CONSULTATION SUMMARY CONSULTATION SUMMARY

Case reference number(s)

2020/0393/P

Case Officer:	Application Address:
John Sheehy	97 Constantine Road
	London
	NW3 2LP
Proposal	

Erection of a single-storey side infill extension at ground floor rear.

Representations							
	No. notified	0	No. of responses	2	No. of objections	2	
Consultations:					No of comments	2	
					No of support	0	
	Press advert published 8/04/'21, expired 2/05/'21.						
Summary of representations	Site notice displayed 2/04/'21, expired 26/04/'21.						
	Resident of ground floor flat 95 Constantine Road-						
(Officer response(s) in italics)	"I am concerned about the design, size and height of the proposed extension along my party wall. The exact height does not seem very clear on the planning application? My loss of light is also of concern to me. Could we please discuss what is amenable to both of us as I am otherwise in full support of their proposed extension and sincerely wish to maintain our amicable neighbourly relationship.						

I have an existing structure on my side of the party wall, No 95, which I would like to make secure, weather proof and improve. This structure, with a plastic roof, has apparently been in place for at least the last 25 years, probably erected prior to a formal application process"
Two comments are also recorded from this resident. These were follow-up messages to check if the objection had been received.
Resident of upper floor maisonette 95 Constantine Road-
"The design of the extension would remove additional shrubs and our bedroom view would be at a roof plus the wooden garden house with little nature left.
These terraced houses were built in an L-shape in the back to allow separation and privacy between the two buildings, so this is also quite uncharacteristic for the area.
The ground floor of 95 Constantine Road has a small extension which has been in place for over 20 years and we cannot see it from our window unless we are leaning out. We would not mind if the 97 extension was brought in line with 95 but the size of the proposed extension is simply overpowering (see second picture - it would extend up to the grass beyond the flags). We are also concerned about the likely months of building work during lockdowns whilst our whole family has to work from home".

Officer response
Revisions were negotiated with the planning agent on the basis of concerns raised in the above objections. The proposed extension has been reduced in height from 3.0m to 2.3m and would not result in a harmful impact on the amenity of neighbouring occupiers.
The principle of infilling the side passageway is acceptable in design and townscape terms and is in accordance with the recent history of decisions in the street.
There would be no impact on TPO trees as a result of the proposal and a