

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2021/5690/P	Barbara Jackson	04/02/2022 17:01:25	OBJ	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 3rd) 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 1st 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 developers plans already include an extensive roof terrace on the 2nd 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.

Printed on: 07/02/2022 09:10:18

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2021/5690/P	Chris Knight	05/02/2022 13:21:45	COMMENT	This application is very little different from the previous refused applications and the application now at appeal, it fails on: Overlooking rule 18mtrs from the rear elevation towards 5 & 7 Belsize Crescent the actual dimension is circa 9.5mtrs. The rear terrace screening is not permanent and is permeable to viewing. It fails on the 25' degree rule as we have stated in previous application. It fails on amenity ruining the use of rear habitable rooms and the gardens of 5 & 7 Belsize Crescent. This is continued planning creep as it is the 3rd application Planning Officers should take heart in the opposition and good reason shown for rejection of this application and don't let the prospect of a further appeal be daunting, and just reject it.
2021/5690/P	Prof Peter Leyland	04/02/2022 17:22:49	OBJ	/Users/peterleyland/Desktop/Leyland Planning objection.pdf

Printed on: 07/02/2022 09:10:18

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2021/5690/P	Gillian English	04/02/2022 21:06:12	OBJ	I am the owner of the basement flat at 7 Belsize Crescent. I strongly object to this planning application (2021/5690/P0). This development will be an overbearing, light-blocking, privacy-destroying development for 5 and 7 Belsize Crescent, increasing the already high sense of enclosure from surrounding buildings. Very little has changed since the last application was refused. ✦ No precedent for a rear 1st floor terrace of this type in any of the developments in Belsize Park Mews (BPM) to date. The rear terrace looks straight into the garden of 5 Belsize Crescent. ✦ The rear terrace is an over-intensification of the site. There is already a very large patio terrace at the front of the building – see the architects' drawings. (The CGI drawings significantly understate this space so are deceptive.) ✦ For 5 Belsize Crescent, this 1st floor roof terrace will be like having strangers sitting on your garden wall, less than 10m away from the bedroom. The double patio doors indicate a clear intention to put a table and chairs out there for 2-3 people. The gaps in the screen will not ensure privacy or stop noise coming into the gardens of 5 and 7 Belsize Crescent. The height of the lightwell and the screen / trellis will further add to the sense of enclosure for 5 Belsize Crescent. ✦ 4.9 in the Delegates Report states the windows of the rear terrace won't look into the garden of 7 Belsize Crescent. This is untrue – there is a direct sightline. See photo attached. ✦ The height of the extension will have an overbearing and/or dominating effect from Belsize Crescent. It will add to the significant loss of light caused by other developments in BPM, notably no 6. Painting the back wall of the rear 1st floor terrace white does not compensate for the loss of daylight caused by the addition of a whole third floor. ✦ In a Conservation Area, attention should be given to the impact of a development on the buildings at the rear, not just at the front. We in the basements flats of 5 and 7 Belsize Crescent already have a strong sense of enclosure because we look out into 3 storey monolithic brick walls. The proposed 5BPM development makes it even worse. See photos. ✦ Developer Application – this application is for a developer, not a private householder. Error in Application – under Application Details on the online page it states 'Erection of two storey rear extension and rear terrace at first floor.' But the Council's Delegated Report refers to 'a single storey roof extension and terrace.' Is this an error or something which is not being made clear in the application? Site visit requested - I request again that a representative from Camden Planning comes to see the impact on 5 and 7 Belsize Crescent for themselves. Looking at the plans is no substitute for being on the spot to understand the loss of light and privacy and increased sense of enclosure. Some comments on this application do not state whether the author actually lives in BPM / Belsize Crescent or any street affected by this application. If they don't, I query the validity of these comments.
2021/5690/P	Marko Milovanovic	06/02/2022 20:29:45	OBJ	I am writing to object to this development in the charming Belsize Park Mews, which I walk past every day. The development shows no consideration of the existing context and it would set a dangerous precedent for further development in the Belsize Park Conservation area. As an architect, I would like to particularly object to the aesthetic aspect of the proposal. The proposed handrail above the front elevation, facilitating a roof terrace is without precedent in this historic area. The form of the roof "pavilion" seem ill-considered, creating no usable internal space, perhaps aiming to add as many square meters to the property as possible, with conspicuous glass creations, without referencing the architectural character of Belsize Park.