

# COMMITTEE REPORT

Planning Committee on  
Item No  
Case Number

22 October, 2015  
07  
**15/3094**

## SITE INFORMATION

**RECEIVED:** 15 July, 2015

**WARD:** Queen's Park

**PLANNING AREA:** Kilburn & Kensal Consultative Forum

**LOCATION:** 33A Wrentham Avenue, London, NW10 3HS

**PROPOSAL:** Proposed erection of single storey rear and side extension and separate access to ground floor flat

**APPLICANT:** Ms Clarke

**CONTACT:** Atelier Woodman

**PLAN NO'S:** D205 Proposed Ground Floor Plan  
D206 Proposed Rear Elevation  
D206 Proposed Section  
D209 Proposed Flank Elevation  
D201 Location Plan  
D208 Existing and Proposed Section  
Design and Access Statement

---


# SITE MAP



## Planning Committee Map

Site address: 33A Wrentham Avenue, London, NW10 3HS

© Crown copyright and database rights 2011 Ordnance Survey 100025260




This map is indicative only.

# SELECTED SITE PLANS

## SELECTED SITE PLANS





35

33

31



photomontage of proposed scheme from the rear garden of number 35, looking towards the rear of No 33 (above)

## RECOMMENDATIONS

**Refusal**, subject to the conditions set out in the Draft Decision Notice.

### A) PROPOSAL

As described.

### B) EXISTING

33a is a ground floor flat which does not have any external alterations. This property is not in a Conservation Area and is not a listed building. The property is, however, within one of the Council's Areas of Distinctive Residential Character (ADRC). The property is split into three self contained flats.

## C) AMENDMENTS SINCE SUBMISSION

## D) SUMMARY OF KEY ISSUES

This proposal conflicts with the guidance set out in SPG5.

- The proposal incorporates a wrap around extension which relates unacceptably to the existing building in design terms,
- The size, bulk and siting of the proposed extension would have an adverse impact on residential amenity

## RELEVANT SITE HISTORY

15/1343- Erection of single storey rear and single storey side extension to ground floor flat- *Granted*.  
- *This scheme is very similar however did not incorporate a 'wrap around'.*

15/3285- Proposed erection of replacement garden shed to rear for ground floor flat- *Granted*

1982- Conversion of single dwelling house into 3 x self contained flats

*There is no other recent or relevant planning history.*

## CONSULTATIONS

Neighbourhood consultee letters were dispatched on 22/07/2015. To date, there have been no responses.

This application has been called in by Councillor Denselow, Councillor Hector and Councillor Southwood.

## POLICY CONSIDERATIONS

### National Planning Policy Framework (2012)

All development has a presumption in favour of sustainable development. Brent's planning policies are found to be compliant with the NPPF

### Local Policy

For the purposes of Section 38 (6) of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004, the statutory development plan for the area is the Unitary Development Plan (UDP), which was formally adopted in 2004, and the Core Strategy, adopted in 2010.

#### *Core Strategy 2010*

**CP17** - Protecting and Enhancing the Suburban Character of Brent

#### *Brent UDP Saved Policies 2004*

**BE2** - Townscape: Local context & Character

**BE7** – Public Realm: Street scene

**BE9** – Architectural Quality

**BE29** - Area of Distinctive Residential Character.

#### *Brent Supplementary Planning Guidance (SPG)*

**SPG 5** – Altering and extending your home

The above policies seek to ensure that development: does not significantly affect the amenities of neighbouring properties; should be in keeping with the design, scale and character of the existing dwelling; preserve or enhance the character and appearance of the existing dwelling and the surrounding area.

## DETAILED CONSIDERATIONS

### 1. Principle

1.1 Alterations and extensions to residential properties are generally considered acceptable provided that there is no detrimental impact on the amenity of neighbouring residents, and that they are in keeping with the character and appearance of the property and its surroundings. The reasons for this proposal is to create a 3 bedroom ground floor flat and increase the floor area of the unit. Whilst three bedroom flats are supported in principle (Core Strategy CP21) this cannot come at the expense of the amenity of neighbours and the character of the area.

