Committee Report Planning Committee on 15 August, 2006 Item No. Case No. **3/03** 06/1533

RECEIVED: 31 May, 2006

WARD: Northwick Park

PLANNING AREA: Wembley Consultative Forum

LOCATION: 127 Sudbury Court Drive, Harrow, HA1 3SS

PROPOSAL: Erection of part single-storey and two-storey side and rear extension, rear

dormer window extension, and installation of one front rooflight to

dwellinghouse

APPLICANT: Mr & Mrs K. Musani

CONTACT: De Wood Group

PLAN NO'S: DW 1A: Existing and Proposed Ground Floor, DW 2C: Existing and Proposed

First and Loft Floor, DW 3C: Existing and Proposed Front and Rear Elevations, DW 4A: Existing and Proposed Side Elevations, DW 5A: 1:2 Details and Angles, DW 6C: Existing and Proposed Front and Rear

Elevations, DW 7A: Existing and Proposed Side Elevations, HM Land Registry

Plan MX 100575

RECOMMENDATION

Grant consent

EXISTING

The application property is a two-storey, detached dwelling located on the north side of Sudbury Court Drive near the "John Lyon" roundabout. The site is not located within a Conservation Area or an Area of Distinctive Residential Character, however, the Sudbury Court Conservation Area is located nearby on the eastern side of Watford Road and an Area of Distinctive Residential Character character abuts the rear property boundary.

Sudbury Court Drive is defined as a London Distributor Road, however, the main point of access to the site is via a slip road, rather than directly from Sudbury Court Drive.

PROPOSAL

The application seeks planning permission for a part single- and two-storey side and rear extension and a rear dormer window extension.

HISTORY

No relevant planning history.

POLICY CONSIDERATIONS

Brent Adopted Unitary Development Plan 2004

BE2: Townscape: Local Character and Context

BE6: Public Realm: Landscape Design

BE7: Public Realm: Streetscape

BE9: Architectural Quality

H21: Domestic Extensions

TRN20: London Distributor Roads

TRN23: Parking Standards – Residential Developments

Supplementary Planning Guidance

SPG5: Altering and Extending Your Home

SUSTAINABILITY ASSESSMENT

N/A

CONSULTATION

Nine properties were consulted by letter on 3 July 2006. One letter of objection signed by the occupiers of the houses either side was received, the content of which can be summarised as follows:

- The two-storey side extension and front dormer window will alter the features of the house and impact the character of the area.
- Potential for extended dwelling (from 3 to 6 bedrooms with 3 studies/TV room) to accommodate an alternate use such as a bed and breakfast use.
- Nuisance of building work causing a disturbance to neighbours.
- Problem of parking in the area, which will be put under further pressure.

The Sudbury Court Residents' Association was also consulted and objected to the proposal based on the internal layout of the ground floor and the bulk of the side extension. They requested the two-storey side extension be omitted, the garage be retained/reconstructed and the front rooflight be omitted.

REMARKS

Introduction

This application has undergone a number of revisions from the original submission in order to comply with adopted Council policy and Supplementary Planning Guidance 5. The original plans detailed a single-storey rear extension, a two-storey side extension and the addition of rear and side dormer window roof extensions. After discussion and a site meeting it was agreed that the application would be revised to remove the side dormer extension in favour of a first-floor rear extension. This revised scheme was assessed and deemed to be compliant with adopted Council policy and Supplementary Planning Guidance 5.

Ground-Floor Rear Extension

At the ground-floor level, the rear extension is proposed to have a depth of 3.5 metres and to extend the full width of the house and proposed side extension. Being a detached property, this depth is the maximum recommended under SPG5. The 3.5-metre depth, together with the proposed width in this situation, is considered to be appropriate in the context of the existing house and does not significantly affect the neighbouring properties which have similar single-storey rear extensions.

