
From: David Blagbrough
Sent: 31 January 2025 18:23
To: Matthew Kitchener
Cc: Planning
Subject: Planning application, 12 Murray Mews Ref 2024/5639/P
Attachments: Comments to Council on proposal for 12 Murray Mews 30 January 2025.docx

[EXTERNAL EMAIL] Beware – This email originated outside Camden Council and may be malicious Please take extra care with any links, attachments, requests to take action or for you to verify your password etc.

Dear Matthew

I am attaching our comments on the above proposal. You will note that we have recommended that it be rejected

Do contact me if you have any queries

Very best wishes

David

Chair
Camden Square CAAC

Camden Square Conservation Area Advisory Committee

12 Murray Mews

Date: 30 January 2025

Planning application Reference: 2024/5639/P

Proposal: Erection of a conservatory to the roof terrace on the first floor including alterations to the lower half of the double storey double-glazed window to triple glazed bi-folding doors to allow for access, replace all existing double-glazed rooflights, windows and external glass doors to triple-glazed while maintaining like-for-like appearance of the existing frames in both design and materials, the existing acid etched chevron pattern glass designed by artist Ray Bradley will be reused and installation of an air source heat pump to the rear garden

Summary: Due to its lack of context information, insufficient detail and an unresolved conservatory design this proposal neither maintains nor enhances the conservation area and should be rejected

Comments:

1. Even though the application documents are generally well put together and clear, essential information is missing. In particular
 - 1.1. The proposal's effects on 14 Murray Mews and 13 St Augustine's Road.
 - 1.2. Lack of detailed drawings comparing the existing and proposed (steel) window profiles
2. With the limited information provided on the neighbouring buildings it is difficult to make a conclusive judgement as to whether the bulk of the proposal is appropriate in relation to its neighbours
 - 2.1. The size of the proposed conservatory may not be overbearing, but context photographs and/or drawings should be provided.
3. The scale and proportion of individual openings and features such as porches and dormers, neither relate directly nor offer a complementary contrast to nearby buildings.
 - 3.1. It is unfortunate that the pre-planning advice, which is quoted in the design and access statement, suggests in a very restrictive tone that "the front (sic!) wall of the conservatory be curved to reflect the angle of the wall it is forward of. This would then result in the conservatory appearing coherent and forming part of the attractive and harmonious


Camden Square Conservation Area Advisory Committee

appearance of the rear of the property.” The revised design, which had apparently shown a straight wall in its previous iteration, now comprises a partly curved, partly straight rear façade, which follows the outline of the existing parapet wall, partly sitting on the parapet wall and partly recessed to leave a small gutter space and is at a smaller radius than the glazed façade of the main house. This results in a very convoluted and very difficult to build shape, which distracts from rather than supports the host building. Not having seen the previous design iteration, it is likely, though, that a straight façade may indeed have been more appropriate.

4. The proposal neither maintains the rhythm of existing features of the building nor of neighbouring buildings
 - 4.1. The spacing of the proposed bifold door and window mullions relates to neither the rhythm of the existing curved windows of the main house, nor the spacing of the new glazed roof sections (with the added difficulty of marrying a curved façade with a single slope roof, which will in consequence require very awkward connection details) – all in all resulting in a rather confusing and distracting addition to the main house.
5. One of the major aspects of this application is to replace all existing windows with triple glazed units, stating that there will be “no change to existing frame material and colour”. However,
 - 5.1. The existing, very slim window and door profiles, appear from the photographs to be steel rather than aluminium, as stated in the design and access statement.
 - 5.2. It is important that details of the existing and proposed frames and glazing are submitted to prove that the proportions of the windows and doors are not distorted by inappropriately chunky frames of inappropriate material.
6. A large proportion of the significance of this application lies in the detailed design, both of the proposed conservatory and the replacement windows. therefore,
 - 6.1. More detailed information, therefore, on the proposed window, door and roof sections is required to ensure that the character of the building is not negatively affected.
7. As stated in para 1, with the contextual information available, it is difficult to determine whether the proposal maintains a level of privacy to be expected in a densely-knit urban environment.

Camden Square Conservation Area Advisory Committee

8. There are concerns over possible light pollution
 - 8.1. The conservatory drawings label the new windows facing 14 Murray Mews as having “opaque glass”, which would, strictly speaking, not allow any light to pass through; but the design and access statement on the other hand states that “opaque glass will be used on elevations adjoining neighbouring (sic!) properties to minimise overlooking and **diffuse** artificial light”, implying that obscured rather than truly opaque glass is suggested.
 - 8.2. This, together with the fact that the rear façade and the glazed roof seem to be of clear glass, may cause unacceptable levels of light pollution.
9. The proposed shape of the conservatory will make detailing extremely difficult.
 - 9.1. The detailed proposed conservatory drawings show inadequate section sizes for the roof structure, as well as for window and door frames.
 - 9.2. The connection to the existing building has not been sufficiently resolved, nor the sloping roof/curved rear façade junction.
 - 9.3. It is unlikely that the conservatory can be built as shown: it is very likely to appear much chunkier.
10. Whereas a modest conservatory infill on the first-floor roof terrace and replacing existing double-glazed windows with triple glazed units may be acceptable in principle, the current application should be rejected due to its lack of context information, insufficient details and an unresolved conservatory design.

Signed: 
David Blagbrough
Chair
Camden Square CAAC

Date: 30 January 2025