

CONSULTATION SUMMARY

Case reference number(s)

2022/2202/P

Case Officer:

Leela Muthoora

Application Address:

47 Murray Mews

London

NW1 9RH

Proposal(s)

Erection of 2nd floor roof extension with front roof terrace and solar panels and installation of an air source heat pump with enclosure in rear garden to the dwelling house

Representations

| | | | | |
|-----------------------|------------------|---|-------------------|---|
| Consultations: | No. of responses | 3 | No. of objections | 1 |
| | | | No of comments | 1 |
| | | | No of support | 1 |

Summary of representations

(Officer response(s) in italics)

The owner/occupier of No's 45 Murray Mews and 28 Camden Square have commented on the application on the following grounds:

28 Camden Square July 2022

- As the most affected by the proposed building extension because it lies directly behind my house I support this application as the neighbouring properties to No 47 have three storeys.
- Support the environmentally friendly solar panels.
- Slightly concerned about potential noise from the air source heat pump (ASHP) and look forward to further details.

45 Murray Mews July 2022

As adjacent owners, we are broadly supportive.

We have concerns regarding the siting of any proposed ASHP adjacent to the property boundary and potential for continuous noise nuisance.

We would like confirmation that building work will not extend into the clear space that separates the boundaries of these two, technically detached, properties.

Camden Square Conservation Area Advisory Committee (CAAC)- objection July 2022

Approval should be conditional on a reduction in the overall height of the development and assurance that any noise from the heat pump is an acceptable level.

Comments:

1. We have concerns about the bulk of the development. Whilst the proposed increase in height is roughly in line with the neighbouring buildings, comparison of the existing and proposed elevations shows it to be higher than its neighbours, due to the choice of a steeply pitched roof. The statement that the proposal raises the house to “two and a half” storeys is slightly misleading.
2. We note that the proposal fails to maintain levels of privacy to be expected in a densely-knit urban environment.
3. A daylight study provided with the application shows no negative impact on daylight to neighbours.
4. There is a potential problem with noise pollution. The proposal includes the installation of an air source heat pump, a sustainable measure which is welcomed. However, there is no information on whether this will produce any noise nuisance. Clarification on this issue should be provided.
5. This is generally a well thought out scheme with good descriptive documentation accompanying the application. However, describing the proposal as “two and a half storeys” is perhaps a little misleading. Whilst the top floor does not take up the whole footprint, its increased height is certainly that of a full storey, and the choice to commence the roof pitch eaves in line with the height of the neighbours top storey on one side and above the other’s eaves level means that the house will stand higher than either of its neighbours.
6. The proposal to upgrade energy efficiency is welcomed, and the principle of the extension is not of concern. However, the overall height should be looked at to make the addition more subservient to the host building (particularly at the rear) and respect the heights of neighbouring buildings. This is particularly apparent in View 3 of

section 5 in the DAS.

7. We would suggest a reduction in its overall height before this mews development can be supported.

CAAC response withdraws objections following revisions- November 2022

We would like to make the following observations

1. The justification provided seems reasonable and we are pleased to see that they have relocated the ASHP.
2. In the justification response the front and rear elevations appear to have a straight parapet with balustrading above (Images 4 & 5), whereas in the DAS the existing pitched line is shown as being retained with infilled balustrading. The proposal drawings show the retention of the pitched parapet line as shown in the DAS
3. It would be good to understand what the intention is and for the information to be consistent.
4. We have a slight preference for the straight parapet as the elevations get a bit busy with all of the differing pitch lines behind. However this is a design preference and is not a critical element for planning approval.

Other than the above, we are happy to withdraw our objection to the proposal.

Summary of comments

(Commentary on the grounds of representation, including balanced reasoning for recommendation)

The potential noise from the air source heat pump (ASHP) has been assessed in the Noise Impact Assessment August 2022. The assessment has been reviewed by Council Environmental Health Officers who are satisfied that the appropriate noise guidelines have been followed and the noise criteria have been adequately predicted. They recommended that an enclosure is installed around the plant and advised the decision was subject to conditions.

During the application, the siting of the ASHP has been revised to the rear ground floor to reduce potential for noise and vibration and allow space for an acoustic enclosure.

CAAC objection July 2022

During the course of the application, the bulk of the proposals have been reduced in depth. While the apex of the taller pitched roof would be higher than the highest point of the neighbouring roofs, the design has considered

the roof in relation to its neighbours and for its potential to accommodate functioning solar photovoltaic panels.

The impact on potential loss of privacy has been considered and mitigated by privacy screens. Due to the existing context of the townhouses and mews to the rear, the proposals would result in no greater detriment to the privacy of the neighbouring residential occupiers than the existing window arrangement. The proposal would not result in significant harm to warrant a refusal on these grounds alone.

Following submission of revised drawings to amend the depth of the extension, and relocate the ASHP, accompanied by a justification statement by the architect. The CAAC expressed a design preference for the parapet walls but confirmed their initial objections were withdrawn.

Recommendation: Grant planning permission