### 2. Impact on Residential Amenity:

2.1. From the site visit, rear extensions are a common feature of the properties in the immediate vicinity of 33a Wrentham Avenue. It is acknowledged that the Council usually only accepts 3m rear extensions, however because of the depth of existing rear extensions adjacent to the proposed, it is considered that a deeper extension could be acceptable in this instance.

2.2- The Councils adopted guidance SPG5 resists extensions within the side return of terrace dwellinghouses owing to the overbearing impact they can have in already quite confined areas. The site is also located within one of the Council's ADRC's which provides further policy guidance steering all development towards high quality design.

2.3- The proposed side return would progress past the outrigger by approximately 4.2m. This section would run parallel to the boundary of 35 Wrentham Avenue at a distance of 0.84m, which is considered to be very close and would have an overbearing impact on views from both the rear amenity space and the conservatory. The conservatory of 35 Wrentham Avenue is 3.36m away, which for the size and bulk of the proposal would have a detrimental impact on the amenity of the neighbouring occupants. The previously approved scheme had the 4.2m extension which did not extend past the side wall of the outrigger and was 5.1m away, which is a considerably greater distance and therefore acceptable. This will be expanded upon in the following section.

### 3- Impact on the Character and Appearance of the Area

*To analyse this section in detail, the extension has been split into three parts- Side Infill Extension, Rear Extension and the "Wrap Around".*

#### 3.1 Side infill extension

3.1.1 As in the section above, although the Council's SPG no. 5 resists extensions within the side return, the Council has modified this approach over time and developed the following set of parameters to ensure such extensions maintain a height and mass that is not overbearing to neighbouring owners or occupiers, while also allowing for the enlargement of a home.

- The side/infill extension should terminate at the rear elevation of the outrigger
- The side/infill extension should have a height no greater than 2m at the eaves and 3m where it adjoins the flank of the outrigger, measured from the adjoining neighbours external ground level. Any part of the extension on the boundary must not exceed this parameter.
- All guttering must be kept within the site curtilage.
- Any glazing on the roof of the extensions that fall within 3m of the rear elevation of the building must be specified on the plans as being obscure glazed and non opening.
- Materials should be in keeping with those in the existing dwellinghouse, in particular the wall material should use brick that matches the existing building.

3.1.2 In this case, the proposal extends past the rear elevation of the outrigger- the majority of the side infill

proposal is acceptable. The eaves height of the side infill extension is at 2.45m however at the neighbouring boundary it is 2m, therefore considered acceptable.

### *3.2 Rear extension*

3.2.1- The Council's Supplementary Planning Guidance (SPG) no. 5 is applied to full planning applications for household extensions and represents a test of whether proposed extensions and alterations will have an unduly detrimental impact on the amenities of the adjoining occupiers. As this SPG was adopted following public consultation, it represents the views of local people regarding the size of extensions that are typically considered to be acceptable within the London Borough of Brent.

3.2.2- The proposed extends 4.22m beyond the rear elevation of the outrigger which is significantly greater than SPG5 guidance allows for however as neighbouring dwellings have extensions which project further than 3m, this is acceptable to bring them into line.

3.2.3- The height of the rear extension is 3.57m (ridge) and 2.27m (eaves) which brings the average height of the roof to just under 3m. This is considered acceptable.

3.2.4- A rooflight is included, as well as a door on the side elevation.

### *3.3- Wrap Around*

3.3.1- .In their separate elements (rear extension and side return as per application 15/1343), the proposals would be acceptable. However, the wrap around is a concern as it significantly increases the mass of the extension when viewed from the neighbouring garden and rear rooms.

3.3.2- According to SPG5, to protect neighbouring amenity, any additions or alterations must be subservient to the host property which this application fails to do. The rear extension extends past the outrigger of the property and the side return extends past the original house. It has been considered that the rectangular element of this proposal (5.25sqm) which is subject to the 'infill' would have a detrimental effect on the neighbouring property in terms of its appearance and impact on the neighbouring amenity.

