



Magdalen House
136-148 Tooley Street
London SE1 2TU
Telephone 020 7234 0234
Facsimile 020 7403 9030
azurbanstudio.co.uk

FAO Nora-Andreea Constantinescu
Development Management
London Borough of Camden
2nd Floor, 5 Pancras Square c/o Town Hall
Judd Street
London
WC1H 9JE

Sent by email: Nora-Andreea.Constantinescu@camden.gov.uk

16th August 2018

Re: Planning application ref. 2018/3110/P – 21 Maresfield Gardens

Dear Ms Constantinescu,

I write to you as agent of planning application ref. 2018/3110/P for development described as *“Roof extension to include creation of crown roof with two rooflights on top, replacement of rear dormer with two dormers, one new front dormer, reinstatement of chimneybreast on southern side, increase in height of the chimneybreast on the northern side, all to non-residential institution (Class D1)”* at no.21 Maresfield Gardens, which is currently under consideration by the Council.

We note that a consultation response to the application has been provided by Mr Stephen Williams for and behalf of the Netherall Neighbour Association. There are some factual errors set out in Mr William’s response which we would like to clarify to the Council in order to assist with their assessment of the application. The below repeats Mr William’s comments and our responses follow:

“The proposed modification of the roof slope to create larger upper floor within the roof is not acceptable. Introducing a mansard roof and forming a flat central roof increases the roof volume significantly. On the front façade it introduces a visually incongruous setting for the façade details, out of keeping with its neighbours and the general rooflines along Maresfield Gardens”.

As set out within the Design & Access, Planning and Heritage Statement submitted as part of the planning application, no. 21 Maresfield Gardens has a particular role to play in the

streetscape and in turn, the Fitzjohns / Netherall Conservation Area. The proposed alterations at roof level enable a more balanced transition between the prominent building of no.19 Maresfield Gardens which exhibits a more pronounced third floor level, and the more recessed no. 23 Maresfield Gardens. The proposal introduces the mansard for one storey before reverting back to the original shallower pitch of the roof back to the ridgeline, as opposed to a full mansard evident at no.19. This same roof form can be seen on the projecting bay no. 23 Maresfield Gardens. The resulting façade and roof slope will not appear as incongruous and will on the contrary, be in keeping with and provide a visual balance between the two immediate neighbouring properties.

“In addition, to allow the raising of the roof, it is proposed to raise the brick parapets significantly on both side elevations which will change the appearance of the roof visible from the road”.

It is important to clarify that the ridge level is to remain the same as existing. The brick parapets will be raised to follow the new profile of the roof, but they remain subservient to the existing ridge and sit lower than both the brick parapets and overall height of no.19 and the ridge of no. 23. Furthermore, we are reinstating the missing historic brick chimney to the side facing no. 19. When viewed from within the context of the streetscene, the restoration of the chimney will reduce the visual impact of the altered parapets and will by far be the prime focal point to any observer.

“The submitted elevations for both back and front elevations fail to illustrate the true effect of this roof change”.

The elevations are an orthographic projection, which correctly represents the scheme. An elevation does not fully represent the street view impact of the scheme, which is why the two street view visualisation were produced, to illustrate how the proposed changes would impact the street.

“The roof will be bulkier, will be an awkward incongruous shape and will push the roof ridge line forward at the front and rear by over a metre. Whilst this is not shown by the submitted elevation drawings, in reality the appearance and bulk of the roof will be considerably changed as partly illustrated in the images on page 21 of the submitted report. It can also be seen that visually the existing roof dormer on the street frontage will be largely lost and the dormer will be, in effect, a window “blip” in the roof, significantly reducing the dormer’s visual importance on the façade”.

The alterations to the roof pitch and the introduction of the flat section at the ridge are fully evidenced on the proposed side elevation and section drawings. The appearance of the roof will not be considerably changed when viewed within the context of the street scene. The existing dormer in the front roof slope remains an important part of the roof composition and

is in keeping with the similar roof composition at no. 19. The visual importance of this existing feature is not therefore reduced.

“In addition, a new dormer window has been introduced to the front elevation at 3rd floor level. The introduction of a dormer window cannot be achieved with the existing roof pitch but requires an increase of the pitch in contradiction of CPG1 Furthermore, the introduction of a “second” level of dormers interrupts the unbroken roofscape at this level. The introduction of new windows on the street frontage should be resisted”.

As reiterated above, the proposed reprofiling of the roof will not result in an increase in the ridge height of the roof – it will involve adding a flat section to the roof whilst retaining the existing pitch angle. The proposed top level dormer is within the zone of the roof where the existing roof pitch angle is maintained and would therefore have the same relationship to the roof slope as the existing dormer in the front roof slope. The proposed additional dormer does not interrupt an unbroken roofscape – dormer windows are evident at upper floor levels of many of the properties within this part of Maresfield Gardens and therefore continue the established pattern of development.

“The raising of the ridge of the roof behind the decorative parapet should be resisted”.

The roof behind the parapet of the projection bay cannot be seen from within the context of the streetscene and therefore raising the ridge by 200mm will have no visual impact.

“The projecting rooflights to the proposed new flat roof will be visible from the properties facing No 21 across Maresfield Gardens and not as the applicant suggests invisible”.

The rooflights will be kept to a minimum upstand of 150mm and will be invisible from the street or within the context of the conservation area. In stark contrast, no. 19 has a pair of large glass roof lanterns that protrude well above ridge, parapet and even chimney lines (as show on front elevation). Despite this, even these lanterns cannot be seen from the street.

“The raised side parapets will affect the light into windows in the adjoining properties at 19 and 23 Maresfield Gardens”.

As set out in paragraphs 5.33 – 5.35 of the Design & Access, Planning and Heritage Statement, there will be no resulting impact on the amenity of the neighbours at no. 19 or no.23 Maresfield Gardens.

“These proposals will seriously weaken the appearance of this important building at 21 Maresfield Gardens and will disrupt the harmony of the group of buildings of which this forms an important central element”.



The three buildings that make up 19, 21 and 23 Maresfield Gardens contain distinct differences to each other, primarily because no. 19 has been extensively remodelled. In comparison, the proposed changes to no. 21 represent a milder form of development and ultimately produces a composition that mediates between its neighbours.

We would respectfully ask that our response is added to the Council's online planning register for consideration as part of the assessment of the application. Please do not hesitate to contact me if you have any queries.

Yours sincerely,

Ellen Creegan MRTPI