

RECEIVED: 4 October, 2010

WARD: Queen's Park

PLANNING AREA: Kilburn & Kensal Consultative Forum

LOCATION: 74 Harvist Road, London, NW6 6HL

PROPOSAL: Erection of single-storey extension to side of dwellinghouse

APPLICANT: Mr Bramall

CONTACT: Nash Baker Architects llp

PLAN NO'S:
See Condition 2

RECOMMENDATION

Grant Consent

EXISTING

The site is occupied by a mid-terrace dwellinghouse located on Harvist Road. This part of Harvist Road is located within the Queens Park Conservation Area with additional Article 4 (1) Controls.

PROPOSAL

See above.

HISTORY

There are no planning applications relating to this property, although there are a number of other decisions for similar forms of development that are referred to in the "Remarks" section below.

POLICY CONSIDERATIONS

London Borough of Brent Unitary Development Plan 2004

BE2 Townscape: Local Context & Character
BE9 Architectural Quality
BE25 Development in Conservation Areas
BE26 Alterations & Extensions to Buildings in Conservation Areas.

Queen's Park Conservation Area Design Guide

Supplementary Planning Guidance 5 *Altering and Extending Your Home*

CONSULTATION

Site notice displayed on 15/10/2010 and press notice posted in local paper 21/10/2010. No representations received to date.

Neighbours

A total of 17 properties were consulted about the application, no representations received to date

Statutory consultees

Queens Park Area Residents Association consulted, no representation received.

REMARKS

This site is located in the Queens Park Conservation Area. The proposed development involves the removal of the dilapidated infill extension and the erection of a single-storey side infill extension built along the entire original rear projection. The extension would have a glazed mono-pitched roof sloping upwards from a height of 2m on the joint boundary with 72 Harvist Road to a maximum height of 3m against the flank wall of the outrigger. It is anticipated that this decision, if endorsed by Members, would form the basis for the way that Officers would approach similar extensions within the Queens Park CA. This may of course change in the future in the event that revised planning guidance is issued, but until then this becomes the agreed approach.

As mentioned above, the existing infill extension is in a dilapidated state, projects to 2.65m in depth from the rear elevation wall of the main building, and slopes down from a height of 3m to 2m at its eaves. The neighbouring property is impacted upon by the existing extension in terms of their outlook, more so than if a 2m maximum wall or fence was in place, and this is a material consideration here, given that it is proposed to remove this structure. The matter is discussed further below.

In this case, the main issues relevant to the determination of the current application are the impacts of the proposed development on the outlook of neighbouring occupiers, as well as the impact on the character and appearance of the property and surrounding Queens Park Conservation Area.

Impact on neighbouring Amenity

The Councils adopted Supplementary Planning Guidance SPG5 "Altering and Extending Your Home" states that infill extensions to terraced properties with side returns will not normally be allowed as they cause problems for neighbours who already suffer from restricted light into their homes. This position, however, has been granted some flexibility, reflected in a number of decisions made by the Councils' Planning Committee and by the Planning Inspectorate. Certain types of infill extensions have been considered not to cause harm to neighbouring amenity.

The first such formalisation of a more flexible approach was when the Councils' Planning Committee considered an application (ref: 07/3115) for an infill extension at Victoria Road where the height, design and material limited the apparent bulk and scale of the extension, whilst it also maintained a 4m deep courtyard between the rear elevation wall of the existing dwelling and the beginning of the extension to protect outlook.

This approach has been followed for a number of years and whilst Officers continue to believe that this is an appropriate means of allowing people to extend their home whilst minimising impact on neighbours, a number of recent appeal decisions where applicants were granted permission for full infill extensions to the existing two storey rear sections have required the Planning Service to revisit the issue. This discussion will highlight the views expressed by Inspectors and explain how these relate to proposals at this application property.

In allowing the appeal for a full infill at 39 Hopefield Road (ref: 09/1247) the Inspector stated that the side parapet wall proposed as part of the application would be equivalent in height to the average height of the existing extension. This is pertinent to this application as the proposed infill would have a height at the eaves and boundary less than the average height of the existing

extension, consistent with the Inspectors considerations in allowing this appeal.

