

# CONSULTATION SUMMARY

## Case reference number(s)

2023/0654/P

## Case Officer:

Blythe Smith

## Application Address:

Flat 1  
6 Gascony Avenue  
London  
NW6 4NA

## Proposal(s)

Erection of a single storey extension to the rear at ground floor level.

## Representations

<b>Consultations:</b>	No. notified	0	No. of responses	3	No. of objections	2
					No of comments	0
					No of support	0

## Summary of representations

### *(Officer response(s) in italics)*

Two owner/occupiers from the same property in no. 4 Gascony Avenue and one owner/occupier from Flat 2, 4 Gascony Avenue have objected to the original application on the following grounds:

- Scheme is misrepresented in the application
- Extension would break the terrace building line and set a precedent
- Existing internals of the property are mislabelled
- Trees and shrubs not mentioned in the application form
- Loss of amenity space

- Impact to outlook
- Impact to sunlight
- Impact to adjoining brick wall

Officer's response:

*One objector has suggested that the scheme is misrepresented in the application but doesn't explain how. Without further clarification it is not possible that fully respond to this comment; however, the plans submitted fully illustrate what is being proposed and an assessment can be made based on this information.*

*Each planning application is assessed on its own merits and therefore the granting of the proposal would not be considered to set a "precedent" for other new development along this part of the terrace. The building line to the rear of Gascony Avenue is not consistent and as such the development would not harm the pattern of development to the rear.*

*The application is assessing the proposed extension and its impacts on neighbouring residents. As the property is not a listed building the internal layout of the existing rooms within the property, although useful, is not required to assess the application.*

*Normally an arboricultural report would be required where trees are being removed. However, Camden's tree officer has reviewed the submitted plans along with photographs of the rear garden space and has confirmed that there would not be any significant trees removed as part of the proposal that would affect the character of the area or provide a high level of public amenity.*

*Amended plans have been submitted to reduce the depth of the extension by 1m. It is noted that there would be a loss of 11 sq, m of amenity space (with the rear garden measuring 37.9 sq. m) and this would result in a loss of 29% of the garden, a useable proportion of garden space would still be retained. .*

*It should be noted that the specific view from a property is not protected as this is not a material planning consideration. At 2m deep and 2.8m in maximum height the proposed rear extension would not overshadow any habitable rooms for either neighbour or create a sense of enclosure.*

*The rear elevations of the properties on this side of the terrace are south-east facing and the resulting rear extension would not create an*

*unacceptable loss of sunlight/daylight to any rear facing windows.*

*The shared brick wall between No.4 and No. 6 is considered a party wall issue and not a planning consideration. Issues associated with the party wall are covered under a Party Wall agreement.*

**Recommendation:-**

**Grant conditional planning permission**