



**Planning Solutions Team**  
**Planning and Regeneration**  
 Culture & Environment  
 Directorate  
 London Borough of Camden  
 2<sup>nd</sup> Floor  
 5 Pancras Square  
 London  
 N1C 4AG

[www.camden.gov.uk/planning](http://www.camden.gov.uk/planning)

**Date: 18/06/2018**  
**Our ref: 2018/2200/PRE**  
**Contact: Laura Hazelton**  
**Direct line: 020 7974 1017**  
**Email: [laura.hazelton@camden.gov.uk](mailto:laura.hazelton@camden.gov.uk)**

Mr Lida Kokorelia  
 Kokorelia Architects Limited  
 14A Coolhurst Road  
 London  
 N8 8EL

*By email*

Dear Mr Lida Kokorelia,

**Re: 5 and 6 Rosslyn Park Mews, NW3**

Thank you for submitting a pre-planning application enquiry for the above property which was received on 17/05/2018 together with the required fee of £426.00.

**1. Drawings and documents**

Existing and proposed plans, sections and elevations, site location plan, photos, daylight & sunlight report, received by email dated 08/05/2018.

**2. Proposal**

Erection of rear and side extensions at ground floor and mansard roof extension with inset roof terrace within the roof slope.

**3. Site description**

The application site comprises 2 x 2 storey semi-detached post war 1960s properties which are located in a mews of an intimate scale to the south of Lyndhurst Road.

The buildings are not listed, but are located in the Fitzjohns Netherhall conservation area to which they are not specifically listed as making a positive contribution.

**4. Relevant planning history**

No.5

2015/3209/P - Erection of front two storey part width extension, conversion of garage to residential use including new window, new windows at second floor front and first floor side elevations, replacement front door and awning, installation of two rear rooflights and replacement of two rear roofslope rooflights. Planning permission granted 16/07/2015.

2014/7915/PRE - Basement, side, loft extensions, garage change of use to residential and other elevational alterations. Officers advised that a roof extension would not be supported at application stage.

No. 6

No planning history.

NB. There is no planning enforcement history for either property.

## 5. Relevant policies and guidance

[National Planning Policy Framework 2012](#)

[Draft Revised National Planning Policy Framework 2018](#)

[The London Plan March 2016](#)

[Draft New London Plan 2017](#)

[Camden Local Plan 2017](#)

Policy A1 Managing the impact of development

Policy D1 Design

Policy D2 Heritage

[Camden Planning Guidance](#)

CPG1 Design (July 2015, updated March 2018)

CPG Amenity (September 2011, updated March 2018)

[Fitzjohns and Netherhall conservation area statement 2001](#)

## 6. Assessment

The principle planning considerations are considered to be the following:

- Design (Impact on the character and appearance of the host building, Rosslyn Park Mews and wider Fitzjohn's Netherhall Conservation Area); and
- Amenity (impact on neighbouring amenity in terms out daylight, outlook and privacy).

Pre-application advice was previously sought by the current owners/occupiers of no.5 Rosslyn Park Mews as to the acceptability of a roof extension to this property. The Officer advised that the proposed extension would interrupt and detract from the consistent roof pattern in the mews and that it was considered to overwhelm the scale and proportions of the existing building. The Officer also highlighted that there were significant concerns relating to the proximity to the residential properties on Lyndhurst Road and the fact that the development could impact neighbouring daylight/sunlight, create a sense of enclosure and overwhelm the intimate and small scale nature of the mews.

Officers' views are now sought on the acceptability of a roof extension to the semi-detached pair of properties, nos. 5 and 6, with a roof terrace incorporated into the rear roof slope. A daylight and sunlight report has been submitted with the pre-application submission to assess the impact of the proposals on neighbouring properties within the mews and Lyndhurst Road to the rear.

Planning permission was granted in 1966 for the redevelopment of the mews with the erection of three three-storey terrace houses, two two-storey semi-detached houses and a two storey detached house. It is clear that the scale, design and height of nos.5 and 6 was limited to 2 storeys with no rear windows in direct response to the relationship with the properties along Lyndhurst Road which are located less than 6m away at their closest point. Likewise, the 3 storey dwellings on the opposite side of the Mews respond well to the 3 storey Rosslyn Lodge, and are not located close to any nearby properties so as to impact their residential amenity.

The erection of an additional storey above nos.5 and 6 would add additional bulk which is considered to overwhelm and dominate this small cul-de-sac. Although the double extension to both semi-detached dwellings would address the previous Officer's pre-application concerns relating to an inconsistent roofline; the proposals are still considered to cause harm to the character of the Mews by reason of the increased sense of enclosure and massing which would overwhelm the intimate and small scale nature of the Mews.

