

CONSULTATION SUMMARY

Case reference number(s)

2018/2664/P

Case Officer:

Tony Young

Application Address:

39 Sarre Road

London

NW2 3SN

Proposal(s)

Single storey side/rear extension and remodelling of existing rear hardstanding patio space

Representations

Consultations:	No. notified	0	No. of responses	2	No. of objections	2
					No of comments	0
					No of support	0

Summary of representations

2 consultation responses were received from local residents (**Susan Burke & David Scott**) who raised objections to the proposals summarised as follows:

1. Extension would result in reduced side access space (between nos.39 and 37) with associated sense of enclosure and wouldn't be wide enough for lifetime homes/access or wheelchair users.
2. Proposals include replacement of boundary fence (between nos.39 and 37). Owner/occupier at no.37 has sole responsibility for fence and has no plans to replace it.
3. The side extension would restrict outlook into rear garden from the French windows in the rear ground floor room at no.37. Should be reduced to 2.5m in height to the eaves with pitched roof to reduce impact.

4. Extension will lead to loss of open space and be visible from the road down the side passage.
5. To proceed with proposal as it stands would set an undesirable precedent for other similar and attractive Edwardian properties from 15-41 Sarre Road.

Officer's response:

1. *The existing access route (between nos.39 and 37) from the road to the rear of the main house is narrow with a steel gate and sloping ground which already restricts access to the rear gardens of both properties. Other existing site constraints include a boundary fence that subdivides this route even further. The proposals do not involve any alterations to this boundary fence and the owner/occupier at no. 37 has also confirmed that they have no plans to alter it either. While the Council encourages dwellings to be adaptable for future use, under these particular circumstances, it is not reasonable to require a wider side access in this location.*
2. *The proposals do not include any alteration to the boundary fence with no.37.*
3. *Revisions to the proposals reduce the height of the extension to approximately 2.5m on the boundary with no.37 and with a pitched roof as suggested by the objectors. Although the extension would still be visible in part from no.37 at ground floor level, the extension would be set approximately 0.6m away from the shared boundary and 4.4m away from no. 37's rear outrigger. It is noted also that any existing side windows/doors at no. 37 already face onto the boundary fence and their outlook is not considered to be significantly diminished by the proposal. Given the separation distance, design, height of the extension and existing boundary fence, it is also considered that the proposal would not result in any significant loss of light or increased sense of enclosure to an extent that would warrant a reason for refusal.*
4. *Given the narrow gap between nos. 39 and 37 when viewed from the front of the properties, the proposed extension would be hardly visible from within the public domain, and as such, there are no visibility concerns in this regard. The proposal would also allow for a reasonably sized garden to be retained in the context of the host property and wider rear verdant environment and in accordance with Council guidance and policies.*
5. *The application proposal has been fully assessed and considered on*

its own merits, and against current policies and guidance, the site's planning and appeals history, and with regard to the Fortune Green and West Hampstead Neighbourhood Plan.

Note: please also refer to the decision notice (2018/2664/P) for further information.

Recommendation:- Grant Full Planning Permission