

**Subject:**

Planning Application 2021/5690/P

Apologies I submitted my comments online today at 17:00. Unfortunately I copied from a Word document but pasted without the formatting.

Here it is again with relevant formatting – easier to read this way.

Regards

Barbara Jackson

I am the owner of the garden flat at 5 Belsize Crescent.

I strongly object to the revised application (2021/5690/P) for planning consent to a considerable development at 5 Belsize Park Mews.

It seems within this latest application (the 3<sup>rd</sup>) that not much has changed since the refusal of the last one. It remains clear the planners have made significant efforts in designing the front of the building to satisfy the neighbours in Belsize Park Mews. Such consideration has not been given to Belsize Crescent properties at the rear.

- ∞ At its rear the proposed development would create a strong **sense of enclosure** to both garden flats at 5 and 7 Belsize Crescent, the feeling of being solidly boxed in. My small garden is bounded to the southeast by a 6m high wall being one side of Burdett Mews and at the bottom by 5 BPM.
- ∞ No precedent has yet been set for a **rear 1<sup>st</sup> floor terrace**. No other house in BPM has been granted approval for a similar extra terrace. Such an addition will be prominent, unwelcome and detrimental to the existing amenity enjoyed by 5 and 7 Belsize Crescent.
- ∞ The addition of a rear terrace at first floor level, accessible from the master bedroom, will certainly create **overlooking and loss of privacy** despite a 1.8m trellis being in place. The latter is not enough to prevent either overlooking or noise pollution.
- ∞ This proposed terrace faces directly into my garden, it could not be more **intrusive**. The distance from bedroom door to boundary wall is only 9.7m so anyone using the terrace will be virtually sitting on top of my wall.
- ∞ In short, for those of us living in 5 and 7 Belsize Crescent the creation of a second outdoor area would be highly intrusive, an invasion of privacy as well as erosion of our existing amenity and outlook.
- ∞ Both gardens at 5 and 7 Belsize Crescent will lose a certain amount of light due to existing skylines being obscured by the addition of a second storey. The high wall of Burdett Mews already overshadows and obscures a substantial amount of both gardens. The planners maintain this loss is within regulated requirements but as we already lose so much due to the Burdett Mews wall any further loss of light is proportionately more significant in this instance.
- ∞ I feel strongly that a **site visit** by a Camden Planning Officer would be highly appropriate in these circumstances. No amount of photography or architects' drawings can replace the reality of a physical visit.

An inspector would then be able to assess and appreciate the impact on the Belsize Crescent side and see how detrimental the proposed development would be.

- ∞ 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 the distance between my rear windows and the rear roof terrace is 9.7m, viz 54% of 18m.
- ∞ Note 5 of the Heritage Statement concludes that similar extensions have been approved in the Mews. This is not correct. These others are sloped/pitched away from the boundary of Belsize Crescent to be less intrusive, whereas this development remains overbearing and dominating from our side of the fence.

The developer's plans already include an extensive roof terrace on the 2<sup>nd</sup> floor at the front of the house. Surely this provides sufficient external space to create the desired amenity on a site of this size without the addition of **another terrace** on the floor below. The latter would appear to be **over-intensification** of the site.

There are some comments on this application by persons who do not state whether they live or work within the area affected by the proposed development. Nor do they say in what capacity they are commenting.

Barbara Jackson