## CONSULTATION SUMMARY

Case reference numbe	r(s)						
2019/6039/P							
Case Officer:		Application Address:					
Kristina Smith		73 Leverton Street					
		London					
		NW5 2NX					
Proposal(s)							
Erection of single storey side infill and rear extension							
Representations							
	No. of responses		2	No. of objections	0		
Consultations							
Consultations:							
	The owner/occupier of 129	South End Close	has m	ade the following			
	The owner/occupier of 129 South End Close has made the following comments:						
Summary of representations ( <i>Officer response(s)</i> <i>in italics</i> )	Likely to be substantial impact in terms of construction traffic						
	Officer response: the application is for minor works to an accessible site (via						
	rear from Railey Mews. It is not considered proportionate to secure a Construction Management Plan in this instance.						
	<ul> <li>To mitigate traffic impact the proposal should consider recycling flora and fauna affected by works</li> </ul>						
	<ul> <li>Plants should be recycled throughout Camden as a condition of</li> </ul>						
	planning approval						

Officer response: there is no policy to ensure plants and shrubbery are recycled. No trees would be removed as part of the proposal and given the minor scale of works, it would not be reasonable to impose a landscaping condition.
The Bartholomew Estate and Kentish Town CAAC made the following comments:
<ul> <li>We consider that this application may lead to loss of light and increase of light pollution to neighbours</li> </ul>
Officer response: Due to the topography across the terrace, the application site sits slightly lower than its neighbour at no.75 resulting in the extension sitting lower relative to the neighbour's ground level. Nonetheless, the extension would have some impact on the neighbour's outlook and daylight to the ground floor window on the side elevation of their closet wing. Given the presence of the existing two storey closet wing at the application site, and that the affected window serves a kitchen, the proposed extension is not expected to have an unacceptable impact in amenity terms.
• It will also lead to loss of garden space which we feel should be take into consideration in making a final decision.
Officer response: the side extension would infill the area between the closet wing and side boundary fence which is not valuable, green amenity space that contributes to the character of the area. The garden would still remain.
<ul> <li>Any Windows and doors must be of wood and match existing at the back of the house.</li> </ul>
Officer response: A condition will require the materials to match existing elsewhere on property. The style of the rear doors to the extension will be of a different style due to their nature, but are still considered acceptable and sensitive for this non-prominent location.

Grant Planning Permission