|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **CONSULTATION SUMMARY** | | | | | | | |
|  | | | | | | | |
| Case reference number(s) | | | | | | | |
| 2021/6226/P | | | | | | | |
| Case Officer: | | | | Application Address: | | | |
| Amy Ly | | | | 119 Fortess Road  London  NW5 2HR | | | |
| Proposal(s) | | | | | | | |
| Erection of single storey rear lower ground extension, addition of a roof terrace at upper ground floor and a Juliet balcony at 1st floor, plus associated alterations. | | | | | | | |
| Representations | | | | | | | |
| Consultations: | No. notified | 0 | No. of responses | | 3 | No. of objections  No of comments  No of support | 2  1  0 |
| Summary of representations(*Officer response(s) in italics*) | A site notice was displayed on 02/03/2022 and expired on 26/03/2022.  Two neighbours have objected to the proposed scheme on the following grounds:   * Limiting light to adjoining properties   + *The proposed extension would not extend higher than the existing and approved rear extension. It would extend a further 2m out from the existing rear outrigger and along the shared boundary with No. 121 at ground level which is considered to be acceptable in size. The land levels on the southern side are raised and so the extension would be lower and not projecting further than the rear outrigger at No 117. So the loss of light to neighbouring properties would not cause any additional significant harm in terms of light.* * The proposed roof terraces causes overlooking and noise concerns   + *Council officers identified concerns in terms of overlooking and neighbouring amenity in regards to the proposed roof terrace at first floor level. This element of the proposal has been removed at the request of officers and replaced with a Juliet balcony, which would not cause any significant overlooking concerns. The upper ground floor roof terrace has been reduced at the request of officers and is now a half width roof terrace to the southern side of the site. An obscured glazed privacy screen is proposed on the north side of the terrace which is considered to be sufficient in minimising noise and privacy impacts. Details of the balustrade are required by condition.* * The proposed privacy screening is not sufficient for minimising amenity impact   + *A condition is attached to ensure that the first floor flat roof of the approved infill extension (dated 16/12/21 under ref: 2021/4665/P) would not be used as a roof terrace. It is considered that the Juliet balcony on the rear first floor window would prevent the use of the flat roof as a terrace. The upper ground floor terrace has been revised to a half width terrace located on the southern side of the extension in order to limit noise and privacy concerns. An obscured glazed privacy screen on the north side would minimise neighbouring amenity in accordance with CPG Design 2021 and CPG Amenity 2021.* * *The proposed extension causes noise amenity impact due to density and extension depth into rear garden*   + *The proposed extension would be ancillary to the use of the host property. It would cover an approximate 11 sqm footprint to the rear of the host property outdoor space. The overall amount of garden space to the rear is approximately 126 sqm. In this case, the proposed extension would represent roughly 9% of the rear garden, occupying mostly existing hard surface and low value green space closest to the house, and is minimal. The extension is single storey and 2m in depth, with a 4m total extension along the boundary with No. 121 including the approved infill extension, which is acceptable in terms of scale.* | | | | | | |
| Recommendation:-Grant conditional planning permission | | | | | | | |