

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2020/5574/P	Richard Fletcher	16/01/2021 14:38:04	OBJ	<p>This proposal is identical in most respects and certainly on impact from that proposed in 2019/4295/P dated October 2019, so the same rationale, analysis and conclusion would be expected to apply. In fact it would be extraordinary if not. 2019/4295/P was rejected by LB Camden after detailed analysis in the Officer's Report, and the Decision Notice, Dated December 4, 2019. And subsequently rejected on appeal by Decision dated 13th October, 2020.</p> <p>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".</p> <p>This conclusion appears to defy reality as the new dormers in 9A Daleham Mews would face a perpendicular wall from 2m. It would be like occupying the worst room in a cheap hotel. Although the dormers are yet to be built, the owner of 9A Daleham Mews has the right to enjoy the full amenity when built. No-one would build a pair of dormers facing a perpendicular wall. Also it 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.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>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".</p> <p>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".</p> <p>"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.</p> <p>The angle, at 36°, is one and a half times 25°."</p> <p>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.</p> <p>I would appreciate that all objections made with respect to 2019/4295/P just concluded on 13th October 2020,</p>

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
				<p>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.</p> <p>I would be grateful if the report of David Bowden BSc FRICS MSLI 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 9A Daleham Mews 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 bona fide light study to quantify the obvious loss of amenity and breach of the BRE Guidelines</p> <p>I have submitted an e-mail to you of today's date with the report of David Bowden as an attachment for consideration</p>
2020/5574/P	Bryan Stroube and Deanna Tricarico	17/01/2021 23:59:14	OBJ	<p>We live in the lower ground flat of 17 Belsize Crescent. The properties on Belsize Park Mews and Daleham Mews already limit the amount of sky that we see from our garden and through our windows. The majority of our windows are in the back of the property, and are the source of most of the natural light in the flat. Given these factors, we believe the negative impact of the proposed development may be greater than concluded in the assessment.</p>
2020/5574/P	Jane Boardman	16/01/2021 15:27:55	OBJ	<p>The bulk of the one storey roof extension would will be extremely imposing and reduce light to my and my neighbours flats and gardens at a time when we are supposed to be reducing our use of electric light. It would also disturb the quiet enjoyment of our dwellings and outdoor space.</p> <p>The added top floor bedroom will be staring straight into my bedrooms, all four of them which are a lot closer than planning guidelines allow. There are three other households (flats) in this house who will also be overlooked, the bedrooms of two face No 10 Bel Park Mews. The additional floor will be even closer to No 17, a building of five households mostly 2 bed flats bedrooms probably at the rear of the building.</p> <p>It looks like a roof-deck in front of the raised roof at second floor level, that will be even closer to me, Nos 17, 15 and 13 Bel Cres will also be closely overlooked. There is also the issue of noise for neighbours, this was a major complaint not long ago when conservatories were the fashion.</p> <p>The applicant's daylight report appears not to agree with my experience or expectation. I asked David Bowden, BSc, FRICS, MSLI, ACI Arb, Urban Building surveyors a light specialist, to critique the report submitted by 10 BPM and to measure the actual light impact of the new floor, principally on 9A Daleham Mews. He states that the new floor will have a substantial effect on the light enjoyed by 9A Daleham Mews as the angle is at 36 degrees, one and a half times more than the BRE guideline of 25 degrees. This is what you would expect as a vertical wall would face the new dormers from 2m . I will submit David Bowden's report by separate e mail. The proposed extension would also immediately overlook the roof-lights of No 9.</p> <p>Additionally, it is not in keeping with the conservation area.</p> <p>Clearly this application must be refused for substantially the same reasons as 2019/4295/P was refused.</p>

