

PLANNING REPORT

Printed Date: 4 July 2006

Application reference: 06/2063/CON **HAMPTON WARD**

Date application received	Date made valid	Target report date	8 Week date
08.06.2006	08.06.2006		03.08.2006

Site:

102 Roehampton Vale, London, SW15,

Proposal:

Proposed erection of part single/part two storey rear extension (with roof terrace area, part of single-storey extension) and installation of dormer windows to side and rear roof slopes in connection with conversion into three flats.

Present use: FINTS.

Status: Pending Consideration (If status = HOLD please check that all is OK before you proceed any further with this application)

APPLICANT NAME Wandsworth Council Philip Ridley **Technical Services Department** The Town Hall Wandsworth High St

London SW18 2PU

Consultations: Internal/External:

Expiry Date Consultee

Neighbours:

History:

Ref No No History Description

Status Date

AGENT NAME

Constraints:

Dummy UPRN

CONSULTATION/REFERRAL REPORT.

Site Address: 102 Roehampton Vale, London

Council: Wansworth

Application No: 2006/2471

Site/Surroundings: The site is located on the northern side of Roehampton Vale and adjoins Richmond Park at the rear, which is designated MOL, conservation area, public open space and a site of special scientific interest. The site is a semi-detached property consisting of a flat with multiple occupants.

Proposal: The proposal involves the erection of part single/part two storey rear extension (with roof terrace area, part of single-storey extension) and installation of dormer windows to side and rear roof slopes in connection with conversion into three flats.

Relevant History: N/A

Public Representations: Worker received.

Objection received from Royal Parks in relation to:

Overlooking over park from rear facing balcony at first floor level.

Ensure no Park facing sercurity lights as they interfere with bats and invertebrates from the adjacent SSSI.

Professional comments:

I consider that the proposed part single/part two rear extension and rear dormer windows would cause no harm upon the character and appearance of the property or adjoining Richmond Park for the follow reasons:

- a) overlooking would be considered minimal as the extension would be 6m away from the 2m boundary wall with the Park, and the area of the Park which may be viewed from the balcony is to be minimal considering the density of vegetation and isolation from public views.
- b) The applicant has a duty by separate legislation to deal with any bats within the property.

Recommendation: Raise no objection.

The determination of this application falls within the scope of Officer delegated powers (YES)/ NO
I therefore recommend the following:
1. REFUSAL Case Officer (Initials): CIA 2. PERMISSION C 3. FORWARD TO COMMITTEE C Dated: 71/7/06
I agree the recommendation:
Team Leader/Development Control Manager Dated:
This application has been subject to representations that are contrary to the officer recommendation. The Development Control Manager has considered those representations and concluded that the application can be determined without reference to the Planning Committee in conjunction with existing delegated authority.
Development Control Manager:
Dated:
REASONS:
CONDITIONS:
INFORMATIVES:
UDP POLICIES:
OTHER POLICIES:
The following table will populate as a quick check by running the template once items have been entered into Uniform CONDITIONS:
CONDITIONS.
INFORMATIVES:

ADDITIONAL NOTES CONTINUED FROM ABOVE: