

COMMITTEE REPORT

Planning Committee on
Item No
Case Number

12 July, 2017
03
17/1915

SITE INFORMATION

RECEIVED	1 May, 2017
WARD	Barnhill
PLANNING AREA	Brent Connects Kingsbury & Kenton
LOCATION	14 Grendon Gardens, Wembley, HA9 9NE
PROPOSAL	Proposed part single and part two storey rear extension, loft conversion including addition of dormer window to rear slope and insertion of roof lights, remodelling of front entrance and landscaping scheme of front garden to existing dwelling house.
APPLICANT	Mr Retkin
CONTACT	David Andrews Chartered Surveyor
PLAN NO'S	DIA-BR-003-001 DIA-BR-003-002 DIA-BR-003-003 DIA-BR-003-004 DIA-BR-003-005 DIA-BR-003-006 DIA-BR-003-007 DIA-BR-003-008 DIA-BR-003-009 DIA-BR-003-010 DIA-BR-003-011 DIA-BR-003-012 DIA-BR-003-013 DIA-BR-003-014 Site location plan
LINK TO DOCUMENTS ASSOCIATED WITH THIS PLANNING APPLICATION	<p><u>When viewing this on an Electronic Device</u></p> <p>Please click on the link below to view ALL document associated to case https://pa.brent.gov.uk/online-applications/applicationDetails.do?activeTab=documents&keyVal=DCAPR_134008</p> <p style="text-align: right;"><i>DocRepF</i> Ref: 17/1915 Page 1 of 13</p>

When viewing this as an Hard Copy .

Please use the following steps

1. Please go to pa.brent.gov.uk
2. Select Planning and conduct a search tying "17/1915" (i.e. Case Reference) into the search Box
3. Click on "View Documents" tab

RECOMMENDATIONS

This application is to be determined by the Planning Committee as it has been called in by Councillors. Please see the call-in details at the end of this report.

It is recommended that the Committee resolve to REFUSE planning permission for the following reason: The proposed rear extension, by reason of its size and siting and in particular, the inclusion of a first floor rear element of extension, having regard to the hilly character and dramatic changes in level throughout the Conservation Area, represents the provision of a feature that is detrimental to the character and appearance of the property and the surrounding conservation area, resulting in harm to the wider views of the property and in particular, views of the first floor rear elevation and the roofslopes within the Barn Hill Conservation Area. This is contrary to policy DMP1 and DMP7 of the Brent Local Plan Development Management Policies 2016 and the Barn Hill Conservation Area Design Guide.

That the Head of Planning is delegated authority to make changes to the wording of the committee's decision (such as to vary the reason for refusal) prior to the decision being actioned, provided that the Head of Planning is satisfied that any such changes could not reasonably be regarded as deviating from the overall principle of the decision reached by the committee nor that such change(s) could reasonably have led to a different decision having been reached by the committee.

SITE MAP



Planning Committee Map

Site address: 14 Grendon Gardens, Wembley, HA9 9NE

© Crown copyright and database rights 2011 Ordnance Survey 100025260



This map is indicative only.

PROPOSAL IN DETAIL

The proposal involves extensions and alterations to this detached dwellinghouse situated within the Barn Hill Conservation Area.

A part single, part two-storey rear extension is proposed. The single storey element projects to a depth of 3.5 m beyond the rear wall of the original house, with the depth of extension reduced by 1 m to the rear of the existing side extension. The side wall of the extension is set 1 m in from the side wall of the existing side extension.

A rear dormer window is proposed together with 1 conservation style rooflight within the rear roof plane and one within the side roof plane.

The existing porch is proposed to be removed and a new porch constructed.

Changes to the frontage are also shown, with a front wall, soft landscaping (approximately 31 % of the frontage) and three parking spaces.

EXISTING

The application site is a two storey detached dwellinghouse situated along the Northern side of Grendon Gardens. The surrounding area is predominantly residential. The property is situated within the Barn Hill Conservation Area, and is subject to the Article 4 Direction. The property is not a Listed Building.

There is an existing two storey side extension, granted under planning application 16/4925. The front porch connects to the original front extension (W/C on the existing ground floor plan). These are covered by a 3.2m high flat roof which connects to the existing ground floor front bay window. The existing frontage consists of 100% hardstanding.