3.3.3-The boundary to the neighbouring property is set away by 840mm however this does not militate against the perceived size and mass of the extension and the impact this would have. The proposal seeks to create a new entrance to the flat which will enable light to access the existing windows whilst not being detrimental to the amenity of the character of the property.

## **4- Design**

4.1- The proposal, as well as being detrimental to neighbouring amenity, has a poor relationship with the host building. The roof, and the way this connects via the wrap around to the outrigger and side return, does not create good consistency in design.

4.2- The proposed materials are painted rendered masonry walls which is at odds with the host building. A previous permission had a condition stating that materials should be the same as the existing. The large expanses of glass are considered acceptable, as are the steel windows and doors.

4.3- Whilst it is not necessary in every instance for an extension to match the existing building in terms of materials and design, in this case, it reinforces the concerns over the poor relationship between the proposal, neighbouring amenity and the general character of the area.



# DRAFT DECISION NOTICE



# Brent

## DRAFT NOTICE

TOWN AND COUNTRY PLANNING ACT 1990 (as amended)

### DECISION NOTICE – REFUSAL

Application No: 15/3094

To: Mr Woodman-Smith  
Atelier Woodman  
40 Canynge Square  
Clifton  
Bristol  
BS8 3LB

I refer to your application dated 15/07/2015 proposing the following:  
Proposed erection of single storey rear and side extension and separate access to ground floor flat

and accompanied by plans or documents listed here:

D205 Proposed Ground Floor Plan  
D206 Proposed Rear Elevation  
D206 Proposed Section  
D209 Proposed Flank Elevation  
D201 Location Plan  
D208 Existing and Proposed Section  
Design and Access Statement

at 33A Wrentham Avenue, London, NW10 3HS

The Council of the London Borough of Brent, the Local Planning Authority, hereby REFUSE permission for the reasons set out on the attached Schedule B.

Date:

Signature:

Head of Planning, Planning and Regeneration

#### Note

Your attention is drawn to Schedule A of this notice which sets out the rights of applicants who are aggrieved by the decisions of the Local Planning Authority.

DnStdR

PROACTIVE WORKING STATEMENT

- 1 To assist applicants the Local Planning Authority has produced policies and written guidance, all of which is available on the Council's website and offers a pre planning application advice service.

REASONS

- 1 The proposed development, which incorporates a 'wrap around extension', by reason of its excessive size, appearance, mass and siting close to the boundary of number 35 Wrentham Avenue, would have a detrimental impact on the visual amenity, and outlook of, neighbouring residents. Furthermore, the proposed overall bulk of the extension, its roof form and the materials relate poorly to the existing building and the surrounding area which is within one of the Council's Areas of Distinctive Residential Character (ADRC). As a result, it is contrary to Council policies BE2, BE7 BE9 and BE29 of the adopted Unitary Development Plan 2004, Core Strategy Policy CP17, and Brent's SPG5 on 'Altering and extending your home'.

## **MEMBERS CALL IN PROCEDURE**

In accordance with Part 5 of the Constitution and Section 10 of the Planning Code of Practice, the following information has been disclosed in relation to requests made by Councillors for applications to be considered by the Planning Committee rather than under Delegated Powers

### **Name of Councillor**

Councillor Southwood

### **Date and Reason for Request**

04/09/2015

No reason given for call in request

### **Details of any representations received**

None given.

### **Name of Councillor**

Councillor Denselow

### **Date and Reason for Request**

04/09/2015

No reason given for call in request

### **Details of any representations received**

None given.

### **Name of Councillor**

Councillor Hector

### **Date and Reason for Request**

03/09/2015

No reason given for call in request

### **Details of any representations received**

None given.

Any person wishing to inspect the above papers should contact Robert Reeds, Planning and Regeneration, Brent Civic Centre, Engineers Way, Wembley, HA9 0FJ, Tel. No. 020 8937 6726