

# CONSULTATION SUMMARY

## Case reference number

2019/0670/P

## Case Officer:

Samir Benmbarek

## Application Address:

31 Fitzjohn's Avenue, London, NW3 5JY

## Proposal

Erection of single storey rear extension to lower ground floor flat and associated alterations at rear

## Representations

<b>Consultations:</b>	No. notified	--	No. of responses	02	No. of objections	02
					No of comments	00
					No of support	00

## Summary of representations

*(Officer response in italics)*

The owners/occupiers at the following addresses have objected:

- 16 Fitzjohn's Avenue
- 62 Redington Road

They have objected on the following grounds:

1. Objection to increase of footprints of buildings on Fitzjohn's Avenue, regardless of its scale;
2. Does not provide any housing socially or for the disadvantaged;
3. Removal open air amenity space/green space which could result in a precedent for further erosion within the vicinity;

4. Results in issues with air quality and water run off;
5. Along with general noise, dust and disruption, the works could cause difficulties in accessing the rear garden and could create a hazardous environment particularly for young children;
6. The materials for the roof have not been stated within the planning application. The material should be of a sturdy construction that can withstand weight of people (for access/maintenance issues), is non-slippery and forms adequate drainage;
7. No railings on the roof of the extension which would jeopardise the safety and security of the flat(s) above;
8. The proposed extension contravenes covenants contained within the leases of the flats of the building;
9. No direct communication from Camden Council in regards to the application.

*Officer's Response:*

1. *The proposed rear extension is considered appropriate in its scale as it does not extend further than the existing rear elevation of the building and makes use of the existing garden return/inset;*
2. *The application concerns a minor extension to provide additional living accommodation for an existing flat and not the creation of a singular or multiple residential units. As such, housing policies are not applied to this development;*
3. *In comparison to the overall area of the rear garden, the scale of built form being developed is considered acceptable and would retain a vast amount of garden/rear amenity space;*
4. *Due to the small scale of the extension and the extension being developed mainly on an existing hardstanding, it is considered that the development would not impact upon air quality or water run-off.*
5. *It would be expected that the construction works would be done in accordance with health and safety regulations as it mandatory within practice. Access arrangements to the garden would also be as part of the practice but it is recommended this be discussed with all occupiers of the building.*
6. *The applicant has confirmed that the proposed roofing would also be in matching brickwork.*

- |  |  |
|--|--|
|  | <ol style="list-style-type: none"><li>7. <i>The provision of railings would have been considered as an inappropriate element if it was proposed. It is considered that the proposal not would jeopardise the safety and security of the upper floor flats in the building. Any railings or roof terrace here would require separate planning permission.</i></li><li>8. <i>Contractual and lease agreements are not a material consideration of granting planning permission. These aspects should be discussed between all owners/occupiers of the building.</i></li><li>9. <i>Camden Council no longer send direct consultation letters to neighbours as of October 2016. Multiple site notices were erected around the vicinity of the applicant property and it is encouraged residents sign up to the e-alerts system to be updated of further planning applications.</i></li></ol> |
|--|--|

**Recommendation:-**

**Grant planning permission.**