CONSULTATION SUMMARY

Case reference numbe	er(s)						
2017/3291/P							
Case Officer:			Application Ad	Application Address:			
Obote Hope			47 Princess Road	47 Princess Road			
			London				
			NW1 8JS				
Proposal(s)							
Erection of two-storey infill extension at lower and upper ground floor levels and installation of roof terrace with metal balustrade at ground floor level all associated with the use as residential (Class C3).							
Representations							
	No. notified	0	No. of responses	1	No. of objections	1	
Consultations:					No of comments	0	
					No of support	0	
	Objections from	occup	ier of <u>No 49 Princess</u>	Road of	on the following grou	inds:	
Summary of representations	• I have seen the application for the adjacent property and am in general content with the volumes proposed; however, I am very concerned about the impact of any overlooking from the proposed first floor terrace on my small garden.						
(Officer response(s) in italics)	Officer's response are as follows:						
,	• The proposed terrace would not have a detrimental impact in regards to loss of privacy into no. 49 Princess Road's rear garden. The terrace is set back and between high closet wings so direct side views are not possible. It is very small so would not accommodate large parties of people. The rear gardens have mutual overlooking						

along large grou As s	b their size and setting surrounded by properties closely located Edis Road and Princess Road. In addition, there are series of windows to the flank elevation facing no 49 Princess Road at d floor level, which is similar in depth with the terrace proposed. ch, the potential impact would not be harmful and not serious the to warrant refusal.				
Comments	eceived from Primrose Hill Advisory Committee are as follows:				
chara	pjection to the proposal is raised in regards to the impact on the cter and appearance of the conservation, the impact of the sed two storey rear extension would be minimal;				
	etention and creation of the openings would follow the pattern of ain house;				
exist	round floor terrace is modest in depth and set back within the ng side addition and any overlooking would be limited to the rear house on Edis Street directly opposite;				
• The	lass balustrade is not appropriate in this location, and;				
critic enlar	st depth and deep set back of the proposed roof terrace are I to the acceptability of the proposal, which should not be ged or extended further back towards the rear boundary. Nor this proposal set a precedent for other terraces in other ons.				
Officer's res	Officer's response are as follows:				
	lass balustrade was revised and the proposed metal balustrade complement the design and appearance of the host building;				
rear sche Furth adve settir deter plani acco	uly noted that the proposed roof terrace along with the 2 storey extension would be appropriate in design/appearance. The ne would not have a detrimental impact on the loss of privacy. ermore, it is not considered that the proposal would have an se impact with the loss of daylight/sunlight due to its design and g within the terrace. All application for development are nined on a 'case by case' basis. As such, any subsequent ing proposal for a similar scheme would be considered in dance with the Local Plan 2017 and the relevant supplementary ing guidance.				
adve settir deter plan acco	se impact with the loss of daylight/sunlight due to its de g within the terrace. All application for developm nined on a 'case by case' basis. As such, any sub ing proposal for a similar scheme would be consid dance with the Local Plan 2017 and the relevant supple				

Recommendation:- Grant planning permission