Although the submitted daylight report concluded that the scheme should not be refused on daylight grounds, the figures show that a number of the windows serving 12 – 14 Lyndhurst Road would experience a significant and noticeable reduction in daylight and sunlight. BRE guidance states that rooms would experience a noticeable reduction in daylight/sunlight, if the loss to each window is more than 0.8 times its former value. The worst affected would be 13 Lyndhurst Road which would see the daylight to the living room reduced to 0.57 times its former value. In addition, the erection of an extra storey to the existing blank rear elevation is considered to have a considerable impact on the outlook from these residential windows and to create a harmful sense of enclosure. For these reasons, the proposed roof extensions are considered to result unacceptable harm to the amenity of neighbouring residents.

In terms of the detailed design of the proposals, the proposed roof extension would feature a sloped front roof slope which would follow the pitch and proportions of the existing roof. To the front elevation, the window openings would remain as existing at ground and first floor, except for the stairwell window which would be reduced in height and replaced with a single pane of glass. The new roof extension would feature window openings to match the size, position and design of the windows on the first floor.

The alterations to the existing fenestration would be unlikely to be supported, namely, the changes to the existing stairwell window which is considered an attractive feature. Likewise, the large window openings at second floor level are not in keeping with the existing window hierarchy nor the 2<sup>nd</sup> floor window openings to the neighbouring properties. If the proposals were considered acceptable in all other regards, it is felt that the window openings should reflect the smaller design with a horizontal emphasis seen at numbers 1-3 Rosslyn Park Mews.

The proposed rear roof terrace is considered unacceptable on both design and amenity grounds. A high level roof terrace in this location would be a discordant feature, highly visible from Lyndhurst Road and neighbouring properties. The proposed glass balustrade would project above the main roof ridge, interrupting the roof pattern and architectural style of the application buildings and the rest of the mews. The use of glazing would not be appropriate or sympathetic to the existing character in this location. Furthermore, users of this terrace would have clear views into the rear windows of the Lyndhurst Road properties and cause significant

harm to their privacy. In order to overcome this, a large privacy screen would be required which would worsen the harm to the appearance of the building already identified.

The proposed corner extension to no.6 is considered a sympathetic alteration which would preserve the character and appearance of the mews, provided it is constructed of matching materials and windows design. The new angled windows to this elevation are considered acceptable in design terms; however, there are concerns over the potential overlooking of the neighbouring windows serving the residential flats at the Olave Centre (12c Lyndhurst Road). This would need to be thoroughly assessed and necessary mitigation measures included as part of any future planning application.

## 7. Conclusion

The proposals raise significant concerns as a result of the harm caused to neighbouring outlook, daylight and privacy. The bulk, height and detailed design of the roof extension along with the proposed terraces would also cause harm to the character and appearance of the host buildings and wider Mews, and would be unlikely to be supported at full application stage.

## 8. Planning application information

If you submit a planning application which addresses the outstanding issue detailed in this report satisfactorily, I would advise you to submit the following for a valid planning application:

- Completed form – Full planning application
- An ordnance survey based location plan at 1:1250 scale denoting the application site in red.
- Floor plans at a scale of 1:50 labelled 'existing' and 'proposed'
- Roof plans at a scale of 1:50 labelled 'existing' and 'proposed'
- Elevation drawings at a scale of 1:50 labelled 'existing' and 'proposed'
- Section drawings at a scale of 1:50 labelled 'existing' and 'proposed'
- Design and access statement
- Sample photographs/manufacturer details of proposed materials
- The appropriate fee
- Please see [supporting information for planning applications](#) for more information.

We are legally required to consult on applications with individuals who may be affected by the proposals. We would put up a site notice on or near the site and, advertise in a local newspaper. The Council must allow 21 days from the consultation start date for responses to be received.

It is likely that that a proposal of this size would be determined under delegated powers, however, if more than 3 objections from neighbours or an objection from a local amenity group is received the application will be referred to the Members Briefing Panel should it be recommended for approval by officers. For more details click [here](#).

**This document represents an initial informal officer view of your proposals based on the information available to us at this stage and would not be binding upon the Council, nor prejudice any future planning application decisions made by the Council.**

If you have any queries about the above letter or the attached document please do not hesitate to contact Laura Hazelton on the number above.

Thank you for using Camden's pre-application advice service.

Yours sincerely,

Laura Hazelton

Planning Officer  
Planning Solutions Team