Two-Storey Side Extension

The proposed 2.6-metre wide, side extension to the property intends to convert the existing ground-floor attached garage to habitable and non-habitable rooms with 2 habitable rooms on the upper floor, and to extend to the side property boundary at both ground-floor and first-floor levels. A number of potential issues arise from extending to the side of the property in this manner, namely the loss of the garage parking space, appropriate set-backs at both ground-floor and first-floor levels and the set-down of the new roof ridge-line.

However, the elements shown on the revised plans indicate a side extension that does not exceed the maximum dimensions stipulated in SPG5. At a ground-floor level, the front set-back is not changed from the existing garage set-back, being a distance of 900mm rearward of the front building line. At first-floor level, the set-back distance is 2.5 metres rearward of the main front wall. This set-back distance is within SPG5 recommended dimensions for side extensions that do not provide at least a one-metre gap between the property boundary and the development. The proposed roof ridge-line was originally intended to be in alignment with the existing roof ridge, however, this was altered in the revised plans to be set down from the existing. These requirements have been met and adequately show a side extension that is subsidiary to the original dwelling.

The loss of the existing garage has been adequately compensated for with the retention of two parking spaces side by side in the front garden area. This parking arrangement is considered to be appropriate in relation to the streetscape as 50% of the front garden area is left and maintained as soft landscaping. The request by the Residents' Association cannot therefore be justified on transportation grounds, nor the omission of the two-storey side extension, which follows normal policy guidance for this form of property. Its revised width of 2.0 metres is half that of the average width of the original roof.

Loft Conversion and Dormer Window Extensions

The original application sought a side and rear dormer window extension in conjunction with the loft conversion. The side dormer window was not considered to be appropriate at this location. The design and scale of this addition, coupled with its relatively open position, result in a feature that would detrimentally affect the streetscene and would fail to complement the existing dwelling. It was therefore agreed that the side dormer would be removed in favour of a first-floor extension to the rear. The first-floor rear extension is discussed in the following section.

The proposed rear dormer window extension is of a size and scale to be considered appropriate for the rear roof-plane. Additionally, the dormer is set down 0.3 metres from the new roof ridge and 0.5 metres up from the eaves line, the minimum required by SPG5. Its position aligns with a first-floor window, being slightly off-centre in this widened property.

First Floor Rear Extension

As discussed in the previous sections, this element of the proposal was not included in the original submission. However, with the removal of the side dormer extension, the internal staircase from the first floor to the loft space was repositioned to a more central location, thereby reducing the size of rooms on the first floor. The rear extension at the first-floor level was therefore proposed as a way in which the lost space was to be regained.

This rear extension is proposed to be the full width of the house and the side extension and 2 metres in depth. The midpoints of the nearest first-floor, habitable-room windows in the rear elevations of the adjacent properties are 4.3 metres in number 125 and 4.2 metres in number 129 from the proposed side walls of this extension. When considering these distances under the 2:1 ratio calculation as explained in SPG5, the maximum depth of a first-floor rear extension would be 2.1 metres. Therefore the 2-metre depth of the first-floor extension is considered to be acceptable in terms of this calculation. Ground-floor windows in the rear elevation of the rear extensions to the neighbouring properties are unaffected by the first-floor rear extension.

Design Detail

The pitched roof of the side extension has resulted in the formation of a crown roof. This in part is due to the ridge line of the original roof being a front-to-rear orientation rather than side to side. The crown roof arises due to the wish to make this extension a subsidiary element to the original house by reducing its overall height. The flat-roof component of the crown roof will not be obvious when viewed from the public realm. This element is also screened by the relatively close proximity of the neighbouring property at number 129. Therefore, this crown roof would not detrimentally affect the original character and appearance of the dwelling.

The guttering detail of the new side element has been shown to be recessed to be set on top of the proposed side wall. This is so that the proposed guttering does not overhang the property boundary. However, to set-in the side extension from the building line, in order to accommodate this guttering, would be difficult to justify, considering the front set-back arrangement and the screening that the neighbouring property provides. Therefore, this detail is considered to be appropriate in the context of the dwelling.

