|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **CONSULTATION SUMMARY** | | | | | | | |
|  | | | | | | | |
| Case reference number(s) | | | | | | | |
| 2017/4587/P | | | | | | | |
| Case Officer: | | | | Application Address: | | | |
| Emily Whittredge | | | | 94 Agamemnon Road  London  NW6 1EH | | | |
| Proposal(s) | | | | | | | |
| Erection of two storey rear extensions, and erection of outbuilding to replace existing garage. | | | | | | | |
| Representations | | | | | | | |
| Consultations: | No. notified | 0 | No. of responses | | 01 | No. of objections  No of comments  No of support | 01  0  0 |
| Summary of representations(*Officer response(s) in italics*) | The owner/occupier of 92 Agamemnon Road has objected to the application on the following grounds:   1. The loss of the garage would add to parking stress in the area; 2. Potential noise nuisance from proposed playroom in loft; 3. Proposed covered passage to the new outbuilding could impact on view and light at the rear of the house; 4. Impact of construction works on adjoining garden and cemetery wall to the rear; 5. Excavation of cellar and new foundations could affect the structure of my house;   The occupier also made the following comments/requests:   1. The new outbuilding will be no higher than the existing garage to avoid loss of light and privacy; 2. Strict controls will be placed on times of construction; 3. There is no party wall agreement in place for matters such as phone and broadband cables;   **Officer response**   1. The loss of the on-site parking complies with transport policy T2 of the Local Plan and is acceptable in planning terms. 2. Issues of building regulations such as noise insulation are not planning matters. The proposed use of the loft for a playroom falls within the existing residential use and cannot be resisted for planning reasons. 3. No covered passage is proposed as part of the development. 4. This impact is covered by the Party Wall Act and is not a planning matter. 5. No excavation of the cellar is proposed. Excavation for foundations of this scale are minor and do not raise concern in respect of major engineering works, tree impacts or archaeology. The impact is therefore acceptable in planning terms, and is also covered by the Party Wall Act. 6. The proposed outbuilding would be 500mm higher than the existing garage, but would have a hipped roof. Due to the modest increase in height, the north facing orientation of the garden and the existing tree cover, the proposed 3.2m high outbuilding would not have a significant adverse impact on the amenity of the adjoining occupiers, in terms of light, outlook or overbearing, and would have a similar impact as the existing garage. 7. Construction works, and associated noise are considered temporary in nature and able to be managed by the Control of Pollution Act 1974. The public is able to contact Environmental Health if any concerns arise during the construction period [here](https://www.camden.gov.uk/ccm/navigation/environment/environmental-health/?context=live), including working outside of time limits. 8. Issues such as services are covered by the Party Wall Act and are not planning matters. | | | | | | |
| Recommendation:- Grant planning permission | | | | | | | |