

CONSULTATION SUMMARY

Case reference number(s)

2019/0811/P

Case Officer:

Josh Lawlor

Application Address:

31 Crediton Hill

London

NW6 1HS

Proposal(s)

Erection of a single storey rear extension with 2 x rooflights; insertion of door to use roof of extension as terrace, 3 x rooflights to main roof slope, demolition of existing conservatory

Representations

Consultations:	No. notified	0	No. of responses	0	No. of objections	1
					No of comments	1
					No of support	0

Summary of representations

One comment was received from 33 Crediton Hill, this was a request for the installation of a privacy screen to prevent harmful overlooking from the terrace above the flat roof of the extension

Officer response: the terrace has been amended to be the same size as the terrace approved at no. 33 Crediton Hill (ref. 2013/5409/P). A privacy screen with measuring 1.8m by 1.7m has also been included in the proposal.

One objection was received from 29 Crediton Hill, the objection can be

summarised as the following:

- 1. Inaccurate plans which do not account for the difference in gradient between application site and no.29*
- 2. Plans do not accurately show the rear building line of no. 29, which is set further back*
- 3. The side passage between no. 31 and no. 29 is owned by 29, the proposed extension would abut our garden*
- 4. Overbearing impact*
- 5. Sense of enclosure*
- 6. Loss of light, the proposal would fail the 45 degree test at ground and first floor windows, and loss of light to side windows*
- 7. Rear first floor windows overlooked from terrace*
- 8. Design is out of character with conservation area, loss of bay window, use of render is unsympathetic to host building*
- 9. Visibility from the road*
- 10. Impact on drainage and loss of garden amenity space*

Officer response:

- With regard to points 1-2 above, the plans have been amended to accurately show the relationship of the application site to neighbouring buildings*
- With regards to point 3, the issue of the extension abutting the boundary wall/fence would be a party wall matter and is not a material planning consideration*
- With regards to points 4, 5 and 6, the proposed extension would not cause a harmful loss of light. It is noted that these comments were informed from a site visit to no.29. The extension would marginally fail the 45 degree test when measured from the ground floor rear window. This has also been measured using the existing plans for the registered application for a rear extension at no. 29 (ref.*

2019/1292/P). The rear windows of no. 29 are south-west facing. There is an existing high fence and vegetation which the extension would rise marginally above. The proposed extension would therefore not harm access to light or create a material sense of enclosure. No. 29 would still retain high quality outlook of the rear garden.

- With regard to point 7, the proposed terrace has been set back, no overlooking would not occur to the rear 1st floor windows at no. 29.
- The extension respects the existing depths and heights of rear development on this street. The side elevation of the extension would not be rendered, the applicant has confirmed this. The loss of the bay window is regarded as acceptable and was deemed acceptable by the planning inspector in the appeal at no.35 decision ref. 2017/2619/P allowed on the 05/02/2018. This application represents a very similar form of development from a design standpoint.
- In regards to point 9, the proposal would not include a side extension, and would not be significantly visible from the street.
- In regards to point 10, a large garden amenity space would be retained and the extension would not increase risk of flooding to a material affect.

Recommendation:-

Grant planning permission