

View neighbour responses

45, MURRAY MEWS, LONDON, NW1 9RH

Application number: 25-00114-HAPP

In assessment 16 days to determination date

Proposed second-floor extension to front and rear.

Date consultation will end

05/02/2025

Responses (10)

Hide all sections

Objection responses (6), Hide

Objection

• Jonathan Reed-Lethbridge [REDACTED]

• Received on 05/02/2025

* Comment on the design, size or height of new buildings or extensions: Over the past twenty...

* Comment on the design, size or height of new buildings or extensions: Over the past twenty years changes in scale have occurred to properties in Murray Mews. Modest Mews homes have been allowed to become quite substantive (now expensive) houses. Several years ago numbers 40 and 45 underwent development, and a further floor was added to each. This did to some degree dwarf adjacent houses. The precedent was then set, and further 'scaling-up' has at intervals along the Mews occurred. At number 41 a larger volume was recently added to the top floor.

The proposals to now enlarge the top floor of number 45 will have an impact on the

neighbouring properties. Particularly to number 47 and our home number 43. The 'street-scape' will change again, and with this mind we are opposed to the current proposals on grounds of overbearing scale to the locality.

[View more](#)

DESIGN

[Redact and publish](#)

[Edit](#)

Objection

- **Mohamed** [REDACTED]
- [REDACTED]
- Received on 22/01/2025

* Other comments: The building is not suited for a person with disabilities as myself.

* ...

* Other comments: The building is not suited for a person with disabilities as myself.

* Comment on the use and function of the proposed development: No lift in the building

* Comment on disabled access: No lift

* Comment on any impacts on natural light: The trees need to be cut

* Comment on any impacts on privacy of neighbours: Ok

[View more](#)

OTHER

USE

ACCESS

LIGHT

PRIVACY

[Redact and publish](#) (Redacted by: Nora Constantinescu)

[Edit](#)

Objection

- **Mischa Weiss-Lijn** [REDACTED]
- [REDACTED]

• Received on 26/01/2025

* Comment on the design, size or height of new buildings or extensions: We would like to register...

* Comment on the design, size or height of new buildings or extensions: We would like to register our opposition to application 25-00114-HAPP, since it is not in keeping with the area's Appraisal and Management Strategy and will strongly impact the light and compromise the design of #47 Murray Mews's terrace.

The proposal does not respect the general nature, nor continue the rhythm of, or adhere to the pattern of the Murray Mews Extensions. In the Appraisal and Management Strategy for this conservation area, Murray Mews is described as having "two or two-and-a-half stories [...] which take an imaginative approach to development in the spirit of a mews' scale, form". As such, houses preserve the scale of the mews by using; either mansards, half-width extensions or full-width boxes that are either set much further back or are on much narrower properties.

This extension breaks precedent, with adding over 50% to their existing second floor resulting mass being directly visible from the mews, that is much larger than on any existing house. In response to an initial proposal for #47, which had to then be substantially scaled back, the planning officer commented that extensions should be "subservient to the host building but also to the scale of the neighbouring streets". We would suggest that this same guidance should also be applied with regards to this proposal.

Furthermore, in response to the initial proposal for #47, the planning officer suggested, an already less visible facade "be set back further to reduce its impact from the street". This same recommendation is applicable here, as would the observation from that same response that "both bedrooms are well above the GLA's minimum standards for both single or double bedrooms so this should be achievable". A half-width extension, that mirrors the one on #47, would offer the opportunity to achieve 2 bedrooms and an en-suite, to GLA standards, while not compromising the neighbouring properties (see sketch: <https://tinyurl.com/mr33wpy8>). * Comment on any impacts on natural light: The application will strongly impact the light to #47 Murray Mews's terrace.

As opposed to the statement in this proposal that it "has no impact on 43 and 47 Murray Mews", it has a substantial impact on #47. This is due to the 'mews facing' portion of the extension jutting out substantially in front of the recently approved one at #47. Consuming well over half of what was a light filled facade of #47's terrace, cutting the light and views, and ruining its carefully considered design (see illustration: <https://tinyurl.com/5cwyhyet>).

* Other comments: The application hints at the issues highlighted above in that it lacks the appropriate transparency. It fails to include the outlines of the neighbouring extensions in it's plan drawing, making it easy to miss the substantial impact of this proposal on #47. It also does not include 3D drawings (but includes incorrectly rendered shadows on the front elevation drawing), making it impossible to judge the impact of this design on the mews more generally.

