

---

**RECEIVED:** 25 March, 2010

**WARD:** Queen's Park

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

**LOCATION:** 24 Carlisle Road, Kilburn, London, NW6 6TS

**PROPOSAL:** Single storey rear extension, rear dormer window and installation of 1 rear and 1 front rooflight and 1 rooflight to rear projection of dwellinghouse

**APPLICANT:** Mr Sebastian Timpson

**CONTACT:** Claridge Architects

**PLAN NO'S:**  
See condition 2

---

## **RECOMMENDATION**

Approval

## **EXISTING**

The application site is a mid-terrace 2-storey dwellinghouse on the west side of Carlisle Road, NW6. The site is within Queens Park Conservation Area.

## **PROPOSAL**

Single storey rear extension, rear dormer window and installation of 1 rear and 1 front rooflight and 1 rooflight to rear projection of dwellinghouse

## **HISTORY**

09/3288 Part Allowed

Single storey rear extension, rear dormer window and installation of 1 rear, 1 front and 1 side rooflight to dwellinghouse

This application was refused by the Council. This decision was appealed by the applicant and the Planning Inspector considered this on its impact on the conservation area and its impact on neighbouring occupiers. The Inspector 'Part Allowed' the appeal granting permission for the front, side and rear roof light and the rear dormer. Permission was not given for the single storey extension.

## **POLICY CONSIDERATIONS**

- **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

- **Supplementary Planning Guidance Note 5**
- **Queen's Park Conservation Area Design Guide**

## **CONSULTATION**

The Owner/Occupiers of the neighbouring properties were consulted on 7th April 2010, a press notice was made on 15th April 2010 and a site notice was posted to the front of the property on 16th April 2010. 1 objection was received:

- No objection to loft conversion.
- Side extension would have profound impact on neighbouring amenity.
- The proposal is in conflict with the character of the original building, extending what is already an extension.
- The outriggers are very close and filling in this gap would result in an unreasonable loss of amenity, sunlight and daylight.
- If permission was given the following details should be considered:
  - height at boundary should be limited to 2000mm from no. 22 Carlisle Road ground level.
  - The boundary wall should be 1500mm above external ground level of 22 Carlisle Road.
  - Wall is shown astride the boundary line which would require a party wall agreement.
  - Beside the boundary at no. 22 there is a hedge of ivy, jasmine, honeysuckle and rose which would be replaced by a brick wall, the proposal should include the replacement of this green edge.
    - The roof angle of the extension should match the outrigger roof.
    - The glazing in the roof should be obscure glazed as should the glazed doors facing the rear of the building to prevent a conflict with the neighbouring property.
    - Further clarification for the proposed ground levels should be provided.

A second objection has been received from Queen's Park Residents' Association:

- Increase in height of boundary treatment will harm amenity of no. 22.
- A chimney to the outrigger is to be removed, the design guide suggests they should be retained.
- 'Infills' represent over development in the terraced houses of this smaller width and adversely affects the adjoining property
- On streets where houses are wider and separated by side passages these developments can be absorbed without so much detriment.

Where adjacent owners object there is a strong feeling that their wish to reject such an intrusion should carry definitive weight.

## **REMARKS**

The proposal is for a single storey rear extension, rear dormer window and installation of 1 rear and 1 front rooflight and 1 rooflight to rear projection of dwellinghouse. As indicated above a Planning Inspector recently considered an appeal for a scheme on this site and consequently the views expressed in his decision letter form the basis of any future considerations.

### **Roof extensions and alterations**

The proposed dormer is half of the width of the rear roof plane and is designed in accordance with the Queens Park Design Guide. It is centrally positioned and its front elevation is filled by timber sash windows.

A single rooflight is proposed to each of the front, rear and side roofplanes. The rooflights are acceptable in size (850mmx500mm) and are conservation style i.e. flush with the roof plane.

The roof extensions and alterations formed part of the previous application but were not part of the reason for refusal, this was agreed by the Planning Inspector who part allowed the appeal meaning that this part of the proposal already has permission.

