of the Bellgate residents.. if they had tunnel vision, that is, and never looked down). I fail to see what relevance the size of our gardens (which, as I said, are very small) has to do with an application to erect a structure on the opposite side of the house. As stated, the outside space in front of our houses is where we gather as a community, for both social events and communal maintenance of the area. The applicants are right, though, Bellgate Mews is “unusual”. For which we read “special”. We would like to keep it that way.

The family “has two young children”, but there are children in the Mews, too (with more on the way). If our children wish to play on, say, scooters or participate in ball games, this outside area is the only space available to them of appropriate size. I find it surprising, to say the least, that the owner’s representative should try and dictate where we residents should spend our leisure time.

In conclusion, I find the proposed structure to be oppressive, insensitive to the neighbours and a poor precedent for the future of our Mews.

Robert Ryan
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