

2015/5061/P	93 Highgate West Hill	Installation of metal balustrade to rear 1st floor in connection with the use of part rear extension roof as a terrace.	Oluwaseyi Enirayetan
<p>General</p> <p>Other than the Application Form, the Design and Access Statement, CIL forms and site photographs, etc, not being available on the web this application appears to be identical to 2014/7459/P which the CAAC has previously commented upon and which was refused by LBC.</p> <p>The comments below are a repeat of the comments made for the earlier application and assume that the missing documents are also exact copies of the earlier application.</p> <p>Strongly Object</p> <p>The installation of a metal railing would create a roof terrace which would grossly overlook the garden and rear bedroom of 94 HWH and as such should not be allowed.</p> <p>That a smaller balcony¹ existed prior to the construction of ground floor extension described in 2011/0263/P is immaterial, the 2011 application was deemed lawful development on the basis that no roof terrace was constructed, the decision notice clearly stated planning permission would be required for such a feature. This application should be judged solely on the merits of creating a roof terrace in the location proposed ignoring any earlier structures.</p> <p>The HLE Conservation Area Appraisal & Management Strategy raises the concern of unacceptable overlooking in relation to roof alterations and recessed roof terraces.</p> <p>CPG 5 states (5.23) <i>Balconies and terraces can provide valuable amenity space for flats that would otherwise have little or no private exterior space. However, they can also cause nuisance to neighbours. Potential problems include overlooking and privacy, daylight, noise, light spillage and security.</i></p> <p>93HWH enjoys large private gardens both to the west of the main house (facing HWH) and east alongside Makepeace Avenue.</p> <p>Notes</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The original (<2011 approval) balcony was both narrower (NS dimensions) and shallower (EW) than that shown on the current application. This can be seen from existing plan submitted with application 2011/0263/P and the photographs with this application, the original balcony was a simple rectangle extending not much beyond the window openings. 2. There are various errors in the Design & Access Statement including in sections (10) & (11) references to the glass balustrade which was proposed in the subsequently withdrawn application 2014/4097/P and in section (11) terming 93HWH as part of a terrace. 			