

# CONSULTATION SUMMARY

## Case reference number(s)

2017/4801/P

## Case Officer:

Nastassja Lazarus

## Application Address:

Flat A, 71 St Augustine's Road

London

NW1 9RR

## Proposal(s)

Erection of rear extension at ground floor level

## Representations

	No. notified	0	No. of responses	3	No. of objections	3
<b>Consultations:</b>						

<p><b>Summary of representations</b></p> <p><i>Officer response is in italics.</i></p>	<p>Three objections have been received, two of which have been received from the same address. Therefore in accordance with Council's Statement of Community Involvement the two representations received from the same address are effectively counted as one representation. Hence, the application can be decided under delegated authority without referral to the Members Briefing panel.</p> <p>The content of all representations are considered as part of the planning process.</p> <p>Summary of comments (with officer response in italics):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Concern raised regarding visibility of the contemporary style rear extension to neighbouring properties, harmful to the character and</li> </ul>
--	---

appearance of the conservation area and host property, contrary to Policies B1, B4 and B7 of the Replacement UDP 2006. Rear extension would result in the site being over-built, considering the presence of an existing outbuilding in the rear of the garden.

*Rear extensions of a similar depth are present at No. 73 and No.69 St Augustine's Road. The existing outbuilding is acknowledged, however due to the depth of rear gardens at this location, the proposed site cover is considered to be appropriate.*

*It is acknowledged that the proposed extension is contemporary in nature, although the minimal design and use of lightweight, quality materials is considered to result in a sympathetic addition to the host building. Further, the replacement UDP has now been superseded by the Camden Local Plan 2017.*

- The proposed extension would result in privacy concerns and loss of outlook for occupiers on upper floors at No. 71. The consultation response mentions overlooking into proposed bedrooms at ground floor of 71. Consultation responses raise concern regarding the proximity of the proposed rear extension to an existing floor to ceiling window on an upper level and the ability to overlook into proposed bedrooms

*The roof of the single storey rear extension would, be constructed using a non-reflective grey coloured rubber roofing and with no terrace proposed, thus there would no overlooking into proposed bedrooms at ground floor level. A condition is required to ensure the flat roof is not used as a terrace.*

- The consultation responses mention current loss of privacy and garden space due to the existing outbuilding, and how the proposed rear extension would further contribute to loss of garden space and outlook.

*As the rear extension is a modest 3.5m in depth, the proposal would not result in an extensive loss of garden space, it is therefore considered that the proposal would not result in a significant loss of outlook from rear windows on upper floors at No. 71.*

- The consultation responses mention health predicament, and how noise, fumes and general disruption in the construction phase of the development would further negatively impact their health, and how

they are largely housebound. The objector has requested advanced warning and accurate dates for start and completion of works.

*Concerns raised regarding construction noise and impacts on health fall outside the scope of a planning consideration however an informative is added reminding the applicant of the Environmental health legislation and hours of construction works.*

*A condition is added to the decision notice stating that works must commence within three years of the decision date.*

*The Council is not in a position to impose any further restrictions on the undertaking of development within the three year timeframe.*

- The consultation responses raise concern regarding originally proposed side facing windows. Consultation responses state that proposed (side facing) openings would be unwarranted and surplus to requirement with regard to light, ventilation and design. Further, concerns are raised by objectors regarding overlooking from No. 73 into proposed windows at 71A.

*Plans have been revised to remove proposed openings and alterations to existing openings on the side elevation of 71a. Therefore openings in the side elevation shall remain as existing.*

- Concern regarding the use of the roof of the proposed extension as an amenity area.

*A condition is added saying that no part of the proposed roof is to be used as an amenity area, such as a terrace.*

- The proposed side extension and increased boundary wall height is considered to be unnecessary and should be reduced or removed.

*Plans have been revised and the side extension has since been removed and the side boundary wall height will remain as existing.*

- No. 71 contains Council owned properties. Concerns are raised regarding the ability to undertake maintenance and cost of maintenance to Council and tax payers. Further, the consultation response states that the neighbours would not be willing to assist with access provision for erection of any scaffolding to undertake maintenance.

*Concerns raised regarding ownership, maintenance and maintenance cost fall outside the scope of a planning consideration and will not be considered as part of this planning application.*

- Plans and the Design and Access Statement do not address how surface run-off shall be addressed.

*In keeping with the contemporary design, the Agent advises that the rainwater pipes will be internal.*

- Concerns regarding loss of planting in rear garden, resulting in waterlogging

*Plans do not indicate the loss of significant vegetation, larger trees towards the rear of the property would remain. The property is located in Flood Zone 1 – low-level flooding, therefore flooding is not normally assessed in a small-scale application of this nature.*

- Back window to 71B serves as a fire escape.  
*This is considered to be a non-material planning consideration. Fire safety would be considered in the building and regulation and other relevant legislation.*

- Security concerns resulting from the proposed rear extension.

*The proposal is not considered to affect safety and security, this is considered to be a civil matter.*

**Recommendation:-**

**Grant planning permission**