SUMMARY OF KEY ISSUES

The following are the key considerations in assessing this application:

- 1) Design and appearance of the proposed extensions and impact on the Conservation Area:
The single storey rear element of the extension and the front porch are considered to accord with the Barn Hill Conservation Area Design Guide. However, the Design Guide sets out a presumption against the provision of first floor rear extensions and there is no justification for a departure from the adopted guidance in this instance. The first floor rear element of the extension is accordingly considered to be harmful to the character and appearance of the Conservation Area.
- 2) Whether the proposed development results in unduly detrimental impacts upon the amenity of neighbouring occupiers. The size of the extension accords with the guidance provided in Supplementary Planning Guidance No. 5 relating to impact on the light and outlook enjoyed by neighbouring properties. However, this is not considered to outweigh the harm discussed in bullet point 1.
- 3) Parking, access and frontage layout: The proposal includes the provision of three parking spaces, but the proportion of soft landscaping falls below the minimum level set out within the Design Guide and the level set out within condition 4 of the 2016 consent relating to this property. If permission was to be granted, a condition could be added requiring revised frontage landscaping and layout details to address this issue.

RELEVANT SITE HISTORY

16/4925 - Demolition of attached garage and erection of a two storey side extension. Granted planning permission.

Condition 4 of the decision notice specified that a front garden plan shall be submitted to and approved in writing prior to first occupation of the extension hereby approved, showing (i) 50% soft landscaping within the front garden including details of any proposed planting and (ii) details of front boundary wall extended to the edge of crossover and showing pedestrian visibility splays (2m x 2m above a height of 0.8m) at the vehicular access. The approved details shall be implemented in full prior to first occupation of the extension hereby approved.

No discharge of conditions application has been submitted.

CONSULTATIONS

7 properties & Cllrs Kansagra and Choudhary were notified of the proposal via letters dated the 24th of May 2017.

Barn Hill Residents' Association was consulted on the 31st of May 2017.

A site notice was displayed on the 31st of May 2017.

A press notice was issued on the 1st of June 2017.

To date, no representations have been received.

POLICY CONSIDERATIONS

National Planning Policy Framework 2012

London Plan Consolidated with alterations since 2011 (March 2016)

London Borough of Brent Core Strategy (2010)

CP17: protecting the suburban character of Brent

Development Management Policies (2016)

DMP 1: development management general policy

DMP 7: Brent's heritage assets

Conservation Area Character Appraisal & Design Guide

Barn Hill Character Appraisal & Barn Hill Design Guide (2013)

DETAILED CONSIDERATIONS

Part single, part two storey rear extension

As discussed above, a part single, part two-storey rear extension is proposed. The first floor element of the extension would be situated to the rear of the original house whilst the single storey element projects rearward of both the original house and the existing side extension. The single storey element projects to a depth of 3.5 m to the rear of the original house with the depth of rearward projection reduced by 1 m where it

is to the rear of the side extension. The side wall of the rear extension is set 1 m in from the side wall of the extension, and thus, more than 1 m from the side boundary of the property. No significant ground level changes are present between the applicant site and the neighbouring properties.

The single storey rear element of the extension accords with the Barn Hill Design Guide. This specifies that single storey rear extensions that project across the whole width of the extended house in this way are acceptable providing the depth of the element to the rear of the side extension is reduced by 1 m and that element of the extension is also set a minimum of 1 m from the side boundary. The roof of the single storey element is pitched. This results in a small section of crown roof. Such roof forms are not supported above first floor level, but given its modest size and height and its location (above a single storey extension), this is not considered to be harmful to the character of the conservation area. The average height of the pitched element of the roof is 3.1 m. Whilst this exceeds the 3m average height stated in the design guide, the roof slopes to the sides with eaves along the flank walls of the extension, reducing its impact. The bay window of No. 16 is not immediately adjacent to the proposed extension, and the extension will comply with the 90 degree guidance specified on P20 of the Design Guide.

The first floor element of the extension would project 2 m from the rear wall of the original element of the house. It is proposed to have a roof pitch which would match the pitch of the original roof of the house. The Barn Hill Design Guide (page 16) specifies that 'Most houses in Barn Hill are relatively modest in size. This means that, in most cases, nothing other than a small extension will be acceptable. The Barn Hill area benefits from its hilly character but the dramatic changes in level throughout the Conservation Area mean that two storey rear extensions will not normally be permitted because they will have a seriously negative impact on your neighbour. Above all, for a proposal to be acceptable, it must either preserve or preferably enhance the character of the area'. There is no section within the Design Guide relating to two-storey extensions because they are not normally considered to be acceptable. The design guide was adopted in 2013 following extensive public consultation.

It is considered that the width, large pitched roof, and depth of the first floor rear extension results in a significant mass which reads as a bulky and overbearing addition; one which is out of character with the applicant property and the surrounding Barn Hill Conservation Area.

It is noted that the house two properties to the east (No. 12A) projects significantly rearward of the first floor rear wall of the house within the subject site which is a historical relationship. However, the properties on both sides of the subject site together with those to further west have a reasonably consistent first floor building line and it is considered that the size and siting of No. 12A, some two doors down, does not mitigate this harm or justify a departure from the guidance within the Design Guide.

