

# CONSULTATION SUMMARY

## Case reference number(s)

2024/1867/P

## Case Officer:

Miriam Baptist

## Application Address:

13-15 John's Mews  
London  
WC1N 2PA

## Proposal(s)

Erection of mansard roof extensions with front and rear dormers, rooflights, green roofs and solar panels. Fenestration alterations to front and rear elevations.

## Representations

			No. of responses	1	No. of objections	1
<b>Consultations:</b>					No of comments	0
					No of support	0
<b>Summary of representations</b>  <b>(Officer response(s) in italics)</b>	24 John Street objected on the following grounds:  <u>Introduction</u>  1. The planning statement supporting this application fails to mention the listed status of the adjoining properties to the East of the site and fails to consider whether the proposals adversely affect the setting of those listed buildings. This is a material consideration in determining the application.  <i>Officer response: The setting of the nearby listed buildings has been taken into consideration.</i>  2. Further, the Planning Statement supporting this application is incorrect in stating that the existing buildings on the site were built post-war. As has					

previously been accepted by the applicants for planning permission between 2014 and 2022, the existing mews houses are original, as is accepted in the Applicant's own Design and Access Statement May 2024 (although that document fails to mention that the 2 mews houses are specifically identified as making a positive contribution to the Bloomsbury Conversation Area) (which is specifically also accepted in the Applicant's own Heritage Statement at page 13).

*Officer response: Noted, the wording within the heritage statement is correct in this instance.*

#### Specific Comments/Objections

3. The pitched photovoltaic cells proposed for the roof area are conspicuous, fail to follow the form and height of the roofline of the existing buildings on either side, are out of context in a conservation area and adversely affect the setting of the listed buildings at 23 and 24 John Street. See also Policies D1 and D2 (Heritage) of the LBC Local Plans and Policy HC1 (Heritage, Conservation and Growth).

*Officer response: The solar panels would be raised and angled to be effective but would be set back on the roof and are not considered likely to be visible from the narrow street below. The roofs would be visible from inside the listed properties to the rear but the changes are considered minor in nature and would not cause material harm to the setting of the listed buildings.*

4. The rear top floor dormer windows fail to observe hierarchy of size and location – they are not subordinate as they are not only too tall and wide (they should be much narrower and less high to adopt a more historical form in a conservation area), they are also not set back enough from the face of the first floor to acknowledge the subservient nature of the mews house to the listed buildings on John Street. They are not designed to minimise overlooking in accordance with CPG Amenity January 2021 para 2.2. See also Policies D1 and D2 of the LBC Local Plans and Policy HC1 (Heritage, Conservation and Growth).

*Officer response: The proposed dormer windows are no bigger than those windows below which they are broadly aligned in terms of position. It is noted that the mansard extensions along John's Mews have a variety of fenestration styles and some are excessively glazed. Within this context the proposed windows are considered acceptable and not out of place.*

5. The rooflights at roof level should not sit proud of the roof line as they adversely affect the setting of the listed buildings on John Street and there is no apparent reason for them not to sit flush with the proposed roof line.

*Officer response: The protrusion of the rooflights is considered minor in nature*

*and would not cause material harm to the setting of the listed buildings, nor be visible from the mews below.*

6. The rear first floor windows should be smaller as they cannot be obscure glazed to minimise overlooking in accordance with CPG Amenity January 2021 para 2.2.

*Officer response: There is an existing relationship of overlooking between the properties on John's Street and John's Mews. Although the proposed windows on the rear façade will be larger than the existing, the proposal is not considered to significantly alter the relationship of mutual overlooking already established between the mews and Listed properties to the rear.*

#### Essential Conditions in addition to Comments/Objections

7. There should be a permanent restriction on any use of the flat roofs in the future with that restriction secured by condition, and it should be a condition that the balustrade at first floor level at the rear should be erected prior to first occupation and retained thereafter.

*Officer response: A condition has been added to prevent the use of the flat roof of the ground floor extension as a roof terrace.*

8. The usual conditions on asbestos, contamination, etc should be imposed.

*Officer response: Due to the nature of the extension proposed (upwards) conditions in relation to land contamination are not necessary. Relevant building regulations and legislation on issues such as asbestos need to be adhered to as with any construction project.*

9. There should be a condition relation to tree protection on adjoining properties. A condition should be imposed to prevent tourists or short term lets unless permitted under a subsequent change of use application.

*Officer response Due to the nature of the extension proposed (upwards) conditions in relation to tree protection are not necessary. Due to the nature of the application, which does not involve any change of use, conditions relating to short term lets etc are not considered relevant.*

#### Additional points

10. The Application for Planning Permission states in response to the question "Does the proposal involve any of the following: ...Land which is known to be contaminated" the answer given is "No". From documents submitted in support of previous applications, the land is known to be contaminated as was explicitly stated in a soil contamination report filed with Camden Council by a previous applicant.

*Officer response: Noted. Due to the upwards nature of the extension, land*

*contamination is not considered to be of significant concern.*

11. The daylight and sunlight report fails to calculate figures for a fully glazed door at basement level at 24 John Street. For the avoidance of doubt, nothing in this response waives existing rights to light. It appears inherently unlikely that the existing area receiving 2 hours sunlight to Neighbouring Gardens figure for Garden G2 is only 1.07% from which it is to be inferred that the figure given is mistaken and the subsequent calculation is therefore also wrong.

*Officer response: In the context of the existing mews building, the mansard extension is not considered likely to have any materially harmful impact on the level of light received to rear gardens or properties on John's Street. The pattern of mansard roof extensions is already established along this stretch, and therefore the relationship with gardens and properties on John's Street similarly is already established. Window 5 in the daylight sunlight report calculates figures for the basement door at 24 John Street. The reason given for the apparent anomaly in garden G2 is because much of that garden is at a lower level than the others and therefore much more heavily overshadowed than G1 and G3 currently. Sunlight to gardens is sensitive to the relative heights of nearby obstructions.*

**Recommendation: Grant conditional planning permission**