

Printed on: 13/04/2022 09:10:09

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2022/0467/P	Will Ottley	12/04/2022 11:48:29	OBJ	<p>COMMENTS BY WILL OTTLEY (4 BERRIDGE MEWS)</p> <p>Planning Application : 2022/0467/P (3 Berridge Mews)</p> <p>Erection of side extension to existing rear extension and replacement of rear window with doors, enlargement of existing rooflight</p> <p>Registered 15/3/2022</p> <p>There are a number of very serious errors in respect of this application which I believe are misleading and it should be dismissed in its current form until a joint design can be agreed between numbers 3 and 4 Berridge Mews.</p> <p>Specifically:</p> <p>Trees and Hedges - there is a TPO tree in the corner of the garden at 5 Berridge Mews that is in close proximity and omitted from the application (6Meters away).</p> <p>Existing Roof Materials - The application states that the existing roof is flat felt roof. This is erroneous as the material is lead (see pictures). The choice of materials materially affect design, and visual amenity in a conservation area. There are no felt roofs at Berridge Mews.</p> <p>Existing and proposed elevation A-A - this plan is totally incorrect. The roof type is wrong. The second floor windows are not uniform as depicted because one of the windows is a single window (not double as depicted). Most misleading is that the double doors to the ground floor kitchen at number 4 Berridge Mews are on the wrong side of the plan which is relevant because of rights of light into the kitchen at 4 Berridge Mews. I currently enjoy direct sunlight and direct lines of sight to the southern sky from my kitchen table (see pictures).</p> <p>Also there is no detail as to Juliet balconies which presumably be required for large double doors replacing windows. Surely we would need 1:20 detail on the type of balconies that would greatly impact the design balance in a conservation area? Surely the design should be agreed by and mirrored by number 4 as it is visually inseparable, as the houses exterior mirror each other (as opposed to number 2 and 5 which are different in design terms.)</p> <p>Gross Internal Area to be added - the application states 7.50 but in reality it is 4.05 sqM. The applicant wishes a 90cm addition along the boundary line party wall of 4.5 Meters, that compromises right of light and visual amenity from 4 Berridge Mews and I question why this is necessary as the impact is so great for such a small change. In my opinion, the existing extension at number 3 is optimum until such time as a joint design can be agreed for both properties.</p> <p>A party wall would affect my own future plans and our houses are so aligned design wise it makes sense to act in both interests rather than just one?</p> <p>Background</p> <p>I purchased 4 Berridge Mews in December 2001. Its my principle residence for over 20 years.</p> <p>The previous owner of 3 Berridge Mews, Ian Struthers (who sold in June 2021) undertook the current large extension (circa 19 sqM) with my full support and agreement on 28th October 2005, as it protected my rights of light and had a hipped end design to the wall to reduce the visual length from dominating my own smaller</p>

Application No: Consultees Name: Received:

Comment:

Response:

garden which is 9.7Meters in average length.

The current extension at 3 Berridge Mews is circa 4.5M in length and 4.3M wide and extends out by 1 meter beyond the extension at 2 Berridge Mews, built at exactly the same time and in consultation and agreement between the owners of Number 2 Berridge Mews and Ian Struthers (number 3), and myself (4).

It is arguable that any addition to this already large extension is overdevelopment, and creates further loss of garden space in a conservation area. My own garden on that side is only (9.7M in length so the hipped end was visually necessary to avoid over domination, and any future design must have a hipped design.

Current Position

The current application would dominate my garden with a long brick wall along half its length. The new owners of 3 Berridge Mews did not agree any designs with me prior to submitting their application. It was a shock. They told me that they wished to have more light in their current extension, but they have not cleaned the existing roof light, nor repaired inoperative blinds that actually block daylight from entering their current extension from above, as was originally intended. Their position is incongruent.

Revised Drawings

I met with the current owners of 3 Berridge Mews following the submission of their factually incorrect proposal to explain my concerns about the blatant errors and the impact on my own property. They did not withdraw the proposal as I suggested, but instead submitted revised plans (that they may or may not proceed with subject to quotes). The revised drawings seek to address the right of light issue, but does not address the errors in the original application or my concerns above.

One new concern with the revised proposal is that it would potentially create a valley gutter, should I build my own extension. As a Chartered Surveyor with over 30 years experience, I am wary of valley gutters because they require a high build quality and very regular future maintenance. I have seen no plans on this critical valley gutter design point which must at the very least be placed behind a parapet wall to protect my own property from future issues. Presumably they will use a brick cavity wall to match existing bricks, but I have seen no detail of this.

Also, given my height (1.9M), I think the boundary wall parapet would have to be 2.2M capped height for mutual privacy and practicality to protect against a valley gutter.

There would need to be a party wall agreement and confirmation that they would not build at any point or height beyond the expansion joint at our building intersection (see photograph), in order that I can abut with my own extension (should I or a successor wish this in the future and agreed with Camden). There is a communal descending gutter at this expansion joint intersection that would be impacted by the proposal and would need diverting, and there is a drain. There is a gas flu. I've seen no detail on any of this.

I would also be concerned about light pollution and peering into their property from above, and would suggest frosted glass to prevent this. The current roof light design has obscure glass on one side to prevent this and worked well.

My final concern, relates to my own or successor future plans for an extension at 4 Berridge Mews for which I have had no time to consult an architect, given the tight time constraints imposed on me, to review the various

Application No: Consultees Name: Received:

Comment:

Response:

design implications from the unilateral proposal at 3 Berridge Mews. Accordingly, there would need to be a condition that any unilateral design must not impact my own future plans in terms of design or light. There might be an implication in design terms for 4 Berridge Mews to mirror what is agreed at 3, but this would be unfair as I was not involved. A sloping roof light for example could set up rights of light which needs to be excluded from impacting a design at 4 Berridge Mews as I might not wish a valley gutter for reasons explained above.

Summary

It would be preferable to have been consulted and agreed a design detail before a planning application was unilaterally submitted and I must therefore request that the application be refused in its current form until such time as it is professionally reconsidered, designed and agreed by all parties affected.



Photographs:

Existing Extension at 3 Berridge Mews built in 2005 with lead roof and large roof-light. A hipped joint at the end to disguise length. 90cm from boundary.

Existing rear extension at 3 Berridge Mews with hipped corner to disguise length.

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

kitchen table at 4 Berridge Mews.

Building expansion joint. Midpoint

Page 5 of 14