

# CONSULTATION SUMMARY

## Case reference number(s)

2020/3083/P

## Case Officer:

Patrick Marfleet

## Application Address:

33 Estelle Road

London

NW3 2JX

## Proposal(s)

Erection of replacement side and rear extensions at ground floor level, erection of a side roof extension to create a part hipped, part gabled roof, and installation of rear dormer and front rooflights.

## Representations

Consultations:	No. of responses	01	No. of objections	01
			No of comments	0
			No of support	0
Summary of representations  <i>(Officer response(s) in italics)</i>	<p>Mansfield CAAC initially objected to the application but withdrew their objection following revisions to the design of the proposed dormer extension.</p> <p>The owner/occupier of No.35 Estelle Road have objected to the application on the following grounds:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"><li>1. There is a very significant error on the existing side elevation (Drwg No 027-P1). The submitted existing side elevation shows the shared wall between the two properties (which is the flank elevation of the existing conservatory extension to No 33 along the boundary line) as being 2.4m in height. It is in fact only 1.66m in height.</li><li>2. The overall height of the revised side elevation (existing) is still significantly exaggerated with it being shown as almost to the same height as the garden fence, it is in fact 0.32mm lower than the fence.</li></ol>			

3. The application is submitted on the basis of Certificate A, which incorrectly states that the Applicant owns all of the land on which the application relates. This is incorrect due to the fact that the flank wall of the proposed replacement side/rear extension would involve additional build on what is in fact a shared garden wall/party wall. In view of this, formal Notice of the application should have been served on ourselves as the owners of 35 Estelle Road and the planning application submitted on the basis of Certificate B.
4. The significant increase in height of the boundary wall only 2.52m from our windows to the kitchen/diner will also mean that there will be a significant loss of light and outlook with the proposed replacement side/rear extension causing an unacceptable sense of enclosure.
5. The proposed rear extension is very contemporary and will be wholly out of keeping with the host building. The extension will have a wraparound large glazed opening and the proposed rear elevation shows vertical brick detailing above and below, which is out of keeping with the existing building and the surrounding area.
6. The proposed plans show significant alterations at roof level with the existing hipped end roof being changed to a partial gable and with a large dormer construction on the rear elevation. The dormer comes very close to the pitched element of the side elevation roof and is set considerably away from the party wall with No 31. It would be more normal, and far more appropriate, if the dormer were to be moved further across so as to be closer to No 31. Dormer should also be clad in tiles with a timber sash window.
7. If planning permission were to be granted for the flat roof rear element of the current planning application, a condition should be imposed to the effect that the flat roof can never be used as a terrace and also requiring that the bottom part of the sliding sash window, which could be opened to provide access, is permanently fixed shut so as to make such access impossible.

Officer response

1. *The applicant has submitted revised side and rear elevations (existing) which show the correct height of the shared boundary wall.*
2. *Officers have measured the heights of the existing boundary wall and fence on the revised side elevation and the difference between the two is approx. 300mm, which is in line with the assertion made above.*
3. *The applicant has submitted an amended application form showing Certificate of Ownership B completed and have served written notice on the neighbouring property at No.35.*
4. *The replacement side extension would have a marginal increase in height along the shared boundary with No.35, which is not considered significant*

*enough to cause harm to the amenity of the neighbouring property in terms of loss of light and outlook. Furthermore, the proposed extension would not breach the 45 degree line of sight (on elevation) when drawn from the mid-point of the nearest rear window at No.35 and is thus considered acceptable in terms of its amenity impact.*

- 5. The proposed side/rear extension, whilst contemporary in its design, is considered to represent a high quality and sympathetic alteration that would not cause harm to the original character of the host building and surrounding conservation area, particularly given its location to the rear of the property (at ground floor level) and the limited visibility it would have.*
- 6. The applicant has submitted revised plans which show the rear dormer set further into the centre of the existing roof-slope which is considered acceptable as it would maintain a 500mm set back from the edges of the main roof in accordance with the Council's planning guidance document (Altering and Extending Your Home).*
- 7. The current application does not propose to use the flat roof of the rear extension as an amenity terrace. The request for the existing first floor sash window to be permanently fixed shut is considered unreasonable particularly as it would provide natural ventilation to this part of the property.*

*As such, the proposed development is acceptable in terms of its impact on the character of the host property and surrounding conservation area, and is not considered to cause harm to the amenity of neighbouring properties in terms of loss of light, outlook or privacy.*

**Recommendation:- Grant planning permission**