

CONSULTATION SUMMARY

Case reference number(s)

2016/2176/P

Case Officer:

Laura Hazelton

Application Address:

15 Rosecroft Avenue

London

NW3 7QA

Proposal(s)

Variation of condition 3 (approved plans) of planning permission 2014/7227/P dated 30/03/2015 (for the erection of a single storey rear extension with 2 x rooflights and balcony above), namely, the change of rear fenestration details, rear extension roof and balustrading (retrospective).

Representations

Consultations:	No. notified	18	No. of responses	2	No. of objections	2
					No of comments	0
					No of support	0

Summary of representations

(Officer response(s) in italics)

The owner/occupier of no.9 Rosecroft Avenue has objected on the following grounds:

1. Design
 - a. The increase in first floor roof height contravenes planning guidance.
 - b. The removal of the eaves fascia board which carried the rainwater gutter and is an important part of the roofline aesthetic.
 - c. The side parapets have been capped with inappropriate concrete slabs.
 - d. The use of timber poles for the balustrade is crude
2. Amenity
 - a. The removal of the eaves fascia board and gutter has resulted in discharge onto the terrace at no.9.
 - b. Roof drainage has been taken via down pipes onto the ground with no

gulleys or proper soakaways.

- c. The raised balcony would compromise the privacy of no.9.

The owner/occupier of 99b Clarendon Drive, SW15 1AN has objected on the following grounds:

1. Design – The development harms the character of the building and conservation area.
2. Amenity - The development directly affects neighbours. Rainwater gutter removed and all rainwater re-directed to discharge directly onto the ground. There is no gully or proper soak-away arrangement.

Officer response

1 Design

The increase in height of the first floor extension by 30cm is not considered a significant alteration. Although Camden Planning Guidance recommends that extensions are set down below the roof eaves, the development is not considered to cause sufficient harm to the character of the host building as to warrant refusal of the application. The original works were modified so that the rear extension roof sits just below the eaves of the main roof slope, which is considered more acceptable. The materials used do not detract from the character of the building, the join between the extension roof and host building is not widely visible from ground level, nor the wider public realm and the overall development is considered acceptable.

2 Amenity

Planning permission is not required for the installation/removal of guttering, and the planning department therefore cannot insist upon this. However, the applicant was requested to revise the plans at the officer's request to include a new downpipe/guttering, and the matter is being investigated by the Council's Building Control department.

The raised balcony is not considered to result in a significant increase in the potential for overlooking than what was previously approved. The proposal still includes the installation of a 1.8m high obscured privacy screens from the external floor level which meets Camden's recommendations to prevent overlooking between neighbouring properties.

Recommendation:-

Grant planning permission