

---

**From:** Iain Roxborough [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** 30 September 2020 16:38  
**To:** Planning; Peres Da Costa, David  
**Cc:** [REDACTED]  
**Subject:** Application 2020/0929/P Site: 81 Belsize Park Gardens ("the Property")  
Objections to Revised Proposed Windows on East Elevation 6402-14h  
**Attachments:** 6402-14h Elevations as Proposed.PDF; IMG\_2017.jpg; IMG\_2012.jpg; IMG\_2019.jpg; IMG\_2015.jpg

**[EXTERNAL EMAIL]** Beware – This email originated outside Camden Council and may be malicious. Please take extra care with any links, attachments, requests to take action or for you to verify your password etc. Please note there have been reports of emails purporting to be about Covid 19 being used as cover for scams so extra vigilance is required.

**Application 2020/0929/P Site: 81 Belsize Park Gardens ("the Property") Revised Proposed Windows on East Elevation**

By this email objections are made in respect of the above application on behalf of the Belsize Park Gardens West Group (being the residents of 83, 85, 87 and 89 Belsize Park Gardens) to the revised proposed windows on the east elevation of the Property in drawing 6402-14h, a copy of which is attached.

In early July 2020 Mr Mulder had filed objections to the windows proposed in the drawings for the east elevation and we had also prepared objections to these on behalf of the Belsize Park Gardens West Group and were about to file them when Mr Mulder explained to us that he had heard from the applicant owners of 81 BPG that, in response to his complaints directly to them, they had decided to eliminate those proposed windows altogether. Accordingly our objections filed by email on 3 July 2020 at 1406pm noted this and did not go into detail on our objections to the proposed windows.

It now appears that on 1 September 2020 at 1910pm a revised drawing "6402-14h Elevations as Proposed" has been filed in relation to the application which, contrary to the representations made in early July about eliminating the proposed windows altogether, continues to propose 2 long windows in place of the previous proposed ones. This email therefore provides objections to the proposed windows in the revised drawings filed on 1 September 2020 as set out below.

As a first point, the applicants having indicated that they would eliminate the proposed windows altogether, it is in our view unfair and inappropriate for them to then seek to introduce revised windows in an amended drawing without further explanation.

As noted in our previous objections filed by email on 3 July 2020 at 1406, the application form refers to "High-performance windows to first and second floors." This seems inconsistent with the elevation drawing which shows only ground and first floor windows so it is assumed no second floor windows are in fact proposed. We oppose second floor windows. The revised drawing still does not include any windows on the second floors.

The conservation statement says: "The south east elevation could be enhanced by improving the fenestration arrangement; however, consideration should be given to the retention of privacy of the adjoining private gardens."

The design statement says: "Limited areas of new glazing are proposed to the easterly façade, with obscured glazing (Reglit proposed in order to maintain privacy for the private gardens, while providing daylight to the nursery areas and maintaining acoustic and fire performance of the façade)." The 1 September 2020 1910 revised drawing "6402-14h Elevations as Proposed" has 2 windows in the Proposed Long Elevation (South-East) described as "New fixed obscure glass windows (non-openable)". They are coloured blue on the drawing like other normal windows, which suggests that they are not Reglit coloured glass or actually blue in colour. It is not clear whether it may be proposed they are to be coloured in some way; it is assumed not. If they were, we would object that such colours would be inconsistent with a leafy green garden.

We have concerns and object to yellow light pollution to the gardens to the south coming through the glass and showing over and through the trees and hedges there, especially in the autumn and winter afternoons and evenings once dusk approaches. We attach a photo (1<sup>st</sup>) of the section where the proposed windows would be introduced showing the current leafy trees and bushes and the character of the garden which would be adversely affected by the proposed windows which would be close at hand to this section.

