

CONSULTATION SUMMARY

Case reference number(s)

2021/3928/P

Case Officer:

Adam Greenhalgh

Application Address:

Flat A, 70 Marquis Road, NW1 9UB

Proposal(s)

Erection of side/rear extension to ground floor flat

Representations

Consultations:	No. notified	N/A	No. of responses	3	No. of objections	3
					No of comments	0
					No of support	0
Summary of comments	<p>Objections have been received from three neighbouring occupiers (all unaddressed). All the objections raised are considered to relate to the rear extension beyond the existing living room which was originally proposed. Following negotiations, the proposal to extend beyond the existing rear building line was omitted and an amended, reduced proposal, no further in depth than the existing rear building line was submitted. It is therefore considered that the objections which were raised (in relation to the proposal to extend beyond the existing rear building line) have been addressed and there are no remaining objections to the revised proposal.</p> <p>For the record, the objections raised by the neighbours and Officer comments are set out below:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none">1. Increased development on garden space. <p><u>Officer comment:</u> The amended proposal does not occupy any garden space. It occupies the hard paved passage at the side of the</p>					

existing building.

2. Likelihood of formation of roof terrace to detriment of amenity of neighbouring occupiers.

Officer comment: The amended proposal, which is for a pitched roof side/rear extension is unlikely to be used as a roof terrace. If an opening onto it and balustrades/railings were formed these would need planning permission and it would be controlled accordingly.

3. Increased density of development/increased noise.

Officer comment: Situated at the side of the existing building/rear extension the proposal is not considered to result in an excessive density of development or level of site coverage. The extension would not give rise to excessive noise either from within, or from the garden or road.

4. Harm to the character and appearance of the Conservation Area.

Officer comment: The comment appears to relate to the original proposal to add an extension to the rear of the building. This is no longer proposed. The amended proposal would not project beyond the existing rear building line and in terms of its scale, siting, form and appearance, it is not considered to result in any harm to the context or character of the area, including the Camden Square Conservation Area.

5. Precedent

Officer comment: While this comment is considered to relate to the original proposal to extend beyond the existing rear building line (which has now been omitted) it should nevertheless be noted that each planning application is determined on its own merits and any applications for similar proposals at any other sites would be considered in accordance with the relevant considerations at those sites.

Recommendation:-

Grant planning permission