**[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.

This is a copy of comments submitted on Camden Planning website – the purpose of my email is to submit as an attachment a report from an independent expert surveyor commissioned by me to appraise the Developer's Analysis of Site layout for Daylight and Sunlight.

## These are the comments of - Barbara Jackson, Garden Flat 5A Belsize Crescent NW3 5QY

I live in the basement flat of 5 Belsize Crescent and strongly object to the proposed development at 5 Belsize Park Mews.

My first impression is that the planners have made significant efforts on the front of the house to satisfy the neighbours in Belsize Park Mews and avoid complaint. Sadly, no such consideration has been given to Belsize Crescent properties at the rear of the building.

This is not a householder application, as described in the Application Details but is a commercial development for profit. The applicant is a company called Bauhaus Developments Ltd who, according to HM Land Registry, is the Registered Owner of 5 Belsize Park Mews having purchased the property in Dec 2020.

The Householder Application has been signed by an Agent. Is this a deliberate lack of clarity when the Developer is in fact the owner?

My objections are:

## Over-intensification of the Site/Sense of Enclosure

The proposed development would create at its rear a strong sense of enclosure to both garden flats at 5&7 Belsize Crescent, a feeling of being solidly boxed in. In my case, the garden is bounded to the south east by a two-storey wall to the back of Burdett Mews and the boundary at the bottom would be a sheer brick wall from ground level to first floor plus a second storey on top.

This not only increases the sense of enclosure that the additional storeys would induce but also makes my garden more reliant on sunlight and daylight from over the Belsize Park Mews properties at 5 and 6.

## Loss of Light

My garden would lose a considerable amount of sunlight owing to the height of a second storey. My bedroom and dayroom, both habitable rooms, look out onto the garden and would be severely affected by the loss of daylight as well as sunlight.

I felt the Daylight and Sunlight Analysis submitted by the developer warranted further investigation, therefore I consulted an independent expert surveyor.

In his report he states:

"All in all, the proposed addition of two storeys and the installation of windows to the boundary wall with 5 Belsize Crescent, my flat, will have the following detrimental effects to the amenity:

A significant reduction in daylighting to the two rear rooms at 5 Belsize Crescent which are presently used as a day room and a bedroom of approx one quarter to one third, significantly more than the 20% at which the loss should be taken into account.

A reduction in sunlight to the garden, possibly losing all of that presently enjoyed in the early afternoon at ground level, contrary to the report accompanying the application, again significantly more than the 20% at which the loss should be considered."

#### **Overlooking and Privacy**

An increase in overlooking of my garden and rear rooms by the positioning of new windows directly facing me on the boundary, all of which are intended to be openable at least in part, with rights to light implications.

Also, the walk-on roof mentioned in the development plans would create severe overlooking.

There will be a severe increase in the sense of enclosure by the raising of one storey at the top and infilling of the existing lightwell.

#### Separation between buildings

According to CPG6, item 2.4 to ensure privacy the suggestion is a minimum distance of 18m between the windows of habitable rooms directly facing the proposed development. In the case of 5 Belsize Crescent, first and second floor rear the distance is the length of my garden, a figure of approx. 9.7m.

## Omissions/Inaccuracies/Lack of Clarity

- ∞ The area of my garden has been miscalculated the applicant's Daylight and Sunlight Report says it is 59.5m2 whereas it is about 69m2.
- $\infty$  In the analysis of this report prepared by our professional and independent surveyor he states:
- ∞ "I can make no sense of the figures.
  - I measured the garden at about 69m2, whereas the report says 59.5m2. There must clearly be a reduction, not an increase in sunlighting.
  - I think it safest to simply say that the figures as presented cannot be relied upon.

It would be helpful to have sight of Figure 3 as the report claims there to be no sunlight at all in the garden outside the hours of 1pm to 3pm on April 21. I had not considered the report before visiting but a photograph I took at 3.20pm on April 19 shows about a quarter of that garden having sunshine on the ground, a good part of which would be lost if the development were to be constructed."

- Missing Item Re the Daylight and Sunlight Report (see page 10) List of Attachments Figure 3 described as Sunlight to garden of 5 Belsize Crescent, this is not attached.
- $\infty$  Is this omission deliberate or careless?
- what does it mean? See page one of the Application Details, in the Proposal section is listed, 'Demolition and creation of a new rear terrace at first floor'. I can find no mention of a new rear terrace in the body of the application nor on the architects' drawings. The former would create even greater overlooking and intrusion, quite unacceptable.

# **Planning Heritage Design**

There is no mention that several other applications for similar developments in Belsize Park Mews have been successfully challenged by people living in Belsize Crescent resulting in plans being downsized to angled or stepped roofs to avoid loss of light, privacy and an overbearing effect.

# **Health and Wellbeing**

On a personal note, over the last 5 or 6 years I have had multiple orthopedic procedures hampering my ability to walk and get around easily. My garden provides a welcome sanctuary, particularly in good weather. Plenty of spring and summer sunshine can provide an essential supply of Vitamin D. If this proposed development were to go ahead the loss of privacy as well as loss of light would severely compromise enjoyment of my garden.

Please confirm receipt of this email and the attachment.

Barbara Jackson