

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2021/3002P	Di Mayhew	26/08/2021 11:58:06	COMMENT	<p>My decision to live in Maryon Mews was largely dictated by the visual positives of the mews, not just the house I now occupy.</p> <p>Below are my concerns about the two planning applications to develop upwards numbers 22 and 23 Maryon Mews.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. There appears to have been no consultation whatsoever by Camden Council with 'interested parties' such as the local residents living in Maryon Mews, and residents of some of the properties in Heath Hurst Road who will be impacted by the development planned. There were no letters sent by Camden Council, no notices attached to trees locally (the development would be seen from outside the mews), no letters sent to any residents in Heath Hurst Road, and no advertisement in the Ham &amp; High newspaper or the Camden Journal. I found out by accident from a neighbour who was also aware informally. This absence of information from Camden Council limits the scope for a genuine comprehensive consultation to take place.</li> <li>2. There is an ongoing technical difficulty with the planning portal making it impossible for some people to even access the website pages, and attempts to post Comments are frustrated by the appearance of an "error" message. This is a disincentive to say the least, perhaps deterring those who would like to comment from doing so.</li> <li>3. The Design &amp; Access Statement's visualisation makes it plain that the roof extensions would alter the skyline seen from the entrance (North Gate), from my home and other houses in the mews or adjacent to the mews, and from the street outside the mews. The mews benefits from spectacular sunsets and cloud formations which are a visual delight. They can be not unlike John Constable paintings. This would be destroyed by the interruption of two white boxes protruding from the brick buildings. Ted Levy had a vision when designing the mews as a whole. If he had wanted buildings to be three story then he would have designed them that way in the first instance. Someone else adding the extra layer subsequently would be like someone adding a baseball cap to the Mona Lisa completely changing Leonardo da Vinci's intended vision.</li> <li>4. The Design &amp; Access Statement mentions a "Future Concept" (Page 11) referring to all five of the houses in the terrace doing the same things (extending upwards). This implies that the skyline imbalance of these two extensions could be remedied by allowing all five properties to do the same thing. This is not a justification, it's a dangerous planning precedent to set and encourage.</li> <li>5. The two extensions appear to include roof terraces which have the potential to cause a 'noise nuisance'. It's unlikely that two people (or more) on a terrace would sit (or stand) in silence. Noise travels from open spaces, an enclosed area is less of a risk. It's also reasonable to expect the terraces to be lit after dark which could cause potential light pollution issues for neighbours.</li> <li>6. I see that there are two sycamores subject to Tree Preservation Orders as noted in the 'Constraints' section but it's unclear where these are sited in relation to the properties other than 'adjacent'. Any interference in the 'well-being' of these trees would be unacceptable.</li> <li>7. If these two developments add two further bedrooms, then it's safe to assume that if all five properties were to do the same that would add ten further bedrooms with the potential to increase the population of the mews by ten (or more) inhabitants putting pressure on services such as waste, footfall, parking and so on.</li> </ol>

Application No:    Consultees Name:    Received:    Comment:    Response:

8. In conclusion, these two developments would not only disturb the overall look and feel of the mews, they would be an insult to award winning Ted Levy's integrity, and an aesthetic disaster.

Di Mayhew,  
1A Maryon Mews.

