

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2022/4164/P	Aviad K	30/11/2022 18:24:20	COMMNT	RE: Objection to 4 BCG Planning Application

I am the owner and my family currently reside at 9 Belsize Court Garages mews ("BCG") which is located on the same mews a few doors away from 4 Belsize Court garages ("4 BCG").

I strongly object to the proposed retrospective permission to split 4 BCG into two self contained units, be it temporary or permanent, for the following reasons:

1. Previously two separate planning application 2004/0847/P and 2003/1258/P to split no 6 BCG, the dwelling next door to 4 BCG, into two self-contained units were refused. There has been no change to relevant circumstances therefore there is no reason to deviate from that precedent and reach a different decision in this instance.
2. 4 BCG is situated in Belsize Court Garages which is a quiet, pastoral family-oriented residential area located at the heart of Belsize Village, a unique area in its own right. If permitted, a split would increase residents density, increase traffic congestion (in an already highly congested area due to St Christopher's school around the corner) thereby increase air and noise pollution, put further pressure on limited parking spaces as well as public amenities and in general change the character and nature of Belsize Court Garages and Belsize Village. Something unique and very special would be lost if Camden allows family dwellings to be split left right and centre and allow more and more people to occupy this small area.
3. 4 BCG was recently renovated and split into two self-contained dwellings without seeking permission for the split, in violation of planning laws. If granted, such retrospective permission would not only reward those who acted in disregard to planning laws but would also send a dangerous message to other developers that violating planning rules carry no serious repercussions since if discovered they can always seek retrospective permission. In addition it would also set a dangerous precedent to other owners on BCG and other mews in Belsize Village who may also seek to split their dwellings based on this precedent. Ultimately splitting more and more dwellings would cause the adverse consequences described in more detail in section 2 above.
4. Last but not least there is a wider trend here which must not be over-looked. We moved to the mews some 10 years ago and we feel a deterioration in the pastoral feel, nature and atmosphere of the mews over that time. I believe this is in part caused by non-resident owners who are less concerned about the character and atmosphere of the mews since they simply do not live here. The dwelling known as 8 BCG now contains an active architect's office on the ground floor with the top two floors converted into an HMO which is let out to multiple non-family tenants. As a result, the effects described in section 2 above are sometimes felt and we are concerned that the ambiance of the mews is becoming that of a work place rather than a quiet residential, family oriented area.

I believe that a rejection of the application is necessary to restore some of the lost qualities of BCG mews.

Yours faithfully

AK