#47 has recently completed a half-width extension, which was deliberately set back further on the side next to #45, to substantially reduce it's visibility from the mews and to perfectly align it's facade with the #45 extension. So, far from "align[ing] the external walls with the adjoining second floor extensions" as claimed in the design statement, it is actually disrupting the existing alignment.

The proposal claims to offer the benefit of "more privacy to 47 Murray Mews terrace". However we were not consulted about any of these plans. If we had been, we would have made it clear that we are perfectly content with the privacy already offered by the 3 frosted glass privacy screens on the boundary wall.

This proposed extension would ruin the terrace's aesthetic, by cutting out in front of, and breaking the symmetry of, our privacy screens (see illustration: <https://tinyurl.com/5cwyhyet>).

[View more](#)

DESIGN

LIGHT

OTHER

[Redact and publish](#) (Redacted by: Nora Constantinescu)

[Edit](#)

Objection

- **Mischa Weiss-Lijn** [REDACTED]
- [REDACTED]
- Received on 26/01/2025

* Comment on the design, size or height of new buildings or extensions: [Note: This comment...

* Comment on the design, size or height of new buildings or extensions: [Note: This comment contains some minor wording corrections to our previous comment]

We would like to register our opposition to application 25-00114-HAPP, since it is not in keeping with the area's Appraisal and Management Strategy and will strongly impact the light and compromise the design of #47 Murray Mews's terrace.

The proposal does not respect the general nature, nor continue the rhythm of, or adhere to the pattern of the Murray Mews Extensions. In the Appraisal and Management Strategy for this conservation area, Murray Mews is described as having "two or two-and-a-half stories [...] which take an imaginative approach to development in the spirit of a mews' scale, form". As such, houses preserve the scale of the mews by

using; either mansards, half-width extensions or full-width boxes that are either set much further back or are on much narrower properties.

This extension breaks precedent, by adding over 50% to their existing second floor, with the resulting mass directly visible from the mews being much larger than on any existing house. In response to an initial proposal for #47, which had to then be substantially scaled back, the planning officer commented that extensions should be “subservient to the host building but also to the scale of the neighbouring streets”. We would suggest that this same guidance should also be applied with regards to this proposal.

Furthermore, in response to the initial proposal for #47, the planning officer suggested, an already less visible facade “be set back further to reduce its impact from the street”. This same recommendation is applicable here, as would the observation from that same response that “both bedrooms are well above the GLA’s minimum standards for both single or double bedrooms so this should be achievable”. A half-width extension, that mirrors the one on #47, would offer the opportunity to achieve 2 bedrooms and an en-suite, to GLA standards, while not compromising the neighbouring properties (see sketch: tinyurl.com/mr33wpy8). * Comment on any impacts on natural light: As opposed to the statement in this proposal that it “has no impact on 43 and 47 Murray Mews”, it has a substantial impact on #47. In particular this application will strongly impact the light to #47 Murray Mews’s terrace.

This is due to the ‘mews facing’ portion of the extension jutting out substantially in front of the recently approved one at #47. It is consuming well over half of what was a light filled facade of #47’s terrace, cutting the light and views, and ruining its carefully considered design (see illustration: tinyurl.com/5cwyhyet). * Other comments: The application hints at the issues highlighted above in that it lacks the appropriate transparency. It fails to include the outlines of the neighbouring extensions in it’s plan drawing, making it easy to miss the substantial impact of this proposal on #47. It also does not include 3D drawings (but includes incorrectly rendered shadows on the front elevation drawing), making it impossible to judge the impact of this design on the mews more generally.

#47 has recently completed a half-width extension, which was deliberately set back further on the side next to #45, to substantially reduce it’s visibility from the mews and to perfectly align it’s facade with the #45 extension. So, far from “align[ing] the external walls with the adjoining second floor extensions” as claimed in the design statement, it is actually disrupting the existing alignment.

The proposal claims to offer the benefit of “more privacy to 47 Murray Mews terrace”. However we were not consulted about any of these plans. If we had been, we would have made it clear that we are perfectly content with the privacy already offered by the 3 frosted glass privacy screens on the boundary wall.

