

CONSULTATION SUMMARY

Case reference number(s)

2016/4716/P

Case Officer:

Darlene Dike

Application Address:

162A Goldhurst Terrace

London

NW6 3HP

Proposal(s)

Erection of a single storey rear infill extension to flat.

Representations

| | | | | | | |
|-----------------------|--------------|----|------------------|---|-------------------|---|
| Consultations: | No. notified | 20 | No. of responses | 2 | No. of objections | 2 |
| | | | | | No of comments | 0 |
| | | | | | No of support | 0 |

Summary of representations

Two owner/occupiers of number 164 Goldhurst Terrace have objected to the application on the following grounds:

1. DAYLIGHT AND SUNLIGHT

- The proposed boundary wall is too high and will impact daylight and sunlight.
- The proposed brick wall of the extension and boundary treatment would block low morning light to 164 Goldhurst Terrace, a property with north facing outlook that already suffers from low light levels
- There is no mention of the height of the proposed boundary wall. If approval is granted clear limitations should be given on its height relative to the existing ground level to ameliorate effects on daylight and sunlight.

2. PRECEDENT

- The applicant is seizing on the unacceptable precedent set by the approved rear extension at 168 Goldhurst Terrace.

3. DAMPNESS AND FLOODING

- The proposal to raise the garden level will lead to an increase of dampness/flooding in the rear garden of 164 Goldhurst Terrace.
- The erection of an extension as well as paved or concreted patio would result in a loss of permeable ground surface area in turn resulting in flooding to neighbouring properties

Officer Response

1. DAYLIGHT AND SUNLIGHT

As acknowledged within the objections, given the north-facing orientation of the site, the property at 164 Goldhurst Terrace currently receives only limited levels of direct sunlight through the passage of the day. In view of this it is not felt that proposals, in particular the erection of the side brick wall to the extension and new brick boundary wall, have the scope to harmfully impact daylight and sunlight to an extent that would be noticeable.

Further to this, the permeation of daylight and sunlight between the properties is presently very limited by the presence of a thick screen of vegetation which reaches first floor level, far higher than the height of the proposed boundary wall and extension, and so proposals would result in an arrangement no worse than the existing condition.

Whilst explicit annotation is not made of the height of the boundary wall, it is indicated by its inclusion in scalable drawings, which show that it will be 1.9m high. At this height the proposed boundary wall is not considered by officers to be too high. It is worth noting in fact that at under 2m, the proposed boundary wall falls below the height at which it would require express consent, and as it does not require planning permission is only included in the drawings for comprehensiveness. Nonetheless, limitation on its height is set by its inclusion in proposed drawings - as development must be in accordance with these drawings, the height of the proposed boundary wall is limited to 1.9m.

2. PRECEDENT

Each application is determined on its own merits so development at 168 Goldhurst Terrace does not set an immovable precedent in the manner suggested, however the pattern of development in the immediate vicinity has been taken into account during the assessment of this application.

3. DAMPNESS AND FLOODING

The garden level is not being raised as part of this application, proposals simply seek to introduce a paved area to the section of the rear garden closest to the house to allow accessible egress to the garden. The

| | |
|--|--|
| | <p><i>agents for the application have confirmed by email that rainwater will be pumped away from this area and transferred to a soakaway, or otherwise permeable paving slabs installed. Consequently, it is not felt that this change will have a negative impact in terms of localised dampness or flooding as sufficient measures have been taken to overcome these concerns.</i></p> |
|--|--|

Recommendation:- Grant Conditional Planning Permission