The proposed first floor extension accords with the 1:2 guidance set out in Supplementary Planning Guidance No. 5 (which measures the distance from the side wall of the extension to the mid-point of both neighbours nearest habitable room window, and then allows an extension half this depth) in relation to both adjoining properties. However, compliance with this guidance (which relates generally to properties in Brent) is not considered to justify the approval of a scheme which doesn't accord with the guidance in place within this specific Conservation Area.

There would be over 4m between the side wall of proposed extension and the mid-point of No.12s nearest habitable room window. There would be over 6m between the side wall of the proposed extension and the mid-point of No.16s nearest habitable room window.

The rear boundary of No.13 & 15 Eversley Avenue adjoins that of the applicant site. The minimum 25m distance (measured via aerial photography) between the rear elevation of No.13 & 15 Eversley Avenue and the proposal would be considered to mitigate against an unduly detrimental impact on the amenity of these

properties.

In summary, whilst the single storey element of the extension is acceptable, the first floor element is harmful to the character and appearance of the property and Conservation Area, contrary to policies DMP1 and DMP7 and the Barn Hill Conservation Area Design Guide.

Rear dormer window and rooflights

Rear dormer windows within Barn Hill are acceptable in principle subject to certain design considerations set out within the Design Guide. The width (1.8m), set up from the eaves (1.5m), set down from the original ridgeline (0.5m) and set in from the side roof planes (0.25 m), predominant glazing of the front face and design comply with the Design Guide.

One side rooflight & one rear rooflight are proposed. The submission confirms that these will be flush mounted, conservation type rooflights with a black factory finish and central vertical glazing bar. This is in line with the Design Guide.

Overall, the rear dormer window and rooflights are in keeping with the character of the property and conservation area.

Change to porch

The front entrance modelling involves the alteration of the existing 3.2m high flat roof porch (which covers the existing porch and original front extension) to create a pitched roof porch, 3.4m in average height. No additional forward projection is proposed.

Whilst the average height is an increase from the existing, the design would be in keeping with the porch structure present at No.12 Grendon Gardens, and the lack of a connection to the existing ground floor bay window would be considered to result in a less dominant structure; to the benefit of the properties' character and the wider streetscene.

Front garden landscaping

The proposal would result in 6 bedrooms. The property has a PTAL 4 rating, which attracts a maximum parking standard of 1.2 spaces for a unit of this size as set out within Apex 1 (parking standards) of the Development Management Policies (2016).

The proposed frontage plan depicts 3 off-street parking spaces with approximately 31 % of the frontage proposed as soft landscaping. It should be noted that a condition (No. 4) was attached to the previous planning consent for the two-storey side extension (reference 16/4925) requiring the approval of details of landscaping showing 50 % soft landscaping, front boundary wall treatments and visibility splays. However, details have not been submitted and no landscape works have been implemented as yet.

Whilst this represents an improvement over the situation prior to the 2016 consent, these proposals place significant additional demand on the need to use the frontage for parking. The landscaping plan does not accord with the Barn Hill Design Guide which specifies a minimum of 50% soft landscaping and which is achievable within the site. However, if permission was to be granted, a condition similar to that imposed on the previous consent could be attached to secure this and this has not been cited as a reason for refusal of planning permission.

Supporting information submitted with this application

The applicant has referred to planning consent reference 16/0539 at 21 Eversley Avenue and applications reference 02/2174 and 11/0289 at 17 Brampton Grove as precedents for the proposal.

No. 21 Eversley Avenue had an existing two-storey rear extension. Application reference 16/0539 proposed a rear extension that would be sited to the side of this existing two-storey rear extension but would not project

to the rear of it. In allowing the appeal, the inspector specified that:

In relation to the first floor rear infill extension, I note that the Barn Hill Conservation Area Design Guide (2013) generally seeks to limit the height of rear extensions to a maximum average of 3m, thereby generally precluding two storey extensions or as in this case, a first floor extension. However, the rear extension being an infill in part of an existing reveal, would appear as part of a unified whole with the remainder of the property, beneath a simpler unified roof form. As it would not project beyond the main rear elevation of the property and given its limited massing, I consider it would integrate comfortably with the host property and would have negligible impact on its overall proportions.

The proposed extension to 14 Grendon Gardens is materially different from that proposal. It is proposed to extend beyond the existing first floor rear wall of No. 14 whilst the Eversley application did not project beyond the existing rear wall of the extension. The inspector placed significant weight on this and the benefits associated with achieving a more unified roof form from the existing.

