

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:
2019/4724/P	John and Lynda Burke	09/10/2019 11:27:59	OBJ

Response:

Planning Application - 2019/4724/P
Site Address 92 Camden Mews London NW1 9AG

We have examined this planning application and, while we welcome improvements to the building, we question and object to the following. Please note that we have written to the owner's agent with regard to a previous application but have received no responses. We would be happy to discuss the owner's proposal in a friendly and neighbourly way. It is also regrettable that substantial building works are currently being carried out at the property, apparently without planning permission or building control supervision. This is causing significant disruption in the Mews.

We note and object to the following items:

1. The proposed ground floor plan shows that the doorway and wall to the left of the main front door will be changed to incorporate a 'fixed pane window' in the existing solid brick wall and the doorway will be changed to a 'fixed window', both glazed with 'one-way glass'. The proposed front elevation describes this glazing as 'frosted glass'. The latter is preferable but there is no indication of how this would affect sound transmission from the studio area.
2. The RWP shown in the existing GF plan is not shown on the proposed plan and there is no indication how this drainage would be replaced.
3. The proposed first floor plan and front elevation show new openings with 'Crittall-style' windows where solid brickwork has existed since the original construction of the building. These are described as 'mirroring neighbouring properties'. This is untrue and the adjacent neighbouring building (closest in style and position) has no such windows. The type of glazing is not described nor are the reveal depths, frame dimensions, colours and other details necessary to assess their suitability.

We strongly object to any new windows facing immediately into our house (and those of our neighbours), just 7m opposite, on the basis of our lost privacy.

If more light is required for the interior of 92 Camden Mews there is the opportunity to install windows on the SE side elevation which overlooks garages and is much further away from any existing neighbouring windows. In any event all new glazing to the front elevation should use obscured glass and limited opening.

4. Similarly we object to the proposed use of the existing roof (originally a 'covered yard') as a terrace for the same reason as 3 above. This space has rarely been used previously for anything other than maintenance and, given the nature of the building's purpose as a recording studio, is likely to encourage anti-social behaviour at all times of the day and night.

5. There is no description or specification for the exterior finish of the building. This is currently painted solid black and the surface has deteriorated, particularly as bagged rubble has been piled up against it after recent demolition work. The existing finish and style are characteristic of Camden Mews.

6. Although the proposal application document section 9 states that parking is 'not relevant' to this proposal, an electric car-charger has been installed (already) next to the main doorway, presumably for use by the

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
				<p>owner (as this is a resident parking zone) and protruding over the public footpath which is extremely narrow and any connecting cable will effectively block it. This is unacceptable, especially as it is dangerous for pedestrians and makes the passage of wheelchairs and baby buggies impossible. The charger also flashes constantly and is an eyesore regardless of the technical benefit.</p> <p>7. The application (section 14) and proposal show no waste or recycling storage. There have been problems in the past because this building has no such storage provision and there is a general problem in the Mews with waste being placed on the footpath outside the permitted collection hours. We would expect to see proper provision for this in any changes to the building.</p> <p>8. Basement excavation in Camden requires building control supervision and full planning permission. Recent and current demolition work at 92 Camden Mews appears to be preparation for some sort of basement where none previously existed. There is nothing about this mentioned in the proposal.</p>

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:
2019/4724/P	John and Lynda Burke	09/10/2019 11:27:51	OBJ

Response:

Planning Application - 2019/4724/P
Site Address 92 Camden Mews London NW1 9AG

We have examined this planning application and, while we welcome improvements to the building, we question and object to the following. Please note that we have written to the owner's agent with regard to a previous application but have received no responses. We would be happy to discuss the owner's proposal in a friendly and neighbourly way. It is also regrettable that substantial building works are currently being carried out at the property, apparently without planning permission or building control supervision. This is causing significant disruption in the Mews.

We note and object to the following items:

1. The proposed ground floor plan shows that the doorway and wall to the left of the main front door will be changed to incorporate a 'fixed pane window' in the existing solid brick wall and the doorway will be changed to a 'fixed window', both glazed with 'one-way glass'. The proposed front elevation describes this glazing as 'frosted glass'. The latter is preferable but there is no indication of how this would affect sound transmission from the studio area.
2. The RWP shown in the existing GF plan is not shown on the proposed plan and there is no indication how this drainage would be replaced.
3. The proposed first floor plan and front elevation show new openings with 'Crittall-style' windows where solid brickwork has existed since the original construction of the building. These are described as 'mirroring neighbouring properties'. This is untrue and the adjacent neighbouring building (closest in style and position) has no such windows. The type of glazing is not described nor are the reveal depths, frame dimensions, colours and other details necessary to assess their suitability.

We strongly object to any new windows facing immediately into our house (and those of our neighbours), just 7m opposite, on the basis of our lost privacy.

If more light is required for the interior of 92 Camden Mews there is the opportunity to install windows on the SE side elevation which overlooks garages and is much further away from any existing neighbouring windows. In any event all new glazing to the front elevation should use obscured glass and limited opening.

4. Similarly we object to the proposed use of the existing roof (originally a 'covered yard') as a terrace for the same reason as 3 above. This space has rarely been used previously for anything other than maintenance and, given the nature of the building's purpose as a recording studio, is likely to encourage anti-social behaviour at all times of the day and night.

5. There is no description or specification for the exterior finish of the building. This is currently painted solid black and the surface has deteriorated, particularly as bagged rubble has been piled up against it after recent demolition work. The existing finish and style are characteristic of Camden Mews.

6. Although the proposal application document section 9 states that parking is 'not relevant' to this proposal, an electric car-charger has been installed (already) next to the main doorway, presumably for use by the

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
				<p>owner (as this is a resident parking zone) and protruding over the public footpath which is extremely narrow and any connecting cable will effectively block it. This is unacceptable, especially as it is dangerous for pedestrians and makes the passage of wheelchairs and baby buggies impossible. The charger also flashes constantly and is an eyesore regardless of the technical benefit.</p> <p>7. The application (section 14) and proposal show no waste or recycling storage. There have been problems in the past because this building has no such storage provision and there is a general problem in the Mews with waste being placed on the footpath outside the permitted collection hours. We would expect to see proper provision for this in any changes to the building.</p> <p>8. Basement excavation in Camden requires building control supervision and full planning permission. Recent and current demolition work at 92 Camden Mews appears to be preparation for some sort of basement where none previously existed. There is nothing about this mentioned in the proposal.</p>
