

CONSULTATION SUMMARY

Case reference number:

2016/6953/P

Case Officer:

John Diver

Application Address:

3 Inverforth Close
London
NW3 7EX

Proposal:

Alterations to dwelling (C3) comprising replacement roof including new dormer windows and roof terrace to facilitate loft conversion, conversion of garage into habitable room and erection of a porch and no.2 front bays at ground floor level.

Representations

Adjoining Occupiers:	No. of responses	1	No. of objections	1
Summary of consultation responses:	<p>A site notice was displayed near to the site on the 23/12/2016 (consultation end date 13/01/2017). The application was also advertised in the local press on the 05/01/2017 (consultation end date 26/01/2017).</p> <p>One letter of objection has been received from the owners/occupiers of nos.2 Inverforth Close. The comments raised can be summarised as follows:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none">1. Request for roof terrace to be removed on the basis that it would cause overlooking to rear garden as well as a dormer window which is currently proposed under a separate application.2. Screening to terrace would appear as an alien feature.3. Noise from terrace would lead to noise and disturbance.4. Scale of terrace contrary to CPG15. Drawings submitted incorrect and do not accurately plot building line6. Submitted daylight sunlight report based on plans is also inaccurate.7. Incorrect certificate signed within application form <p><u>Officer's response:</u></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none">1. <i>The applicants have submitted revised plans to show that the terrace would be screened to the South to a minimum height of 1.8m and that a planter would be placed to ensure that users of the terrace would not be able to stand immediately adjacent to this edge. The retention of the screen and</i>			

planter would be secured via condition. These two elements are considered to have overcome issues regarding overlooking to the South. With regard to the proposed dormer window, it is not possible to assess the impact upon a feature which is not in existence. This element would require express permission which, at the time of writing, had not been granted and therefore this is not a material consideration for this application. Notwithstanding this, it should be noted that the level of overlooking from the terrace into any dormer window build out in this location in the future is likely to be limited, with views afforded at oblique angles only.

2. In order to screen the rear edge of the terrace, a 1.8m screen would be erected, 0.4m of which would be visible above the roof edge. The several properties within the local area feature decorative detailing at ridge level in the local area and it is not considered that the addition of a 0.4m screen would lead to a cluttered roof form or cause harm to the integrity of the overall design. Details of the screen will be secured via condition.
3. The proposed terrace would serve a single family dwellinghouse and would be of an area that would not allow for the congregation of large groups. The potential noise and disturbance from the terrace is therefore not considered to substantiate a reason for refusal.
4. The scale of the proposed terrace would remain proportionate to the host property as well as overall roof volume. It is considered that the proposed terrace complies with the criteria set out within paras.5.25 – 5.26 of CPG1.
5. Following the receipt of this comment, the applicants were asked to respond to this point. The applicant responded to state that as the building line at ground floor level in this location is not proposed to be altered from existing and the variation highlighted would be de minimis the submitted drawings maintain an accurate illustration of the proposed works.
6. Submitted alongside the objection comment is a floor plan of the adjacent property with an overlay of the building line as described as accurate by the objectors. This plotted line shows the Eastern bay window to be located approximately 30cm further East than as shown on drawings. The submitted daylight/sunlight report found that the proposed extensions would cause no detrimental impact upon adjacent habitable room by quite some margin. The report outlines that all windows would continue to receive the recommended 27% VSC value and the proposed level of daylight would continue to be greater than 0.8 times the former value, leading to a negligible impact. The report also finds there to be no impact in terms of sunlight and that the adjacent garden would not be overshadowed to a degree which would substantiate a reason for refusal against the latest BRE guidelines. Even if the objection comment is correct in its assertion of the plotted building line, considering the form of the proposed roof, it is considered highly unlikely that the marginal difference suggested would lead to the assessment being altered from negligible to a major adverse impact. Given the siting of the neighbouring window in relation to the extended roof pitch the proposed development would not result in a loss of light to this neighbouring window. In addition the neighbouring window serves a bedroom and is not the main habitable living accommodation to the unit. Therefore the proposed development would not have a detrimental impact on the amenity that would be enjoyed by the neighbouring residents.

	<p>7. <i>Following the receipt of this comment, the applicants were also asked to respond to this point. The applicants have confirmed that they are the sole freeholders of the property and that they have therefore given all relevant freehold consent. As a certificate has been signed and the applicants are confident that this was the correct version of the certificate of ownership, no objection is raised. The consideration of property ownership is a civil matter for which the Local Planning Authority may not intervene. Notwithstanding this, submitted revisions have included a gutter along the southern and eastern boundary which is in the exact same position as existing in order to address this concern.</i></p>
Hampstead CAAC	<p>One letter of comment was received on behalf of the Hampstead CAAC. The comments raised can be summarised as follows:</p> <p>1. HCAAC agrees with the proposals in general but requested that the ridgeline is increased to form a dual pitch to improve proportion and remove area of flat roof</p> <p><u>Officer's response:</u></p> <p>1. <i>In order to remove the flat roof section and form a dual pitch, the ridgeline of the dwelling would need to be increased a further 1.1m than currently proposed (1.8m higher than existing). The resulting eaves to ridge height would be 4m and this would result in a highly top heavy appearance. It would also mean that the proposed uplift and the resulting mass would be considerably enlarged, increasing the impact upon the Metropolitan Open Land. On balance it was considered that in this instance, maintaining a lower massing which better relates to the ground floor of the property would be preferable than increasing the ridge height to form a more traditional roof form.</i></p>
<p>Recommendation:-</p> <p>Grant conditional planning permission</p>	