

# CONSULTATION SUMMARY

## Case reference number(s)

2017/2399/P

## Case Officer:

Charlotte Meynell

## Application Address:

81 Clarence Way  
London  
NW1 8DG

## Proposal(s)

Erection of single storey rear extension.

## Representations

<b>Consultations:</b>	No. notified	0	No. of responses	2	No. of objections	2
					No of comments	0
					No of support	0
<b>Summary of representations</b>  <i>(Officer response(s) in italics)</i>	<p>The owner/occupier of Nos. 79 and 83 Clarence Way have objected to the application on the following grounds:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Daylight and sunlight – The extension fails the BRE Daylight and Sunlight 45 degree rule and will unacceptably compromise daylight and sunlight to the adjacent neighbouring properties. A Daylight and Sunlight report should be produced to prove that neighbouring daylight and sunlight will not be unacceptably affected.</li> <li>- Overbearing nature – The extension will have an overbearing impact on No. 83 due to the close relationship of the proposed extension and the dining room window of No. 83. Design of side of extension clad in black timber will add to the overbearing and heavy visual impact of the design and loss of outlook to Nos. 79 and 83.</li> <li>- Overdevelopment – Consider extension together with approved first</li> </ul>					

floor extension at same to be overdevelopment of what is a small terraced house in a conservation area.

- A similar application at No. 68 Clarence Way was refused due to overdevelopment in the conservation area.

Summary of comments

- *Given the modest height and depth of the proposed single storey extension set in 0.2m from each side boundary, it is not considered that the proposal would have a significant adverse impact on neighbouring amenity in terms of loss of sunlight and daylight. It is therefore considered that the submission of a BRE Daylight and Sunlight report would not be necessary in this instance.*
- *Given the modest height and depth of the proposed single storey extension set in 0.2m from each side boundary, it is not considered that the proposal would have a significant adverse impact on neighbouring amenity in terms of loss of outlook. The proposed timber cladding to the sides of the extension is considered acceptable given the location of the proposal to the rear of the property and given that timber cladding is already a feature of the rear fenestration of the host building and the adjacent neighbour No. 83.*
- *The proposal is considered to be of a modest size, and would allow for the retention of a reasonably sized rear garden. The proposal is considered to be in keeping with the pattern of development along Clarence Way.*
- *The only planning history for No. 68 Clarence Way is application 9200345 for the erection of a roof extension to form additional habitable space for the dwelling house plus minor elevational changes at rear, which was refused on 09/07/1992 as it was considered that the roof extension would have an adverse effect on the appearance of the building and the visual amenity of the street, by reason of its bulk and proportions. Overdevelopment was not a reason for refusal in this application.*

**Recommendation:-**

**Grant planning permission**