Looking at the drawings, the two windows are about 1 metre in height and about 2-3 metres wide. The top of the ground floor one is aligned with the top of the fire exit doors and according to the ground floor drawing about 1.7 metres to the west of the fire exit. The bottom of the first floor one is aligned with the bottom of the left hand column of windows above the fire exit, again about 1.7 metres to the west of that column of windows.

### **Ground floor window**

The wall 1.7 metres to the west of the fire exit where the ground floor window would be has 2 features:

1. it lies about 2-3 metres behind a hedge and a number of others trees. Photographs (1<sup>st</sup> and 4<sup>th</sup>) are attached which show the hedge and trees which will be in front of the window. The top of the window will be about level with the top of the hedge and below the trees which will therefore obscure light getting to the window.

2. there is what looks like a drain pipe attached to the wall at about where the top of the proposed window is in the drawing. The drainpipe leads from a drain pipe coming down from the floors above on the next reverse and then along the length of the wall and then re-enters the gym building at the return by the fire exit doors presumably going to a downpipe near the fire exit. Photos (2<sup>nd</sup> and 3<sup>rd</sup>) are attached showing the horizontal drain pipe which would seem to cross in front of any proposed window and will need to stay in place as part of the gym buildings guttering. It is not shown on the drawing of the elevation.

Any construction to put windows in the wall would likely require scaffolding and work being done from the garden side for which any construction workers would need to gain access and fence off a good part of the garden to actually do the work. This would likely cause substantial loss and damage to the existing hedges trees and plants, which would then need to be replaced with equivalents at a high cost. It would also cause considerable inconvenience to the garden owners and users. These works would be objected to under the Party Walls Act. We will have rights under that Act and under the restrictive covenants in favour of 83 Belsize Park Gardens. Given that the hedges and trees would in due course obscure the ground and first floor windows and preclude much light entering them, the inconvenience, loss and damage involved would in our view be unnecessary and unreasonable and should not be allowed. Any work would also need to be the subject of a carefully prepared construction plan so as to deal with these issues. None of this has been addressed.

### **First floor window**

The first floor window would be higher up the wall where there is currently ivy growing and where about the top half metre to metre of various trees are present. A photo (4<sup>th</sup>) is attached showing this. A window there would cast polluting light on the garden and would be out of character with the rest of the wall and garden.

We have concerns and object to the design with glass showing through on the first floor and not being hidden behind hedges and trees as with the ground floor. The garden spaces to the south of the east elevation are traditional and leafy whereas the windows are neither and therefore in our view they do not preserve the character or appearance of the garden area, contrary to the Conservation area requirements.

Some of the current trees and hedges in the garden may obscure the windows in the summer but some are deciduous and will not obscure them in the autumn winter and spring months especially in the afternoon and evening as dusk approaches and later. The result in our view is we will be faced with a modern set of glass windows with light shining out through them at the side of the garden in the non-summer months once the sun sets. In our view it will not enhance the elevation and does not preserve the character and appearance of the area which is one of quiet traditional leafy garden.

We are also concerned that noise will transmit more easily through glass than through brick and into the gardens through the glass. It is not explained how the acoustic performance of the facade will be maintained when glass replaces brick.

To conclude:

- we would prefer no new windows were installed in the Long South-East elevation and object to the proposed new windows there. It would be better if they were just eliminated as had, previously in July, been indicated would be the case.
- we object to the inconvenience and damage which will be caused by the work to insert such windows when little will be achieved in terms of gaining light.
- we strongly object to windows on the first floor where there will be less scope for them to be obscured by the existing trees and plants in the garden and they will adversely affect the character of the garden.
- we strongly object to the light pollution which will be caused particularly in the autumn winter and spring afternoons and evenings by light coming through the glass windows.

Yours sincerely

Belsize Park Gardens West Group

Iain Roxborough | Consultant Solicitor

t: +44 (0)20 3319 3700 | [REDACTED] 48 Chancery Lane, London WC2A 1JF, United Ki



KEYSTONE LAW