## CONSULTATION SUMMARY

## Case reference number(s)

2022/3586/P	
Case Officer:	Application Address:
	23 Meadowbank
Edward Hodgson	London
	NW3 3AY

## Proposal(s)

Erection of roof extension to replace sunroom at 4<sup>th</sup> floor, installation of new air-conditioning units within acoustic enclosure at roof level, installation of rooflight, erection of front extension at ground floor, replacement of windows and doors on all floors and elevations, plus creation of a new rear garden lightwell

Representations							
	No. notified	0	No. of responses	2	No. of objections	1	
Consultations:					No of comments	1	
					No of support	0	
	Site Notices: 30/11/2022 to 24/12/2022						
	Neighbouring residents at 22 and 24 Meadowbank						
Summary of representations							
	2) Proposed	l exten	sion would block acc	ess to t	he fire escape route	•	
(Officer response(s) in italics)	<ol> <li>Air conditioning units may cause noise and vibration, especially at night</li> </ol>						
	4) Works to neighbou	•	htwell may cause wat operties	er ingr	ess issues at		
	5) Internal w gutted ins		re causing noise issu	es and	the house has beer	١	

Office	r response
1)	Party Wall Agreements are considered to be a civil matter that the Council is not able to get involved in.
2)	The fire strategy of the application site and neighbouring buildings is an issue covered by Building Regulations. An informative is attached to the decision notice stating that the proposals may be subject to control under the Building Regulations and/or the London Buildings Act which covers aspects such a fire and emergency escape. The fire strategy is not considered to be a material planning consideration.
3)	The noise impact assessment submitted states that noise from the units would be in line with Camden Planning policy. The Council's environmental health team have reviewed the report and consider it acceptable. Conditions are attached ensuring that necessary noise and vibration mitigation measures are implemented and that the noise from the plant must not exceed the required levels.
4)	The lightwell would serve the ground floor which is accessed at ground level and is thus not considered to be a basement. The lightwell would not exceed beyond the depth of the existing ground floor level and thus a basement impact assessment is not required in this instance. The lightwell would measure approx. 3.6sqm and would be 1.4m deep. It would be set back from the neighbouring occupiers by approx. 0.4m. It is considered that the small size and scale of the lightwell would not cause adverse impact on the ground water within the garden. This area of the garden is covered by patio and therefore the lightwell would not adversely affect drainage in the rear garden.
5)	Works internally do not generally require planning permission and can therefore be carried out without consent. A planning enforcement case was opened ref. EN22/0677 and it was found that no works requiring consent had been undertaken.

**Recommendation:** 

Grant planning permission