

CONSULTATION SUMMARY

Case reference number

2024/2312/P

Case Officer:

Leela Muthoora

Application Address:

12 Burrard Road, London, NW6 1DB

Proposal

Erection of side infill extension with mono-pitched glazed roof and rear extension with flat roof and skylight.

Representations

Consultations:	No. of responses	1	No. of objections	1
Summary of representations <i>(Officer response(s) in italics)</i>	The owner/occupiers of No's 14 Burrard Road have objected to the application on the following grounds: <ol style="list-style-type: none">1. Rear Dormer: Comments about application for rear roof dormer.2. Neighbours' extension: The rear infill extension is incorrectly shown on the land of the adjoining property's land and needs revision.3. Partial Infill History: No. 14 previously had a partial infill extension under a different planning application, reference 2017/3169/P. This extension ensured appropriate scale and visual impact which addressed the neighbours' concerns around bulk, mass, scale and light to the neighbouring kitchen and courtyard.4. Loss of Light: No sunlight and daylight assessment was submitted. Due to its position the glazed infill extension at No. 14 is vulnerable to loss of light, overshadowing and a sense of enclosure.5. Boundary wall: existing wall shown on drawing PL02 (Proposed Plans) is built on No 14 land and not on the boundary.			

6. The two applications should be considered together.

Summary of comments

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

1. *The dormer to the rear roof was approved under Certificate for Lawful Development under application reference number: 2024/2313/P, on the 17 July 2024. The roof extension falls within householder permitted development rights a Permitted Development is a planning permission granted by the General Permitted Development Order (GPDO) and therefore does not require planning permission.*
2. *The objection asserts the glazed extension is shown incorrectly. A site visit was carried out on 18 June 2024 where the location of the neighbouring extension was observed and documented in photos which has informed the assessment. It can also be viewed in the submitted objection photos so has informed assessment.*
3. *The amendments made to the extension at number 12 were assessed and negotiated under a previous application. The proposal would have had an impact on light to windows located due south and at a lower level to the proposal.*
4. *Daylight / sunlight: The proposed extension marginally dissects the neighbour's rear elevation door and extension on elevation; however, it complies with the 45-degree rule on plan. Due to the extension being due north, at slightly higher ground level and fully glazed, a daylight/sunlight assessment is not considered necessary in this instance. Furthermore, due to the fully glazed neighbouring extension, the impact on light would not be so harmful as to justify a refusal on these grounds.*
5. *Sense of Enclosure: Any increased sense of enclosure that may arise from a new boundary wall is mitigated by the mono-pitch roof sloping down to the boundary. This reduces the bulk of the extension to the side return. Furthermore, the height of the boundary wall to number 14 would be almost 2m which meets permitted development and could be built without planning permission. This would be subject to Party Wall matters.*
6. *Party wall matters: The Party Wall Act 1996 provides a framework for preventing and resolving disputes in relation to party walls, boundary walls and excavations near neighbouring buildings. These are considered civil matters dealt with under different legislative regimes; therefore, they are not material planning considerations.*
7. *They are two types of application, the previous application for a roof*

extension was to establish it complied with permitted development rights under the GPDO. The subject application is a householder application. The Council can only assess what forms part of the application, any subsequent applications will be assessed on their merits.

8. *The objection asserts the two proposals should be considered together: There are two types of application, the previous application for a roof extension was established as permitted development under the GPDO. The subject application is a householder application. The Council can only assess what forms part of the application, any subsequent applications will be assessed on their merits.*

Recommendation:- Grant planning permission