

Committee Report
Planning Committee on 4 November, 2009

Case No. 09/1880

RECEIVED: 7 August, 2009

WARD: Fryent

PLANNING AREA: Kingsbury & Kenton Consultative Forum

LOCATION: 2 Highfield Avenue, London, NW9 0PA

PROPOSAL: Retention and completion of single storey side and rear extension to dwellinghouse

APPLICANT: Mr Gorasia

CONTACT: Saloria Architects

PLAN NO'S: 9290-91-P1;
Site plan (Scale 1:1250).

This application is reported to the Planning Committee as Councillors Crane and J. Moher have requested the application be called in.

RECOMMENDATION

Refuse Planning Permission

EXISTING

The site is located on the southern side of Highfield Avenue and is bounded to the west by the rear gardens of properties on Roe Green. The dwelling has been extended through the provision of a substantially completed single storey side and rear extension, which forms the subject of this application.

Single storey rear extensions of similar materials and ages have been built on the neighbouring properties at no.s 4 and 6 Highfield Avenue as part of Application 09/0239.

No. 22 Roe Green has a detached rear outbuilding located in its rear garden adjacent to the common boundary with the site address and a large, detached pitched roof storage structure, projecting forward of the established building line is located to the west of the site property.

Land levels fall significantly towards the south and west, with the eastern side of the property approximately 1.4m higher than to the west.

PROPOSAL

The application seeks retention of the single storey side and side rear wraparound extension which links to no. 4 Highfield Avenue. The depth of the building behind the rear elevation is 3.5m adjacent to no. 4 Highfield Avenue (matching the depth of the extension on this property) and 4m adjacent to the Common Boundary with properties on Roe Green. The height of this extension at its greatest point (at the south western extent of the side extension), is 4.2m.

The extension is set back behind the main frontage of the dwelling by 250mm and has a flat roof. Construction is primarily brick, one window is inserted in the flank elevation of the side extension facing properties on Roe Green, and windows and doors are provided to rear. A window would also be provided in the front elevation.

HISTORY

- An application for full planning permission at no.s 2,4 & 6 Highfield Avenue for single storey rear extensions to all three properties and a single storey side extension was approved under 09/0239 on 20/03/2009.

An application for the erection of a two storey side extension under application C5641 1543 was approved on 26/10/1971

POLICY CONSIDERATIONS

The following policies contained within the Adopted London Borough of Brent Unitary Development Plan 2004 are applicable to this application:

- Policy BE2
- Policy BE9

Also applicable are the provisions of Supplementary Planning Guidance No. 5 "Altering and Extending Your Home".

CONSULTATION

8 Neighbouring occupiers on Highfield Avenue and Roe Green were consulted as part of the application. Three objections were received as part of the application from the occupiers of 20 and 22 Roe Green (two from this address). Objections contained within the application are as follows:

- Loss of privacy, daylight, quality of life and enjoyment of their properties.
- Concerns over the total height and length of the extension and its visual impact.
- Materials do not match main dwelling.

REMARKS

Development history:

A single storey side and rear extension (reference 09/0239) was approved for this site earlier this year and involved extensions to the site address as well as no. 4 and no. 6 Highfield Avenue.

Details within the application did not adequately indicate the correct ground level adjacent to the boundary with properties on Roe Green. Plans showed an extension of a height of 3.1m above ground level at the corner of the side rear extension, whilst the approved development would actually have been some 3.8m in height at this point. It is acknowledged that the changes in levels onsite may have been difficult to appreciate without specialist equipment and it appears that this misrepresentation was not fully appreciated at the time of consideration of the original application.

Notwithstanding this, it appears that the development proposed within application 09/0239 would have resulted in difficulty in providing internal access for the extended building as it would have required internal changes in levels to attain adequate ceiling heights and would have obstructed existing doorways. The officer understands that the development was constructed some 400mm higher than approved in order to address these issues.

