
From: Simon Legg [REDACTED]
Sent: 16 January 2021 16:51
To: Planning; andrea speziale-bagliacca
Subject: Further comments on planning application 2020/5574/P

[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.

Attention Charlotte

Further to my earlier e-mail giving a brief summary of objections I have now had time to consider the matter further with others and would comment as follows :-

This proposal is identical to planning app 2019/4295/P dated October 2019 in both the design and impact on both my property 9A Daleham Mews and number 9 Daleham Mews. It would be therefore be extraordinary if it was not rejected as 2019/4295/P was rejected by LB Camden after detailed analysis in the Officer's Report, and the Decision Notice, Dated December 4, 2019. 2019/4295/P was further rejected on appeal by a decision of the Planning Inspectorate dated 13th October, 2020.

10 BPM has provided a Daylight Sunlight Assessment Report provided by CHP Surveyors Limited which concludes "The results of the analysis demonstrate that in all instances the numerical values set out in the BRE guidelines are achieved. The proposals will therefore not have a significant effect on the neighbour's enjoyment of daylight and sunlight".

This conclusion appears to defy reality as my new dormers in 9A Daleham Mews would directly face a blank wall from only a couple of metres which would oppressive and give absolutely no outlook whatsoever. I have the right to enjoy the full amenity when my dormers are built. Nobody in their right mind would build a pair of dormers facing a brick wall 6 feet away ! The statement also appears to refute all the findings contained in the LB Camden Decision and the Inspectors Report with respect to 2019/4295/P and the neighbours in Belsize Crescent !

In response neighbours commissioned David Bowden BSc FRICS MSLL ACI Arb, Urban Building Surveyors to critique the Daylight and Sunlight report produced by CHP Surveyors which I would highlight as follows :-

CHP Surveyors state 9.5.2 "Due to the distance between the proposals and the dormer windows, a line drawn at 25° from the centre of these windows, will not be bisected. This demonstrates that in accordance with paragraph 2.2.5 of the BRE guidelines the proposals will not have a significant effect on the daylight enjoyed by this property".

David Bowden states: "I have compared the position of the dormer at 9a for which planning permission has been given as shown on drawing 06-12 of the present application and as shown on drawing PA-06-01 of that permission. Whilst the present application appears to show a greater distance I do not see that the conclusion can be correct. The closer of the windows is full height and the maximum angle subtended by the proposal as shown on drawing 06-12 is about 36°, not less than 25° as suggested".

"The guidance says at 2.2.5: If this angle is less than 25° for the whole of the development then it is unlikely to have a substantial effect on the diffuse skylight enjoyed by the existing building. If, for any part of the

new development, this angle is more than 25°, a more detailed check is needed to find the loss of skylight to the existing building.

The angle, at 36°, is one and a half times 25°."

Mr Bowden also finds that despite the roof extension being set back relative to that in the previous refused application 2019/4295/P, most if not all of the inspector's findings from paragraphs 10 to 17 would still prevail. The only real difference is that now the proposal is set back from the boundary with 9 and 9a and so the impact will be less, and that a sunlight and daylight report has been provided.

I would appreciate that all objections made with respect to 2019/4295/P just concluded on 13th October 2020, on amenity, loss of light, and the negative impact on the conservation area, be relevant again here for consideration as expressed by neighbours and the BCAAC.

I would expect that the report of David Bowden BSc FRICS MSLL ACI Arb, the LB Camden Decision on 2019/4295/P and the subsequent rejection by the Inspector be part of the material used to consider this application. Clearly the proposed new floor facing my home would abuse the BRE Guidelines by a wide margin of 50%, and should as a consequence be rejected. The one difference here on 2020/5574/P versus 2019/4295/P is that we now have a professionally prepared light study to quantify the obvious loss of amenity to me and breach of the BRE Guidelines.

The drawings supplied to you by the owners of 10 Belsize Park Mews are not detailed enough and are not wholly accurate in order to make the impact upon my property seem mitigated. Upon inspection the elevation drawings between front and rear differ by .2 metres.

Once again I must object in the strongest terms to the plans to build ANY new storey on to number 10 Belsize Park Mews for all the reasons and points highlighted above and importantly the overbearing nature of the new structure to both Belsize Park Mews and the many homes surrounding the site. It is also completely at odds with the spirit of a Conservation Area which I understood effectively bans all additional storeys to homes hence the many applications now for Basements as a way to increase living accommodation ?

Regards

Simon Legg