

# CONSULTATION SUMMARY

## Case reference number(s):

2024/4754/P

## Case Officer:

Miriam Baptist

## Application Address:

99A Camden Mews  
London  
NW1 9BU

## Proposal(s)

Amendments to regularise the works as built on-site in regard to the roof extension approved under planning permission 2023/1409/P dated 18/07/2024.

## Representations

<b>Consultations:</b>	No. notified	0	No. of responses	2	No. of objections	2
					No of comments	0
					No of support	0

<b>Summary of representations</b>  <i>(Officer response(s) in italics)</i>	<u>84 Camden Mews <b>objected</b> on the following grounds:</u>
	<ol style="list-style-type: none"><li>1. The height of the proposed extension and its relationship within the street context has been inaccurately represented, namely the relationship to 97 Camden Mews, the adjacent property. Surely when assessing any application the context i.e. any adjacent properties should be represented accurately. This can be done by lidar survey very quickly and accurately. The non-material amendment states that the height of the extension is accurately built above the front gable of 99a and by implication the existing ridge of the property. However, this height is inconsistent with the height of the second storey of 97 which is shown on the approved planning application. The built extension at 99a is at least 600mm above this line. The increased height of the extension is because of a desired increase in ceiling height of second floor bedroom from 2100mm which is shown on</li></ol>

drawings. The original planning approval is invalid as it has been based on inaccurate information. We would object to this non-material amendment and suggest that a survey is carried out of the elevations to properties either side and that a drawing is produced showing how the new extension sits within the context.

*Officer response: In regard to the height of the extension, it is noted that the built height corresponds with the approved drawings when measured from the gable and roof level. This has been measured on-site by the Council's Planning Enforcement Officers. Although some discrepancy with comparative height to surrounding buildings is acknowledged (likely due to inaccuracies in the original drawings) the site has been inspected by the Enforcement Officer and, as built, would not have a material detrimental impact on the site, surrounding sites or the wider Conservation Area.*

99 Camden Mews **objected** on the following grounds:

1. The notion of regularisation of works is in itself invalid as the works have been done unlawfully as the owner of 99A has not followed the Party Wall Act of 96 (an Act of Parliament) which requires serving the correct notices. The build is therefore unlawful so cannot be 'regularised'.

*Officer response: Party wall matters are a civil matter rather than a material planning consideration. However, it is understood that the applicant has provided the title deeds and legal advice to support their position that the wall at first-floor level is not a party wall.*

2. The current structure neither reflects the original permission, nor the new application as they have built the wall to No.99 in a totally different shape with a protrusion at the rear which is not reflected in any plans.

*Officer response: The drawings have now been revised to show the small protrusion at the rear where the flank wall joins the rear wall.*

3. The applicant has failed to fulfil the many legal responsibilities that surround carrying out works.

*Officer response: These procedures in relation to undertaking building works are civil matters and not material planning considerations.*

4. The works are a trespass and anything in my airspace is unlawful- the applicant pretends to be unaware of this.

*Officer response: The roof extension does not encroach on the*

	<i>neighbouring properties. Any details or procedures in relation to civil matters are not a material planning consideration.</i>
--	---

**Recommendation:**

- **Grant planning permission**