

CONSULTATION SUMMARY

Case reference number(s)

2015/4083/P

Case Officer:

Tessa Craig

Application Address:

111A Torriano Avenue

London

NW5 2RX

Proposal(s)

Replacement of single-storey rear extension and roof terrace with part single, part double-storey rear extension and external staircase. Changes to front lightwell.

Representations

Consultations:	No. notified	0	No. of responses	18	No. of objections	01
					No of comments	01
					No of support	00

Summary of representations

(Officer response(s) in italics)

The owner/occupier of No's 113A Torriano Avenue and NCHC who own 113 Torriano Avenue have objected and commented on the application on the following grounds:

1. Depth;
2. Height;
3. Mass;
4. Loss of light;

5. Out of keeping with Victorian property;
6. Inappropriate materials;
7. Light pollution;
8. Overlooking;
9. Overdevelopment of site.

Officer Comment:

1. *The depth of the extension would be 7cm deeper than the existing closet wing to 113 Torriano Avenue (3.975m deep). The extension is considered modest (less than 4m) and in keeping with the scale of other rear extensions on this side of Torriano Avenue.*
2. *The lower ground floor extension would measure 2.3m in height from the adjoining ground level at the boundary with 113 Torriano Avenue. It was noted at the time of site visit that a timber fence has been erected at the boundary with 113 Torriano Avenue which is approximately 2.2m high from ground level at the subject property and about 1.6m high at 113 Torriano Avenue due to the higher ground level at 113 Torriano Avenue. The lower ground floor extension would be 0.7m higher than the boundary fence. Under permitted development, a fence which is 2m high at 113 Torriano Avenue could be erected at the subject site, in which case the extension would only be 0.3m higher than a permitted development fence. The upper ground floor extension is part width and set back 2.3m from the boundary with 111 Torriano Avenue. The ground floor extension would be 2.6m high and is set 2.3m from the boundary with 113. Given the limited height of this element and its distance from the boundary, it is not considered to be out of scale or unduly dominant and is considered acceptable.*
3. *The proposed mass is considered acceptable given the full width extension is at lower ground level and the ground floor extension is part width.*
4. *Whilst there may be some shading of 113 Torriano Avenue as a result of the development, the proposed lower ground and ground floor extensions are not considered to cause significant loss of light to 113 Torriano Avenue. The height of the lower ground extension would be 0.3m higher than if the applicant were to build a boundary fence under permitted development (2m fence permitted development). The lower ground flat of 111 Torriano Avenue is already shaded by the closet wing of 111 Torriano Avenue. It is not considered a*

daylight report is necessary.

- 5. Most of the properties in the terrace include two storey rear extensions. The scale and mass of the extension is considered sympathetic to the host building and not out of character with the area.*
- 6. Whilst the extension shall be constructed from contemporary materials, it is considered they are acceptable in the rear elevation and shall be of a high quality, similar to other modern developments in the area. The lower ground shall be brick and the upper ground floor shall be timber clad. A condition of consent will require samples of the materials be submitted for approval.*
- 7. Whilst a small roof light (1.2sqm) is proposed on the part width ground floor extension, the light would shine on the stairwell directly behind the extension. The lower ground floor extension would not cause more light pollution than the existing ground floor and the glazing faces the rear garden.*
- 8. The development is not considered to cause overlooking. Fixed louvers on the ground floor extension would restrict views back into 111 Torriano Avenue and this shall be secured by consent condition (condition 4).*
- 9. The lower ground and ground extensions are not considered overdevelopment; they are 4m deep and shall remain subordinate to the main building. The extensions are consistent with development on this side of Torriano Road.*

Recommendation:- Grant planning permission