

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2020/5948P	Mike Harvey	12/03/2021 18:11:31	OBJ	<p>Dear Mr Greenhalgh</p> <p>We live at number 5 Belsize Mews and also as a director of the mews residents management company we were writing on behalf of Belsize Mews Residents Limited.</p> <p>I would advise that we have not been consulted on any of these proposals to date by either the people submitting the application nor Camden which is disappointing as we are directly affected and overlooked by these proposals. We would not have found out about these, unless advised by Number 14.</p> <p>That said the additional week extension to the 14th has been very helpful as we have been in Yorkshire with my wife's 89 year old Mum who is our support bubble. This time has enabled me as a director of the Mews company to gather some facts for you on behalf of all of the Belsize Mews Residents Limited numbers 1-12 inclusive.</p> <p>As residents of Belsize Mews we would raise the following items/facts for consideration to the proposed development.</p> <p>The planning submission states that 'The proposal has been discussed with the neighbours' This is simply not correct. (This was a previous statement in the previous applications and again no consultation took place the either).</p> <p>Facts</p> <p>Their immediate neighbour is No 14 in the same building with a shared front door and hallway, and Adam has confirmed that they had not been approached nor spoken to by No 13.</p> <p>Having spoken to each of the Belsize Mews Residents numbers 1-12 I can confirm that no one has approached any of them on behalf of number 13 to discuss this proposal.</p> <p>I have spoken to Frank Martinkovic who is our senior management contact for the main freeholder and Landlord (of 29 the building that No 13 is a leaseholder of), and in turn thru Frank to Will Ricker the Owner/Landlord. They too have confirmed that they have no knowledge of this request and no one has approached them re this on behalf of number 13 and they certainly haven't instigated it.</p> <p>Lastly I have spoken to Diego the main contact at Calici (the restaurant underneath 13 and 14 at 29 Belsize Lane which is served solely by this plant on the roof), and they too confirm they have no knowledge of this and no one has spoken to them on behalf of number 13.</p> <p>The statement would be therefore be accurate if it had said 'The proposal has not been discussed with any of the adjacent or affected neighbours.'</p> <p>The landlord has confirmed that the roof space is not demised to number 13 and that the Plant on that roof is not the property of number 13.</p>

Application No: Consultees Name: Received:

Comment: Response:

So the plant is not theirs and the roof is not theirs so we fail to see why they should have any need to change their window to a door or indeed be making an application for this, or be able to?

The roof plant has been in place for some 8/10 years and has been progressively maintained during that time.

There is already an escape route access / egress to the roof via the ladder on the west side from number 10's roof this is shown on the submitted drawings eg E05 and ED1
The restaurant are also, for PPM, able to access with agreement from the east side of the mews with the right equipment.

Incidentally there isn't a photograph of the window proposed to be replaced in the design and access statement and the drawing submitted is incorrect. The window in question is the same as the others on that elevation in that it is a sash window with a central vertical mullion, I can send a photograph when I am back in London at the end of March as you can see it clearly from our roof terrace.
The door proposed does not appear in keeping with this style of Architecture.

So why would they be applying for access to the roof? Why would they want maintenance personnel tramping through their home?

Recently 2 applications have been made by the same address re extending or creating outside space, both have been rejected by the council.

It would be conjecture to suggest that this proposal is to gain access to the roof for use as outside space.

The proposed change of window to a door would allow for the misuse of the roof space which not only invades our privacy as it would overlook our bedroom and living room but also it would increase noise levels in the Mews, which will affect the quality of life for all the residents.

The design as it stands would also impact the aesthetic integrity of houses in the near vicinity and Belsize Mews directly.

Albeit the Mews occupants all strongly object, but if you were to grant permission, could a restriction condition be placed upon the approval that the use of the door is to be used for the sole purposes of maintaining the landlords plant by authorised qualified personnel?

Happy to discuss any points m: [REDACTED]

Yours sincerely
M. P. Harvey

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2020/5948/P	Jane Chapman	14/03/2021 09:19:44	COMMENT	<p>I am writing this objection both as an individual owner of one of the 12 freehold houses within Belsize Mews (No 8).</p> <p>I object strongly to the proposed development. There have already been several applications of a similar nature that have been submitted to Camden Council and rejected in recent months.</p> <p>The proposed development would seriously invade the privacy of numerous residents in the Mews, including me, since the roof terrace area would overlook a number of living rooms, bedrooms and other roof terraces. Please note that the design of all our houses in the Mews is such that there are no back facing rooms with windows - all our windows face outwards - that is, they will be overlooked. The application also would increase noise levels in the Mews, affecting the quality of life for all Mews residents. On noise, please note that our existing 'in-fill' development was constructed in a dip of the land, which means that whatever noise we encounter resounds around the complex. This application would add to these inherent existing noise issues.</p> <p>Furthermore, the application would impact upon the aesthetic integrity of houses in the vicinity and Belsize Mews directly. It would constitute 'over development', destroying character.</p>