Other details of this development, including materials, will be conditioned to match that of the existing dwelling.

Other Issues raised by Objectors

- 1. Any use of the property other than as a dwellinghouse would be the subject of a planning application, when related issues would be examined.
- 2. There is no front dormer window proposed. The front rooflight (0.5 x 0.8 metres) is relatively small and will not seriously affect the appearance of the property in the streetscene. The side rooflights (0.5 x 0.5 metres) are smaller. The installation of rooflights normally constitutes permitted development.
- 3. Whilst the size of the property will be increased, adequate on-site parking is provided to meet the Council's standards which should not seriously affect on-street parking on the neighbouring streets.

Conclusion

In light of the above assessment and revisions made to the original application, it is considered that this extension does not harm the neighbourhood amenity and is appropriate for the existing dwelling. Planning permission is therefore recommended.

RECOMMENDATION: Grant Consent

REASON FOR GRANTING

(1) The proposed development is in general accordance with policies contained in the:-

Brent Unitary Development Plan 2004 Council's Supplementary Planning Guidance 5 - Altering and Extending Your Home

Relevant policies in the Adopted Unitary Development Plan are those in the following chapters:-

Built Environment: in terms of the protection and enhancement of the environment Housing: in terms of protecting residential amenities and guiding new development

CONDITIONS/REASONS:

(1) The development to which this permission relates must be begun not later than the expiration of three years beginning with the date of this permission.

Reason: To conform with the requirements of Section 91 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990.

- (2) The development hereby approved shall be carried out and completed in all respects in accordance with the proposals contained in the application, and any plans or other particulars submitted therewith.
 - Reason: To ensure that the proposed development will be carried out as approved so as to avoid any detriment to the amenities by any work remaining incomplete.
- (3) All new external work shall be carried out in materials that match, as closely as possible, in colour, texture and design detail, those of the existing building.
 - Reason: To ensure a satisfactory development which does not prejudice the amenity of the locality.
- (4) No access shall be provided to the roof of the extension by way of window, door or stairway and the roof of the extension hereby approved shall not be used as a balcony or sitting-out area.

- Reason: To preserve the amenity and privacy of neighbouring residential occupiers.
- (5) No windows or glazed doors shall be constructed in the north eastern wall of the building, as extended without the prior written consent of the Local Planning Authority.
 - Reason: To minimise interference with the privacy of the adjoining occupiers and in the interests of good neighbourliness.
- (6) The extension hereby approved shall be used solely in connection with the use of the existing property as a dwellinghouse.
 - Reason: To ensure that the premises are not sub-divided or used for multiple occupation without the prior written permission of the Local Planning Authority, in the interests of the amenity and character of the locality.
- (7) The existing hardsurfaced frontage to the site shall not be extended, except with the prior written permission of the Local Planning Authority obtained through the submission of a planning application.

Reason: To ensure excessive car-parking facilities are not provided, in pursuance of the Council's traffic-restraint policies, and adequate soft landscaping is retained in the interests of the visual amenity and character of the locality.

INFORMATIVES:

(1) The applicant must ensure, before work commences, that the treatment/finishing of flank walls can be implemented, as this may involve the use of adjoining land, and should also ensure that all development, including foundations and roof/guttering treatment, is carried out entirely within the application property.

REFERENCE DOCUMENTS:

London Borough of Brent Unitary Development Plan 2004 Supplementary Planning Guidance 5 'Altering and Extending Your House'

Any person wishing to inspect the above papers should contact Stephen Allen, The Planning Service, Brent House, 349 High Road, Wembley, Middlesex, HA9 6BZ, Tel. No. 020 8937 5376

Planning Committee Map



Site address: 127 Sudbury Court Drive, Harrow, HA1 3SS

Reproduced from Ordance Survey mapping data with the permission of the Controller of Her Majesty's Stationary Officer © Crown Copyright. Unauthorised reproduction infringes Crown Copyright and may lead to prosecution or civil proceedings. London Borough of Brent, DBRE201 2005

