

CONSULTATION SUMMARY

Case reference number(s)

2022/1313/P

Case Officer:

Elaine Quigley

Application Address:

5 Tanza Road
London
NW3 2UA

Proposal(s)

Variation to condition 3 (approved plans) of planning permission ref 2021/0478/P dated 14/09/2021 (for installation of an inset balcony on the rear roof slope, extension of main side roof slope with solar panels, single storey side extension to side store and replacement windows and doors), namely to increase the height of the single storey side extension, set back the extension from the front elevation of the main building, and associated alterations.

Representations

Consultations:	No. notified	0	No. of responses	2	No. of objections	2
					No of comments	0
					No of support	0

Summary of representations

(Officer responses in italics)

The owner/occupiers of nos. 2b Tanza Road and 3 Tanza Road have objected to the application on the following grounds:

- Loss of view
Views and loss of views are not a planning consideration and would not be assessed as part of the planning application
- Loss of light and increased sense of enclosure
The changes to the height and location of the extension would not result in additional loss of light to windows in neighbouring properties.

No. 3 has 2 windows at lower ground floor level in the side elevation. These appear to serve circulation space and ancillary rooms and do not appear to be habitable (measuring 4 sqm and 8 sqm respectively). The proposal would not result in any loss of daylight or sunlight or outlook to primary windows that serve habitable rooms in the main house. There is a lower ground floor single storey side extension that includes a sloping partially glazed roof. This would not be affected by the proposal in terms of any additional loss of daylight, sunlight or outlook due to the height of the extension in relation to the existing boundary wall. No. 2b Tanza Road lies opposite the application site approximately 19m from the front elevation of the application property and would not be affected by the proposal in terms of amenity.

- Building on party wall
Party wall issues are a legal matter and do not fall under planning legislation. The agent has submitted a copy of the Party Wall agreement that has been served to the owners of no. 3 Tanza Road and an informative would be added to any permission to remind the applicant that a party wall agreement may be required for any works to shared party walls.
- Increase in proportions of the extension and detailed design
Changes to the proportions of the extension and modest design changes to the front elevation of the side extension would be assessed as part of this planning application.
- Building extension as additional habitable space for the house rather than the covered side passage for bikes
The use of the extension as habitable accommodation for main house or for the storage of bikes does not raise any land use issues as it is ancillary to the enjoyment of the house.
- Inconsistency between description of development and plans
The description of development included specific measurements which were for consultation purposes only. These have been removed as changes have been made to the proposed plans during the course of the application (extension has been set back further from the front elevation than was originally proposed). This has not changed the nature of the proposal nor the revisions which are being sought as a variation to the original planning permission and would not prejudice local residents from commenting on the application.

- | | |
|--|---|
| | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No assessment of impact on the conservation area or amenity in the design and access statement
<i>The design and access statement is a supporting document that should provide a narrative on the design of the extension and access issues. It does not need to assess impact on the conservation area or the amenity of neighbouring occupiers. The local planning authority assess these considerations when determining planning applications.</i> • Height of the party wall not part of the original planning permission
<i>The planning application is seeking to vary aspects of the 2021 planning permission that included a single storey side. Submitting an application to make minor material changes to a planning permission including increasing the height of the party wall is the appropriate mechanism to seek permission for the changes that are being proposed and obtain a new planning permission.</i> • No reference to the increase in height of 250mm
<i>There is no requirement for dimensions to be included on drawings in order to make the application valid or assess its impact. A measurement scale has been included on each of the drawings which can be used to measure the dimensions of the single storey side extension.</i> • Unclear why the extension is above the level of the current side gate
<i>The height of the extension is approximately 2.5m. Building Control regulations requires extensions to be constructed to meet a certain head height. Notwithstanding this, there is no requirement for the applicant to build an extension to the same height as an existing gate. The increased height of the extension has been assessed and is considered acceptable.</i> • Design is not in keeping with the similar structures along Tanza Road
<i>There are a number of buildings along this part of Tanza Road that include single storey side extensions. There does not appear to be any consistency in their design which differing roof forms and use of different facing materials. The single storey side extension that was approved in 2021 included a flat roof and was brick built and was considered acceptable. A brick built structure including a flat roof is also proposed as part of this application. Given the location of the extension at lower ground floor level and the fact that there are tight gaps between buildings, the design and appearance of the single storey extension is not considered to have a detrimental impact on</i> |
|--|---|

the character and appearance of the streetscene nor the conservation area

- Set back of extension is unclear
The plans have been revised during the course of the application to set the extension back 1.1m from the front elevation of no. 5
- Width of extension makes it look hefty and fails to be proportionate
The width of the extension remains the same as the approved scheme
- Photos are misleading
The photos submitted in the design and access statement that formed part of the approved scheme provide context to the site and surroundings. As part of the current application a site visit was undertaken by the case officer on 20th June 2022 to understand the site and surroundings.

Recommendation:-

Grant conditional planning permission