

CONSULTATION SUMMARY

Case reference number

2021/0096/P

Case Officer:

Tony Young

Application Address:

Flat 2
71 Goldhurst Terrace
London
NW6 3HA

Proposal

Installation of rear terrace to 1st floor flat roof with railings and privacy screen(s), and replacement of sash window with timber framed French doors to allow access.

Representations

Consultations:	No. notified	0	No. of responses	1	No. of objections	0
					No of comments	0
					No of support	0

Summary of representations

Combined Residents Associations of South Hampstead (CRASH)

initially responded objecting to the proposal as follows:

- 1. It is noted there are a number of precedents already in this stretch of Goldhurst Terrace. However, no. 73 which adjoins does not have permission to use its flat roof as a terrace either in its current state or in the proposed application for an enlarged extension inc basement which has recently been submitted;*
- 2. There remains an application for an enlarged extension to the ground floor at no. 71 (2020/4244/P) which does not appear from the Camden planning website to have been approved or withdrawn or amended - so it is unclear what would happen to the size of this proposed terrace in the event of that application being approved/amended etc.;*
- 3. CRASH welcomes the proposal to use wood french windows if approval is given and that screening will be provided. However, in general CRASH is concerned about the increased overlooking of gardens and noise pollution to very close neighbouring properties which can occur when terraces are granted.*

Officer response:

- 1 No. 73 Goldhurst Terrace does have permission to install a similar roof terrace at the adjoining property (2020/3224/P) dated

16/06/2021. There are also other existing terraces on roofs of single storey extensions at the rear of the property which establish the principle for the current proposal;

- 2 The application referred to has since been approved (2020/4244/P). As a consequence, the current application has two sets of drawings (Sets 1 and 2) which would allow for the introduction of a roof terrace whether the above approval for a full-width extension is implemented or not;
- 3 Timber material for door frames is appropriate. See also the reason for granting planning permission in regard to amenity considerations.

Combined Residents Associations of South Hampstead (CRASH)

subsequently responded following receipt of revisions to confirm that they agree to withdraw their previous objections. However, they wanted the following to be noted:

4. *Existing condition which restricts use of roof as a terrace - no comfort can be gained from a clear restriction against the use of an extension roof as a terrace granted only two years ago;*
5. *Precedent - this is not a valid planning consideration;*
6. *Omission of green roof from revised proposals - privacy concerns through rooflights during maintenance of the green roof seems erroneous given the owners of the ground floor extension would organise any maintenance.*

Officer response:

- 4 The purpose of the condition referred to was to protect the privacy of the ground floor occupiers given that 2 large rooflights were approved (2020/4244/P). Following discussions between the occupiers of both the ground and 1st floor flats, one of the approved rooflights has been granted approval to be repositioned (2022/2846/P) allowing the possibility for a suitably sized and positioned roof terrace to be introduced with appropriate privacy screening as proposed. A condition would be attached to any permission to ensure that screening is installed prior to first use and that the remaining part of the roof cannot be used as additional terrace space in the future;
- 5 Good examples of existing development can provide a precedent for similar alterations. As stated above, a recent approval at the adjoining property in particular provides an example of such a precedent (no. 73 Goldhurst Terrace - 2020/3224/P);
- 6 While sedum and green roofs are encouraged by the Council where appropriate, there is not a requirement for an applicant to introduce one in all cases. In this particular case, the applicant decided not to do so and it was not felt proportionate to require one in this instance.

Recommendation:- Grant planning permission with conditions	