

## CONSULTATION SUMMARY

### Case reference number(s)

2020/1035/P

### Case Officer:

Laura Hazelton

### Application Address:

Flat 1, 105 Priory Road

London

NW6 3NN

### Proposal(s)

Erection of side and rear ground floor extension and installation of new side entrance door.

### Representations

<b>Consultations:</b>			No. of responses	3	No. of objections	1
					No of comments	2

### Summary of representations

#### *(Officer response(s) in italics)*

Site notices were displayed between 06/03/2020 and 30/03/2020 and the application was advertised in the local press on 12/03/2020.

The owner/occupier of Flat 3, 105 Priory Road has objected to the application on the following grounds:

- I object as the lessee of Flat 3, 105 Priory Road that the proposed extension due to its bulk is sited upon land the applicant does not own and upon which rights of way are granted to myself and other lessees. I have a lease plan clearly showing my rights of way upon which the applicant is asking for permission to build but I can find no way to attach it to this objection.

#### *Officer Response*

- Leaseholder issues and consents are not a planning consideration and would need to be obtained separately from the planning consent.*

The Owner/Occupier of the first floor flat, 105 Priory Road submitted the following comments:

- As the building is of late Victorian age, the internal soundproofing quality is low. Therefore, a key concern is the level of noise that the construction would cause - as we would be directly impacted.... we face significant noise levels and months (if not longer) of having no quiet enjoyment of our property. Given that we are unsure of the length of the current period of having to work from home under Government order, the level of noise and disruption expected from the anticipated demolition and construction work is significant.
- There is also concern around security of the site during the period that the outer wall is missing - creating a direct access to the property. There is also a concern that the work planned will adversely impact our, and other occupiers' access (and private enjoyment) of the garden.

*Officer Response*

- *Noise from construction is not a planning consideration, but all works would be expected to be conducted in accordance with the [Camden Minimum Requirements](#). Noise from demolition and construction works is subject to control under the Control of Pollution Act 1974. Any building works that can be heard at the boundary of the site must only be carried out between 08.00 and 18.00 hours Monday to Friday and 08.00 to 13.00 on Saturday and not at all on Sundays and Public Holidays. An informative would be added to the decision notice to remind the applicant of this.*
- *Leaseholder issues and consents are not a planning consideration and would need to be obtained separately from the planning consent.*

*Applicant response to comments*

- Timelines - Under no circumstances will any building work start during this current Coronavirus shutdown/WFH period. The intention would be to start sometime in 2021 at the earliest and give as much notice to all owners and tenants as possible.
- Garden Access - Access will be maintained throughout the works for all tenants. A partition will also allow for access to the rear communal garden away from view of any tradesman.
- Security - The main entrance will not be required by the builders during the project. Our existing front door accessed through the main entrance will be removed and converted into a wall. All access will be from our private garden as well as the new entrance planned for the side of the property.
- Noise - Obviously all building projects will create some noise but all Camden guidelines will be followed to minimise this, including fully adhering to when the builders are allowed to work at the property.

CRASH (the Combined Residents' Associations of South Hampstead) submitted the following comments:

- CRASH welcomes the care and attention taken by the applicant in choosing, where possible, appropriate matching materials for the intended works. In particular, the use of reclaimed white gault bricks to match the existing Victorian brickwork.
- However, the new street-facing entrance to Flat 1..." is hardly "traditional" for a Victorian building. CRASH would prefer to see the new entrance designed in a style more sympathetic to the existing 19th century front elevation. The designer's attempt to match the "garage doors" at the adjacent 103 Priory Road would be, in the opinion of CRASH, a mistake.
- CRASH also has some concerns about light spillage from the number of new roof lights in the proposal, In particular, the two roof lights on the flat-roof section above the kitchen/dining area of the rear extension. CRASH notes, with concern, that one of these roof lights is to be located directly beneath, and in close proximity to, the windows of the neighbour's first floor apartment. CRASH would like to suggest that the applicant consider a single centrally-located roof light to reduce light spillage and mitigate any nuisance to the tenants of the first floor flat.

*Officer Response*

- *The Council's Conservation Officer has assessed the proposed design and considers the proposed timber doors to be the most suitable design solution for the new entrance door to the ground floor flat. The doors do not appear as a standard garage door. They are differentiated well enough from the front door not to compete with the original building but would be complementary in their design and materials.*
- *The proposals were revised to address this concern, and the rooflight in question removed from the proposals. The remaining rooflight would be towards to the edge of the extension and would not result in excessive lightspill to the first floor flat.*

**Recommendation:-**

**Grant planning permission**