### **Single storey extension**

The proposed extension is to the side of the 2-storey outrigger and begins at a distance of 4m from the rear elevation of the main part of the house. This is considered to be an acceptable distance to allow outlook and light from windows which rely on outlook along the outrigger as well as providing a form of extension that would not detract from the character and appearance of the Queen's Park conservation area, which may be the case if it extended the full length of the outrigger. The extension is 3.6m in length.

At the boundary, measured from the neighbours ground level which is 0.2m lower than the application site, the existing 1.5m high fence would be replaced with a 2m high boundary wall and beyond this the extension slopes up to a approximately 2.8m measured from the neighbour's external ground level. The pitch of the roof has been revised to better reflect that of the outrigger and therefore the maximum height has reduced from 3m as originally proposed.

This compares favourably to the previous scheme which was refused and subsequently dismissed at appeal. The side elevation of the extension was proposed to be 2.7m in height from the neighbours ground level and given the siting of the extension and the sensitivity of windows relying on this passage for light and outlook this was considered overly high.

It is recommended that such extensions have a height at the boundary of 2m in the interest of neighbouring amenity, this has been difficult to achieve in this instance due to the application site having a higher ground level than its neighbour. However the proposal involves excavating the ground level by 0.65m to achieve this height at the boundary.

At ground floor the neighbour's outrigger is a kitchen, this has 2 windows in the flank wall and a sliding door to the rear. One flank wall window would be opposite the extension which would be situated at a distance of 1.65m. This relationship has significantly improved with the reduction in height of the extension to 2m.

The main part of the house has an internal floor level of 0.65m higher than external ground level. The height of the side elevation of the extension would therefore be just 1.35m above the internal floor level of the main part of the house. The glazed panels proposed to the roof will also minimise its impact compared to a slate roof.

In this instance, as pointed out by the Planning Inspector, the distance between the outriggers is quite narrow, though not notably different from the rest of the conservation area and this style of terraced property. While windows do rely on the space for light and outlook it is considered that the proposed extension is sufficiently modest so as not to have an unacceptable impact on neighbouring amenity.

In the elevation of the extension facing the main part of the house patio doors are proposed and plans indicate that these would be obscure glazed to prevent any conflict of privacy between this window and the neighbouring property. The treatment of the rest of this elevation would be brick, matching the rest of the extension. A door from the main part of the house opens onto the side return currently, the proposal involves excavating ground level of the courtyard and as such it is envisaged that the existing stairs will be continued down to the new level.

The rear elevation of the house and extension would, at ground floor, be filled by glazed sliding or folding doors. Further details are required of the proposed treatment of the garden to demonstrate how the proposed excavation will be dealt with in terms of landscaping.

Regarding the neighbours concern about the existing planting to the no. 22 side of the boundary treatment, the applicants have indicated that they would be willing to replace this planting. This could be dealt with as part of a Party Wall agreement but being a civil matter it does not form a part of this application or condition attached to it the permission.

The proposal is considered to comply with policies contained in Brent's UDP 2004 as such approval is recommended.

## **REASONS FOR CONDITIONS**

**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  
Queen's 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 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.

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

GA.00  
GA.01  
GA.02  
GA.03  
GA.04D  
GA.05C  
GA.06C  
GA.07C  
GE.01  
GE.02  
GE.03E  
GE.04E  
GS.02C

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

- (3) All new external work shall be carried out in materials that match, 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) Further details of the proposed development shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority before any work is commenced and the development shall be carried out and completed in all respects in accordance with the details so approved. Such details shall include:-

- The landscaping of the rear of the site including proposed ground levels and hard and softlandscaping.

Reason: These details are required to ensure that a satisfactory development is achieved.

**INFORMATIVES:**

None Specified

**REFERENCE DOCUMENTS:**

Any person wishing to inspect the above papers should contact Liz Sullivan, The Planning Service, Brent House, 349 High Road, Wembley, Middlesex, HA9 6BZ, Tel. No. 020 8937 5377



# Planning Committee Map

Site address: 24 Carlisle Road, Kilburn, London, NW6 6TS

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.