
Dear Samir,

Please note this objection to application # 2019/1037/P. 7 Daleham Mews

Raising the roof peak and dormers above that permitted in 2017/3743/P is a material amendment to 2017/3743/P and must be rejected.

Camden decision 2017/3743/P was an **outrageous** planning decision. It completely reneged on Camden's long history and policy of protecting the mews, and just ignored **overlooking guidelines developed over decades**. It approved an additional floor on a small mews building, the raising of the peak, and construction of 3 large dormers facing Belsize Crescent, **causing outrageous overlooking from 12m**. It was as if the overlooking guidelines developed over decades, just didn't exist. The reality is that 7 Daleham Mews is completely unsuited for a development of this bulk.

2017/3743/P went before the full planning committee but was waved through despite sound objections particularly on overlooking from 12m. Residents pointed out that the peak height of 2m was insufficient to allow for decent living conditions, although the applicant was adamant that the height of the peak was adequate. (it now turns out otherwise) The decision made no reference on mitigation, like use of opaque glass, or a restricting the size of the dormers. Everything was just waved through.

Contrast 2017/3743/P (7 Daleham Mews) with 2018/8539/P (9a Daleham Mews -next door). I have attached the Decision Notice and the Briefing Document prepared by John Diver. The original application was for 2 large dormers causing significant overlooking. The decision **approved much smaller dormers and mandatory use of obscure glazing as a perpetual condition of the planning approval**

3. *4 Prior to occupation of the bedrooms hereby approved, the 2 rear dormer windows shall be obscured glazed. The obscure glazing shall be thus maintained and retained in perpetuity thereafter.*

Reason: In order to prevent unreasonable overlooking of neighbouring premises in accordance with the requirements of policy A1 of the Camden Local Plan 2017.

The principle objections to 2018/8539/P apply here

Amenity

1. *Loss of privacy / overlooking due to separation distance to properties at rear along Belsize Crescent. The raised height will further worsen the impact*
2. *Overbearing sense of enclosure and loss of light; and now exacerbated by a further rise in height of the building*

So, in summary, if Camden is minded to approve the 75mm rise, it must be associated with planning protection; **smaller less imposing dormers, and mandatory use of obscure glazing as a perpetual condition of the planning approval**

