Skapoullis Jon

From: Planning Support
Subject: FW: Comment Received from Public Access

Application Reference No. : HGY/2016/2549
Site Address: 50 Mount View Road London N4 4JP
Comments by: Howard Kleiman
From:
48
Mountview Road

London

N44JP
Phone:
Email:
Submission: Objection
Comments:
> We make the following comments on the proposed addition of a recessed balcony:
>
> 1. This is a new application following approval of the dormer to the rear roof. The application for the dormer did not mention any balcony, recessed or "Juliet". Had it done so further objections would have been made to the dormer application. The numerous planning applications for this development are leading to development creep to an already overdeveloped residential dwelling. We question why the developer did not apply for a balcony in its original application. Such a feature for an overdeveloped space would enhance returns for the developer and must have been in mind.
>
> 2. The plans submitted for the recessed balcony are not clear. This objection is on the basis that what is proposed is a balcony going out 1 metre from the dormer window. I was told by the developer that the only balcony would be a "Juliet" balcony similar to 48 Mount view Road. I would have no objection to this. It is also not clear what railings are being proposed.
>
> 3. The plans show the balcony finishing behind a section of roof which is pitched in line with the existing roof. The position on site is that work has been carried out to create a large flat space, which appears to be more or less complete. There is no pitched roof in front of the proposed balcony. This area goes all the way to the end of the building.
>
> 4. The dormer itself, and the proposed balcony, are extremely close to an existing bedroom. The balcony would be heavily used by the proposed small one bedroom flat as additional eating and leisure area. Given the overdevelopment of the roof space this balcony would constitute additional valuable space for the owner of the flat. The balcony would be used for outdoor cooking, amongst other activities. It would create noise pollution, light pollution and be a security risk.
>
> 5. There are no examples of planning being given in the local area for a balcony leading off a dormer that can be used for eating etc, This would not be a recessed balcony and would be clearly visible from the ground. In addition, sound and light pollution at such heights travels large distances. Given the likely high usage of the space this will lead to ongoing neighbourhood disputes involving the local authority. Permission for a "Juliet" balcony alone would prevent this.
>
> 5. The balcony would be visible from adjacent gardens and would overlook them. In addition, the appearance of the roofline is not in keeping with the period houses forming the four dwelling terrace. If the roofline is not preserved the owner of the flat will simply move any "temporary" railing to give themselves more room in breach of planning. Given the size of the proposed flat and the overdevelopment of the roof, this is highly likely. Any enforcement action would result in wasted costs and time. Ensuring that the roof line is reinstated and any balcony is simply decorative ie "Juliet" would prevent this.
>