Current development:

The dominance of the structure is most noticeable on the rear corner of the side rear extension, adjacent to the boundary with properties on Roe Green. The structure is significantly higher than the existing 1.6m high boundary fence and results in a significant and overbearing extension for No's 20 and especially no. 22 Roe Green.

The extension splays outwards along the side boundary of the property so that at its rearmost point it is some 5m wide as opposed to 3.2m at the front. The rear elevations of dwellings on Roe Green are over 20m distant and generally such a distance would be sufficient to mitigate the impact of such an extension on the rear windows of these dwellings.

Additionally, the extension would be substantially screened from no. 24 Roe Green, which is closest to Highfield Avenue, by virtue of the large pitched roof outbuilding to the south of the site. This structure also effectively screens much of the impact of the extension from view from Highfield Avenue itself.

Notwithstanding these mitigating factors, it is considered that the significantly lower ground level of the properties on Roe Green, the relative height of the extension, and its location close to the common boundary, with these properties, the development would result in a significant impact on the amenity of neighbouring occupiers on Roe Green (particularly no's 20 and 22) which would also be significantly greater than that approved under application 09/0239.

It is considered that the development would have a significant overbearing and monolithic appearance for these occupiers and that the outlook and general amenity of their rear elevation windows and rear garden areas have been detrimentally impacted by the development.

Provision of side elevation window:

The application proposes a side elevation window within the side elevation of the structure. Plans accompanying the application show this to be proposed to use obscure glazing and to serve a secondary shower room. It is considered that the provision of such a window would be unlikely to result in a material loss of privacy for neighbouring occupiers and can be considered to be acceptable in this respect. It is however noted that a window in this flank wall may cause problems due to access for maintenance and could be blocked by development in Roe Green

Surrounding properties:

The officer notes the presence of an existing garage structure existing to the side boundary of the property opposite the site address at no. 1 Highfield Avenue.

This extension was approved in 2000 and proposed a pitched roof single storey side extension which would partially replace an existing structure and a single storey rear extension. It appears that the structure itself may not have been built in accordance with approved plans as it appears higher and has a flat roof. The structure also includes a dummy pitch roof on the frontage of the building and a front extension including roman pillars may have been relatively recently erected to the front of this dwelling. This matter has been referred to planning enforcement for further investigation.

The officer acknowledges that the extensions to no. 1 Highfield Avenue may have resulted in detriment to neighbouring occupiers on Roe Green similar to that within the subject site, however the existence of this extension cannot be considered to negate the practical impacts resulting from the application under consideration within the current application. As such, this consideration is given limited weight in the consideration of the application.

With regard to the outbuilding existing in the rear garden of no. 22 Roe Green, the officer notes that its height appears to be of a height greater than would have been permitted under permitted development at the time of construction (sometime after 2005). In light of this, the matter has been forwarded to planning enforcement for further investigation.

Conclusion:

Given the above consideration, the impacts on adjoining occupiers are considered to be so significant that the application cannot be supported and it is recommended that the development should be refused and referred to Planning Enforcement for remedial action.

RECOMMENDATION: Refuse Consent

CONDITIONS/REASONS:

- (1) The existing unauthorised extension, by virtue of the change of ground levels onsite, and the resultant total height of the development, in conjunction with its proximity to the boundary with properties on Roe Green, would result in a significant loss of outlook from the rear facing windows of these properties, as well as a generally overbearing impact, loss of daylight and consequently diminished enjoyment for the back gardens of these dwellings and would be contrary to policies BE2 and BE9 of the Adopted London Borough of Brent Unitary Development Plan 2004 and Supplementary Planning Guidance No.5 "Altering and Extending Your Home".

INFORMATIVES:

- (1) The applicant is advised that this matter has been referred to Planning Enforcement for further action.

Any person wishing to inspect the above papers should contact Ian Hyde, The Planning Service, Brent House, 349 High Road, Wembley, Middlesex, HA9 6BZ, Tel. No. 020 8937 5241



Planning Committee Map

Site address: 2 Highfield Avenue, London, NW9 0PA

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.