| | | | | Printed on: 27/01/2023 09:10:24 |
|-----------------|-------------------------|---------------------|----------|---|
| Application No: | Consultees Name: | Received: | Comment: | Response: |
| 2022/4836/P | Catherine Hannam | 20/01/2023 11:31:42 | COMMNT | This application would alter the entire side of the mews raising the level of the buildings, which are currently completely uniform at two stories. I note the application references an approved permission for the neighbouring house (application 3031/3549/P). I am very disappointed to note this approved application. I live at no 19 and received no notification of this application and I do not believe it was displayed on the lamp post at the end of the mews as this, and previous applications have been. This and other comments on this application, suggest there was no consultation. The result seems to be that a precedent has now been set and I see no reason why there could be a valid objection to the entire mews going up a floor. This would completely change the appearance of the road (in a conservation area) and impact on the light and view for everyone on the other side of the mews and England¿s Lane residences. It is also disappointing to see the previous application was given the go ahead based partially on the appearance of the mews on the other side of Primrose Gardens, and even then, not even on the same side, backing on to Englands Lane, but the side backing onto gardens of Primrose Gardens. I do not see how this was in any way relevant - it is essentially a different road with a different appearance. |
| | | | | With this in mind I object to this application and would like more information on what consultation took place |

for the previous approved application at 26 Elizabeth Mews.

| | | | | Printed on: 27/01/2023 09:10:2 | 24 |
|-----------------|-------------------------|---------------------|----------|--|----|
| Application No: | Consultees Name: | Received: | Comment: | Response: | |
| 2022/4836/P | Karuna Dusija | 22/01/2023 21:54:13 | OBJ | As the owner of Flat 1, 25A Elizabeth Mews the proposed extension at 25 Elizabeth Mews would severely affect the light to my only bedroom window as well as light, outlook and enjoyment of my balcony (approved as part of application 9201335). The drawings submitted allude to maintaining rights to light to my bedroom window within the 45 degree rule however given that no precise measurements were taken, nor do the drawings appear to consider other windows such as those in the common areas of our flat or the shop below, I am in doubt of the accuracy of the drawings and that claim. Therefore, I object to the severe impact I am expecting on the amenity and enjoyment of my property. Historically, similar planning applications on either side of the Mews have been systematically rejected on the basis of impacts to appearance of a conservation area, rights to light, outlook and amenity, see some examples below: 1. In 2011, Application 2011/0189/P for 19 Elizabeth Mews was rejected, with one reason being "The reduced outlook and create an increased sense of enclosure to the neighbouring residential property at 82 Belsize Park Gardens" 2. In 2005, Application 2005/3042/P for 17A Elizabeth Mews was rejected due to "harm to the character and appearance of this designated Belsize Conservation Area" 3. In 2004, Application 2004/4898/P for 14B Elizabeth Mews was rejected due to "loss of daylight, outlook and sun on ground for 14A Elizabeth Mews." I am seeking the same protections from the council as the owner of a property in the mews. This request is troubling to me as a 1st floor resident, because it sets a dangerous precedent for a potential domino effect for all first floor residents with flats above Englands Lane, following the approval of application (2021/3549/P) for extension of 26 Elizabeth Mews. However, and more importantly and uniquely 25 Elizabeth Mews, unlike other properties on the Mews will have a much more significant impact beyond the 1st floor flat to my fellow neighbors by impacting lights to common | |

| | | | | Printed on: 27/01/2023 09:10:24 |
|-----------------|------------------|---------------------|----------|---|
| Application No: | Consultees Name: | Received: | Comment: | Response: |
| 2022/4836/P | Dee Fernandes | 23/01/2023 09:16:57 | OBJ | I respond as the owner of Flat 3, 25a Elizabeth Mews, a building which extends over the shop at 32 Englands Lane. The proposed mansard extension would result in a severe reduction in the natural light to the common parts of our homes and potentially jeopardise our only access, which is from the Mews between houses numbers 25 and 26. It will greatly impact on the natural light and outlook of the balcony of our neighbour in Flat 1 on the first floor of our building. We have one window in the entrance corridor and one window on the half landing of the communal staircase which will lose available light. This does not appear to have been noted or rigorously measured, prompting apprehensions about many aspects of the proposals. Considering the fragility of the party wall to our only entrance, we also have concerns about arrangements for load-bearing measures, such as steels. The existing party wall is only half a brick thick as evidenced when recent damp treatment at No. 25 broke through to our entrance hall leaving a one foot hole in the wall. The risk of damage could be further amplified by building planned at the adjoining house no.26 (application 2021/3549/P), with whom we share the other party wall that supports our entrance. Our entry corridor runs directly below the current first floor of number 25 and severe movement or collapse could completely deny us access to our homes. None of the adjoining houses on our side of Elizabeth Mews have mansards and granting their addition would have negative impacts for all neighbouring flats above the shops in Englands Lane, as well as further restricting the light and impacting the outlook of the houses that face us on the other side of this very narrow mews. We are sure Camden Council will now wish to take all of the matters raised in the comments on this application into careful consideration. |

Printed on: 27/01/2023 09:10:24

Application No: Consultees Name: Received: Comment: 2022/4836/P Katie Lockett 22/01/2023 23:58:18 OBJ

Response:

As the owner of an adjoining property to the proposed application I am extremely concerned about the detrimental affect such an extension will have on both my own property and those of my immediate neighbours.

Firstly, the application doesn't not appear to have properly assess or considered the right to light of the adjoining properties. It seems implausible that the mansard roof extension on 25 Elizabeth Mews will not have a considerably negative impact on both the access to light and privacy of the immediate neighbours, within our own properties but also whilst utilising the common areas shared for admission. As no precise measurements have been taken from these neighbouring properties it is hard to conceive that the drawings submitted in the application can be fully accurate and correct.

In addition to this, the application letter states that the proposals are in keeping with the immediate neighbours. However currently the row, of which 25 Elizabeth Mews is part, maintains 7 two-story residences with previous applications having been historically rejected based on the negative impact on appearance, access to light, outlook and amenity of the neighbouring properties. It also does not consider the unique features of the neighbouring property at 25A Elizabeth Mews/32 Englands Lane where there is both a window and basement skylight belonging to the shop on Englands Lane. I have serious concerns about the impact such an extension will have on the appearance of this unique and special conservation area, my personal enjoyment and pride of the area in which I have spent all of my life and the precedent that this sets for the remaining properties within the mews.

With regard to the specific plans for the construction methods, I would like to raise a concern as to the impact this construction will have on the load-bearing walls of the neighbouring properties at 25A/26. As recent investigations have proved the adjacent walls are woefully thin between the two properties, one of which provides the only access to the three flats within 25A Elizabeth Mews. At present I am not confident that the application fully considers the risks to the adjacent properties or the use of appropriate materials such as steel bracing and support to ensure the integrity of these properties throughout the build and into the future.

Finally, Elizabeth Mews provides a limited number of parking spaces utilised by the mews residents along with other key facilities. As numerous events involving delivery drivers and careless others indicates this is a tight space which needs to allow for parking, access to rubbish disposal and pedestrians right of way. I am doubtful as to how the extended period of such a build, with the requirement of scaffolding which will need adequate footings and support, will facilitate the needs of the other mews residents during this time.

I hope that the Council will fully consider the concerns and objects of both me and my neighbours when determining how to process this application.