This proposed extension would ruin the terrace’s aesthetic, by cutting out in front of, and breaking the symmetry of, our privacy screens (see illustration: tinyurl.com/5cwyhyet).

[View more](#)

DESIGN

LIGHT

OTHER

[Redact and publish](#) (Redacted by: Nora Constantinescu)

[Edit](#)

Objection

- **Stephen Weiss** [REDACTED]
- [REDACTED]
- Received on 29/01/2025

* Comment on the design, size or height of new buildings or extensions: It is noticeable that no...

* Comment on the design, size or height of new buildings or extensions: It is noticeable that no dimensions are provided with this application.

However it is possible to calculate these from the scale provided. From this I work out that this application would like to increase the size of the area of the top floor from 31.5 Sq M to 48.15 Sq M - an increase of 53%.

This would be a massive increase in the bulk, visibility and intrusiveness of the top floor of No 45 Murray Mews, onto it's neighbours and the general public.

My house faces the rear of No 45 and so will only be directly affected by the the proposed extension over more than half of the rear roof terrace. The existing roof terrace is 2.75 M deep. This proposal suggests covering a depth of 1.40 M of this with a box shaped extension which would of course overlook my back garden. This will also of course significantly reduce the light reaching the rear of my property, particularly in the mornings.

Apart from the part of this proposal that directly affects my property, I also object in principal to the proposed extension on the side which overlooks Murray Mews. Having lived in Camden Square since 1975, I have seen many developments and conversions in Murray Mews and Camden Mews over the years. Up until now, when Planning Applications have been granted, planners have always insisted that any new 2nd floor had to be modest and well set back from the front and rear walls of the building. This proposal flies in the face of that convention.

The present box shaped 2nd floor is set back 2.8 M from the front of the house. This proposal would like to bring that box within 1.5 M of the front wall thus making it much more visible and intrusive as seen from both Murray Mews but also from

Canteloves Road. This flies in the face of all of the previously permitted 2nd floors - and indeed this one - where they are well set back and or have much less visible roofs.

* Comment on any impacts on natural light: The very large size and the box shape of the roof of this proposed 2nd floor, will have a significant negative affect on the light reaching our back garden. The proposed 2nd floor is totally out of scale with all the other neighbouring properties, which I notice are not shown at all in this application. It is clear that by doing that, the applicant would like to hide the impact that this proposal would have on their neighbours.

* Comment on any impacts on privacy of neighbours: This proposal would bring the top floor of the rear of No 45, 1.4m closer to us. It would also of course reduce our privacy but increase our feeling of being overlooked, accordingly.

* Other comments: I think that it is really bad that this application has been submitted without any dimensions being given and also without showing the neighbouring properties and the effect that it will have on them.

It is clear that the proposed 2nd floor is far too big and protrudes far to much onto the existing terraces both on the Murray Mews side and at the back.

I am also aware that this proposal will have a very negative impact on its neighbour at No 47, because being to its south, it will block a great deal of sunlight from reaching that property. The applicant has clearly given no consideration to this.

[View more](#)

DESIGN

LIGHT

PRIVACY

OTHER

[Redact and publish](#) (Redacted by: Nora Constantinescu)

[Edit](#)

Objection

- **STEPHEN BENTLEY** [REDACTED]
- [REDACTED]
- Received on 05/02/2025

* Comment on the design, size or height of new buildings or extensions: This appears a poor...

* Comment on the design, size or height of new buildings or extensions: This appears a poor application and lacks clear dimensions and also does not really show how it will affect neighbouring properties in the visualisations given.

However it is clear the scale is disproportionate to others, including neighbouring properties, which will tend to reduce the charm of the mews. * Comment on any impacts on natural light: The very large size of this proposed development will have a significant effect it increasing the shading of neighbouring properties and will generally reduce the light penetrating the area. It will shade properties at both the front and the rear which is a most unwelcome plan making the area less pleasant for all * Comment on any impacts on privacy of neighbours: The proposal would bring the outside of the property and the windows closer to the neighbouring properties which is completely unwelcome and unnecessary since the property is large scale already and would cause a loss in privacy. A decrease in privacy would also also be caused by decreasing the size of the rear terrace bring users closer to my property

[View more](#)

DESIGN

LIGHT

PRIVACY

[Redact and publish](#)

[Edit](#)





