

# CONSULTATION SUMMARY

## Case reference number(s)

2023/1300/P

## Case Officer:

Daren Zuk

## Application Address:

Flat 1  
80 Marchmont Street  
London  
WC1N 1AG

## Proposal(s)

Erection of single-storey first-floor rear extension.

## Representations

<b>Consultations:</b>	No. notified	0	No. of responses	2	No. of objections	2
					No of comments	0
					No of support	0

## Summary of representations

*(Officer response(s) in italics)*

Two responses in objection were received from neighbouring occupiers. Their comments are summarised as follows:

### Objections

1. No notice of the application was provided.
2. No dimensions or heights were provided on the submitted application documents.
3. Further information on the owner should be sought.
4. The submitted Daylight and Sunlight Review is inaccurate. The proposed rear extension would have negative effects on the availability of daylight/sunlight to the ground-floor commercial unit and first-floor residential flat at no.82.
5. The design of the rear extension is not in keeping with the existing Victorian terraces.

6. The noise impact from the construction is unacceptable.

**Officer response:**

1. A site notice was posted near the property on 14/04/2023 and a press notice published in the Ham & High on 20/04/2023. Camden Council does not send out public notification letters for planning applications.
2. The inclusion of dimensions on application drawings is not a requirement. All drawings have been provided to scale as stated on the plans. Further information on dimensions is included in the Application Form.
3. Property ownership information is not a material planning consideration.
4. The submitted daylight and sunlight review was reviewed by officers and found to be acceptable. It contains sufficient information and rationale in support of the application. Further, the 2m depth of the extension is considered minor enough to not impede the airflow to the rear of the properties along Marchmont Street, and not to have an impact on the availability of daylight/sunlight.
5. The design of the rear extension is considered acceptable, with matching brick and windows. A Conservation Officer reviewed the proposed plans and did not have any concerns with the design or the impact on the host building and wider conservation area.
6. The proposed extension is minor in scale and thus a Construction Management Plan is not required. The application will be required to adhere to the Noise and Pollution Act 1974, which outlines hours of construction.

**Bloomsbury CAAC**

No response received.

**Recommendation: Grant planning permission**