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2020/5574/P	dorian roca	16/01/2021 16:57:54	OBJ	<p>OBJECTION TO 2020/5574/P 10 BELSIZE PARK MEWS</p> <p>The application is described as a minor alteration by the applicant to divert attention from what is a major change, an addition of an extra story on a two level building.</p> <p>This scheme is virtually the same 2019/4295/P dismissed at appeal 13/10/2020</p> <p>This development is out of character with a traditional Mews and will not improve, enhance or preserve the Belsize Conservation Area.</p> <p>The site plan is an odd configuration that again is out of character.</p> <p>The extension would create a sense of enclosure in the gardens and living rooms of 11,13, 15, 17 and 19 Belsize Crescent, with ever increasing roof heights that will obstruct once charming views over the neighbouring roof line replaced by another wall.</p> <p>Most importantly will be the loss of light within Belsize Park Mews, the immediate neighbours at 9a & 9 Daleham Mews as well as 11,13, 15, 17 and 19 Belsize Crescent.</p> <p>This development will be detrimental to those living in the vicinity as well as detrimental to the Belsize conservation area for such an extension to go ahead.</p>
2020/5574/P	L Cram	18/01/2021 20:27:43	OBJ	<p>I object to the planning application- the proposed additional floor/roof height is not in keeping with the mews and out of line with the adjoining property. The property was purchased as a mews house and should be retained a such and not re developed in a manner which imposes on the adjacent properties.</p> <p>I do believe that this proposal will impact on the light to the rear of the affected properties on Belsize Crescent.</p> <p>In addition, the residents will once again have to put up with considerable noise from the works which will go on for many months. This is particularly detrimental as realistically we will be working at home in some form for the remainder of 2021.</p>

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2020/5574/P	Sarah Fletcher	16/01/2021 16:45:23	OBJ	<p>OBJECTION TO 2020/5574/P 10 BELSIZE PARK MEWS</p> <p>The application is described as a minor alteration by the applicant to divert attention from what is a major change, an addition of an extra story on a two level building.</p> <p>This scheme is virtually the same 2019/4295/P dismissed at appeal 13/10/2020</p> <p>This development is out of character with a traditional Mews and will not improve, enhance or preserve the Belsize Conservation Area.</p> <p>The site plan is an odd configuration that again is out of character.</p> <p>The extension would create a sense of enclosure in the gardens and living rooms of 11,13, 15, 17 and 19 Belsize Crescent, with ever increasing roof heights that will obstruct once charming views over the neighbouring roof line replaced by another wall.</p> <p>Most importantly will be the loss of light within Belsize Park Mews, the immediate neighbours at 9a & 9 Daleham Mews as well as 11,13, 15, 17 and 19 Belsize Crescent.</p> <p>It appears cruel, selfish and detrimental to those living in the vicinity as well as detrimental to the overall neighbourhood preservation area for such an extension to go ahead.</p>
2020/5574/P	Dido and Simon Tart	17/01/2021 15:28:01	OBJ	<p>We would like to object to this application, which proposes to add a storey to a flat-roofed mews building. This unique location is too congested for the addition of a whole extra storey without significant detriment to neighbours on all sides.</p> <p>The main issue cited for the rejection of the previous application on appeal, was that the proposed roof extension would be overbearing and cause loss of outlook for the consented dormers to 9A Daleham Mews. This slightly revised proposal for an additional floor does not materially address this feedback, nor other issues that neighbours highlighted.</p> <p>Precedents on Belsize Park Mews should not apply as this is a very different location to other properties on Belsize Park Mews. It has an unusual angled footprint and is located at the junction of Belsize Park Mews, Daleham Mews and Belsize Crescent with several houses built directly against it. For 9 and 9a Daleham Mews in particular the vertical front gable would take away light and amenity, towering over the rooflights and consented dormers for 9a, which are the only source of light into the rear of these properties. Given the concentrated location, the full new storey would also detract from amenity, light and be generally overbearing for a number of other properties close by, including ours.</p>

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2020/5574/P	Ian Woolgar	17/01/2021 16:14:26	OBJ	<p>I live in Daleham Mews and, whilst the proposed development would not adversely impact my property or inhibit my enjoyment of it, it would in my opinion set a regrettable precedent in respect of developments that abut on to houses on the South side of the Mews.</p> <p>Others have pointed out that the proposal does not enhance or preserve the area's conservation status. Most particularly I see no substantive difference between the owner's plan (Appeal decision APP/X5210/D/20/3244417) already rejected. In that decision the Inspector reporting Mr J Bowyer laid out the impact on neighbouring properties with admirable clarity.</p> <p>I also take exception to the description of the development as 'minor' and as a 'roof extension' which is disingenuous to say the least.</p> <p>I urge you to reject this application.</p>
