



Diocese of Westminster

PROPERTY DEPARTMENT

Mr David Peres De Costa
Planning Department
London Borough of Camden
2nd Floor
5 Pancras Square
c/o Town Hall
Judd Street
London
WC1H 9JE

26th January 2016

Dear Mr Peres De Costa

Re: 2 Maresfield Gardens, NW3 5SU – Application 2015/6894/P

Thank you for the notification of the above application seeking a variation to condition 3 of Application 2014/6313/P dated 20/3/2015. This original application was seeking a further addition at second floor with a new roof and alterations to the coach house facade to provide 6 residential units, it appears they are increasing the front lightwell, creating rear stepped lights to the basement a glazed infill extension at the rear and a 1st floor roof terrace at the rear with opening French doors. The application is being made by Mr D Pine of AZ Urban Studio on behalf of 2 Maresfield Gardens Ltd.

The metal railings to the side roof and the second floor of the coach house flat has french doors to the side could lead to the creation of a nuisance to the church users as the garden is used by the parish and the side passage between the application property and the church is part of the fire route. Looking at the plans there is not a key to features on the roof of the proposed roof plans drawing 0052-106. It appears to show a central void and other detailing to the windows.

We would object to the further extension of the property as this is an over development of the site. We would also have concerns about the further excavation of the coach house at basement level front and back close to the church as previous contractors have undertaken work without consent on our land. A basement has been added through earlier applications and is not original. It should not be further extended beyond the existing footprint of the building. This needs to be in line with the council policy on basements it should only be permitted with reference to policy DP27 Basements and Lightwells.

Please reply to: Property Services, Diocese of Westminster, St Joseph's, St Joseph's Grove, London, NW4 4TY



The existing sub-surface box at the end of the garden is to be infilled. This is to be welcomed as it is and has been an anomaly from earlier applications but it should not constitute a building to allow further development on the site.

On the proposed ground floor plan with the site boundary, identified as 0052-100 revision C, it is unclear if the area on the boundary to the front close to CTV is the bin store area for the flats as there are no notes or keys.

On proposed section CC 0052-304 it refers to free drainage and it would appear this is soaking into the ground but it is not clear. The applicant makes reference to this being dealt with by SUDS. The area is gravelled to the church so we would not want damp problems arising within the church. There have been problems with the soil conditions and subsidence to buildings in the vicinity.

As the building is in a conservation area and the building has been extensively extended and various applications made over the last six years the amendments should be controlled. While on their design statement it is stated roofs are an important and conspicuous element the side railing to the roof of the coach house at second floor is visible from the street at the front and will be a loss of privacy to neighbours if used as amenity space. The other homes in the street of this period will not have this detailing. The rear lightwells to the middle flats are screened by the remainder of the building. The artists impression indicates the glazing is just onto the garden so light nuisance is controlled and less obvious and intrusive at low level. This should not be further extended.

We would ask the French doors to the coach house at second floor are refused to protect the front elevation of the house and privacy of the church and other properties used by the parish. This is against Policy DP26 of the Development Policies.

If the garden is to be extended due to the rear ground structure being infilled the coach house could have a section of the communal garden as amenity space and will **not** require use of the large side balcony to the coach house. This will not then affect the conservation area and the roof design to this building and the amenity of the parish and neighbours.

It is understood the third floor that is to be the nominated flat under the section 106 agreement. This does not have any direct amenity space while the lower flats to the main house do. Each of the properties will have access to the large rear garden.

Thank you for your assistance in dealing with this.

Yours sincerely



Carol Haigh
Estates Surveyor