

CONSULTATION SUMMARY

Case reference number(s)

2025/0383/P

Case Officer:

Kristina Smith

Application Address:

2 And A Half
Rudall Crescent
London
NW3 1RS

Proposal(s)

Erection of front and side extensions and alterations to ground floor fenestration; garden landscaping works including provision of mobility scooter and bin storage shed; alterations to boundary treatment including installation of electronic sliding gate.

Representations

Consultations:	No. of responses	2	No. of objections	2
			No of comments	1
			No of support	0
Summary of representations (Officer response(s) in italics)	<u>Two objections were received from neighbouring residents on the following grounds:</u>			
	<ul style="list-style-type: none">Visual detriment of front extension within a conservation area. <i>Officer response: the front extension would have no greater impact on the front elevation than the existing front porch. Although wider and slightly deeper, it would be much lower. The existing boundary treatment conceals most of the extension from view.</i>Have had concerns about the impact of construction on the stability of adjoining buildings, given the nature of the subsoil and the existence of underground watercourses in the area. Have been provided with various assurances by the resident's architect and, in order to protect the neighbouring property and request that conditions reflect those assurances			

and details included in the plans that have been submitted:

Officer response: the impact on the stability of neighbouring properties is not a planning consideration in the context of a modest extension. This is a matter for Building Control and Party Wall Act.

- That the foundations of the rear extension are dug by hand to avoid any unnecessary vibration and movement of the subsoil and neighbouring buildings.

Officer response: as above. This is not considered a reasonable condition of planning permission.

- That the roof of the rear extension is a sedum roof, cannot be used as a roof terrace and may only be accessible for maintenance.

Officer response: the roof is secured as a green roof which is not compatible with being used as a terrace. The green roof condition ensures the green roof is retained in perpetuity.

- That the height of the rear extension roof is no greater than 20cm above the existing garden dividing wall or the existing rear fence, whichever is lower.

Officer response: this is detailed and secured by the drawings

- A cellular attenuation system mentioned in the Design and Access Statement (but which does not appear on the plan) is installed.

Officer response: Given the nature and scale of the works, there is no policy requirement for a cellular attenuation system to be installed.

The following comment was received from a representative of the Rudall Crescent Residents Association:

- Appreciate effort made by owner to consult extensively with surrounding neighbours about this application which is an improvement on previously applications. Now much more in-keeping with the property and utilises an area of dead space that provides little amenity value
- Apart from one, no other members of the RA have objected subject to several provisos surrounding height on boundary wall, a condition to restrict the flat roof from being used as a terrace.

Officer response: the roof is secured as a green roof which is not compatible with being used as a terrace. The green roof condition ensures the green roof is retained in perpetuity.

Recommendation:-	
Grant conditional planning permission	