In allowing the appeal for a full infill at 11 Donaldson Road, the Inspector noted as a result of the materials chosen to lighten the visual effect, and proposed excavation works to maintain a height of 2m at the joint boundary measured from the neighbours ground floor level, that the impact of the infill extension toward the neighbouring dwelling was reduced to an acceptable level. This current application uses light materials for its roof structure and also maintains a height of 2m at the joint boundary measured from the neighbouring ground floor level, consistent with the above reason put forward by the Inspector for approving the appeal at 11 Donaldson Road. Furthermore, as mentioned above, an existing structure at this current property would be demolished.

It is important to note that precedent is not normally considered to be a material planning consideration. However, given the views expressed when the Councils adopted policy on infill extensions is subject to external scrutiny, and the fact that matters of impact are inevitably similar where the specific site contexts are similar, these decisions can be given weight in the determination of this application.

Impact of infill extension on character of existing dwelling

Officers consider the infill extension to be in character with the existing building, as it is finished in light materials, in particular the glazed roof, and is also subservient to the existing dwelling. These characteristics for infill extensions were highlighted at appeal by an Inspector as reasons for approval for 39 Hopefield Road (09/1247), stating the infill:

".....would be subservient in height, width and bulk to the existing two storey extension and the original 'L' form of the present dwelling would be retained. With its glazed, monopitch roof, it would represent a contemporary approach to design, but not one that would be inappropriate in this context."

Your officers consider therefore that the infill responds to the aims of UDP policy BE26 through being sympathetic to the original design of the dwelling.

Impact of infill extension on the character of the Queens Park Conservation Area

Members will be aware that Officers have previously adopted the view that an argument could be made that a full length infill extension, filling the gap between the building and the boundary, could be considered to be out of character with the Queens Park Conservation Area. Members have also been recently informed at a recent meeting that an appeal against a refusal of planning permission at 30 Hopefield Avenue (Ref: 10/0290), where the sole objection related to the impact of the full infill on character and appearance, was allowed.

The Inspector at 30 Hopefield Avenue stated that:

"Overall, I do not find that the area of this proposed addition has any particular significance with regard to the conservation area and it would have no impact on its character or appearance".

Additionally, the Inspector at 24 Carlisle Road (09/3228) although he dismissed the appeal on impact grounds, concluded that he did not consider the infill proposal to be detrimental to the character of the conservation area, as it would not be visible from public view.

In terms of character and appearance, Officers do remain of the view that the spaces between the two-storey rear projections are defining characteristics of the properties within the Queen's Park Conservation Area and other similar Conservation Areas in Brent. However, as explained above, during recent appeal decisions Inspectors have been inclined not to dismiss appeals on the grounds of the impact on the character and appearance of the Conservation Area. This is based largely on their limited visibility and given that the specific site context here is similar to those appeal sites, it is considered that it would be difficult to construct an argument based on the

proposals detrimental impact on the character of the locality.

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
Queens Park Conservation Area Design Guide

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 hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved drawing(s) and/or document(s):

Existing Floor plans # 101, Existing Elevations # 102, Location Plan # 100, Proposed floor plans # 201 Revisiosn B, Proposed elevations # 202 revision B.

Reason: For the avoidance of doubt and in the interests of proper planning.

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

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

INFORMATIVES:

- (1) The applicant is informed that planning permission is granted here on the condition that the height of the extension is restricted to a maximum of 2 metres in height at the boundary with No.72 Harvist Road when measured from the ground level at No.72. Consent is only granted on this basis.

Any person wishing to inspect the above papers should contact Samuel Gerstein, The Planning Service, Brent House, 349 High Road, Wembley, Middlesex, HA9 6BZ, Tel. No. 020 8937 5368



Planning Committee Map

Site address: 74 Harvist Road, London, NW6 6HL

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



London Borough of Brent - Copyright (C)

This map is indicative only.