Application 02/2174 relating to 17 Brampton Grove proposed a part single, part two storey side and rear extension to the dwellinghouse. This application was refused, but allowed on appeal. The extension was not built in accordance to the plans approved under appeal and a retrospective planning application (11/0289) was submitted following the upholding on appeal of an enforcement notice (served 15th May 2008). The appeal decision for 02/2174 accepted the principle of a two-storey rear extension development at 17 Brampton Grove. In relation to this particular site, the Inspector considered that the extension completed an extension to the adjoining property and would not appear overly intrusive in the area, highlighting the stepped design approach between properties in the vicinity. Following the construction of an extension that was no in accordance with the original consent, consent was granted in 2011 for the extensions with alterations to the unlawful extension (reference 11/0289). A first floor rear extension was approved through the 2011 consent on the basis that it had been accepted previously for this particular site by an Inspector in 2002. The circumstances are again considered to differ from the current applicant site, and it is not considered that this creates a precedent for the proposed extension.

It should be noted that permission was refused and appeals dismissed for proposed first floor / two-storey rear extensions relating to properties at 66 West Hill (07/2154), 2 Wickliffe Gardens (09/1007), 6 Mayfields (10/1011) and 1 Corringham Road (14/4838). Each proposal is considered on its individual merit having regard to the specific circumstances. However, officers do not consider that appeals within the Conservation Area have created a precedent to justify the approval of a scheme that is clearly contrary to the adopted Barn Hill Conservation Area Design Guide.

The applicant has also cited initial comments from the Council's Heritage Officer within which the officer specified that '*a first floor rear extension is on balance acceptable if designed to follow other precedents*'.

An assessment of the cited and other cases has shown that this original assessment was incorrect and the heritage officer has confirmed that the scheme is considered contrary to the Design Guide and harmful to the character of the property and conservation area.

Recommendation

Whilst the single storey element of the extension and the porch are considered to be acceptable, the proposed first floor rear element of the extension is harmful to the character and appearance of the Conservation Area and contrary to policies DMP1, DMP7 and the Conservation Area Design Guide. The frontage layout is also contrary to the design guide, but a revised layout and associated details could be secured through condition if consent was to be granted.



Brent

DRAFT NOTICE

TOWN AND COUNTRY PLANNING ACT 1990 (as amended)

DECISION NOTICE – REFUSAL

Application No: 17/1915

To: Andrews
David Andrews Chartered Surveyor
Scarthoe
Market Street
Kington
LD7 1EY

I refer to your application dated 28/04/2017 proposing the following:
Proposed part single and part two storey rear extension, loft conversion including addition of dormer window to rear slope and insertion of roof lights, remodelling of front entrance and landscaping scheme of front garden to existing dwelling house.

and accompanied by plans or documents listed here:

DIA-BR-003-001

DIA-BR-003-002

DIA-BR-003-003

DIA-BR-003-004

DIA-BR-003-005

DIA-BR-003-006

DIA-BR-003-007

DIA-BR-003-008

DIA-BR-003-009

DIA-BR-003-010

DIA-BR-003-011

DIA-BR-003-012

DIA-BR-003-013

DIA-BR-003-014

Site location plan

at 14 Grendon Gardens, Wembley, HA9 9NE

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: 30/06/2017

Signature:

Alice Lester

Alice Lester

Head of Planning, Transport and Licensing

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. The scheme does not comply with guidance.

REASONS

- 1 The proposed rear extension, by reason of its size and siting and in particular, the inclusion of a first floor rear element of extension, having regard to the hilly character and dramatic changes in level throughout the Conservation Area, represents the provision of a feature that is detrimental to the character and appearance of the property and the surrounding conservation area, resulting in harm to the wider views of the property and in particular, views of the first floor rear elevation and the roofslopes within the Barn Hill Conservation Area. This is contrary to policy DMP1 and DMP7 of the Brent Local Plan Development Management Policies 2016 and the Barn Hill Conservation Area Design Guide 2013.

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 Warren

Date and Reason for Request

20th June 2017. Requested because: Councillor considers the proposal is in accordance with Barn Hill Design Guide; There is precedent for similar properties to be granted approval; The application was given approval....but then approval withdrawn.

Name of Councillor

Councillor Carr

Date and Reason for Request

21st June 2017. Requested because: same reasons as Cllr Warren

Name of Councillor

Councillor Shaw

Date and Reason for Request

20th June 2017. Requested because: same reasons as Cllr Warren.

Name of Councillor

Councillor Kansagra

Date and Reason for Request

19th June 2017. Requested because: proposal is compliant with, and takes into consideration the Conservation Area status of the site.

Representations

We have been approached by the applicant, Mr B Retkin regarding this matter.

Name of Councillor

Councillor Colwill

Date and Reason for Request

19th June 2017. Requested because: same reasons as Cllr Kansagra.

Name of Councillor

Councillor Davidson

Date and Reason for Request

19th June 2017. Requested because: same reasons as Cllr Kansagra.

Name of Councillor

Councillor Pavey

Date and Reason for Request

16th June 2017. Requested because: no reasons provided.

Any person wishing to inspect the above papers should contact Elliot Brown, Planning and Regeneration, Brent Civic Centre, Engineers Way, Wembley, HA9 0FJ, Tel. No. 020 8937 020 8937 6204