Committee Report Planning Committee on 8 June, 2010

Item No. 18 Case No.

10/0933

RECEIVED: 17 April, 2010

WARD: **Brondesbury Park**

PLANNING AREA: Kilburn & Kensal Consultative Forum

LOCATION: Garages rear of 55 Mount Pleasant Road, Henley Road, London

PROPOSAL: Demolition of an existing single-storey, double-garage building to rear

of 55 Mount Pleasant Road, NW10; and the erection of a new

single-storey, pitched-roof, two-bedroom dwellinghouse with basement storage accommodation, removal of the existing vehicular access onto Henley Road with associated landscaping of the garden amenity area.

APPLICANT: Mr Rayburn

CONTACT: Ambo Architects London

PLAN NO'S:

OS Sitemap

350/020

350/021

350/022

350/023A

407/GA.1A

407/GA.2B

407/GA.3A

407/GA.4A

407/GA.5A

407/GA.6A

407/GA.8A

407/GA.10A

407/GA.11A

407/GA.13A

407/GA.15

RECOMMENDATION

Refusal

EXISTING

The application refers to the site at the rear of No 55 Mount Pleasant Road which sites a detached The ownership of the application site have been separated from the dwellinghouse at No 55 for over 7 years.

The predominant surrounding character is residential, mainly with semi detached properties along Mount Pleasant Road and terraced properties along Hanover Road. The rear gardens of Mount Pleasant Road and Hanover Road make up the street frontage of Henley Road with access to the detached garages at the rear of those properties. There are four detached garages in total, including the application site, fronting Henley Road.

PROPOSAL

Demolition of an existing single-storey, double-garage building to rear of 55 Mount Pleasant Road, NW10; and the erection of a new single-storey, pitched-roof, two-bedroom dwellinghouse with basement storage accommodation, removal of the existing vehicular access onto Henley Road with associated landscaping of the garden amenity area.

HISTORY

The application site has been subject to various applications in previous years.

00/1475 - An application was refused for the demolition of existing double garage and the erection of a two storey detached house in the rear garden, in 2000. The applicant appealed the Council's decision and the Appeal was subsequently dismissed.

06/0254 - A change of use application for the use of the garage as a design studio was refused on 06/04/06

07/1004 - An application for the demolition of the garage to erect a two storey dwellinghouse was withdrawn on 02/08/2007

08/0150 - A similar application to 07/1004 was refused on 31/3/08

08/1976 – Demolition of an existing single-storey double garage to the rear of 55 Mount Pleasant Road, NW10, and erection of a new two-storey (basement and ground-floor level), 3-bedroom dwellinghouse, replacement of boundary fences and walls, removal of existing vehicular access onto Henley Road, NW10, and formation of new pedestrian access onto Henley Road, with associated landscaping. Dismissed at appeal.

Another application was submitted simultaneously, the principle difference being the form of the roof:

10/0933 - Demolition of an existing single-storey, double-garage building to rear of 55 Mount Pleasant Road, NW10; and erection of a new **single-storey**, flat-roofed, two-bedroom dwellinghouse with basement storage accommodation, removal of the existing vehicular access onto Henley Road with associated landscaping of the garden amenity area. This application appears elsewhere on this Planning Committee agenda.

POLICY CONSIDERATIONS

Brent Unitary Development Plan 2004

STR11 – The quality and character of the Borough's built and natural environment will be protected and enhanced; and proposals which would have a significant harmful impact on the environment or amenities of the Borough will be refused.

STR14 – New development will be expected to make a positive contribution to improving the quality of the urban environment in Brent by being designed with proper consideration of key urban design principles relating to townscape (local context and character), urban structure (space and movement), urban clarity and safety, the public realm (landscape and streetscape), architectural quality and sustainability.

BE2 - Design should have regard to the local context, making a positive contribution to the character of the area. Account should be taken of existing landform and natural features, the need to improve the quality of existing urban spaces, materials and townscape features that contribute favourably to the area's character, or have an unacceptable visual impact on Metropolitan Open Land. Proposals should not cause harm to the character and/or appearance of an area. Application of these criteria should not preclude the sensitive introduction of innovative contemporary designs.

BE3 – Relates to urban structure, space and movement and indicates that proposals should have regard for the existing urban grain, development patterns and density in the layout of development sites.

BE6 - High standard of landscaping required as an integral element of development, including a design which reflects how the area will be used and the character of the locality and surrounding buildings, new planting of an appropriate species, size, density of planting with semi-mature or advanced nursery stock, new integrally designed structural landscaping on appropriate larger sites, boundary treatments which complement the development and enhance the streetscene and screening of access roads and obtrusive development from neighbouring residential properties.

BE7 – A high quality of design and materials will be required.

BE9 – Creative and high-quality design solutions (for extensions) specific to site's shape, size, location and development opportunities Scale/massing and height should be appropriate to their setting and/or townscape location, respect, whilst not necessarily replicating, the positive local design characteristics of adjoining development and satisfactorily relate to them, exhibit a consistent and well considered application of principles of a chosen style, have attractive front elevations which address the street at ground level with well proportioned windows and habitable rooms and entrances on the frontage, wherever possible, be laid out to ensure the buildings and spaces are of a scale, design and relationship to promote the amenity of users providing satisfactory sunlight, daylight, privacy and outlook for existing and proposed residents and use high quality and durable materials of compatible or complementary colour/texture to the surrounding area.

H11 - Housing will be promoted on previously developed urban land which the Plan does not protect for other land uses.

H12 – The layout and urban design of residential development should comply with the policies in the Built Environment Chapter, and in addition they should have a site layout which reinforces or creates an attractive and distinctive identity, have housing facing onto streets and defining roads, have access to and layout which achieves traffic safety, have appropriate car parking, and avoid excessive coverage of tarmac or hard landscaping.

TRN11 – Developments should comply with the plan's minimum Cycle Parking Standard (PS16), with cycle parking situated in a convenient, secure and, where appropriate, sheltered location.

TRN23 – Residential developments should not provide more parking than the levels as listed in standard PS14 for that type of housing, with its maximum assigned parking levels. Lower standards apply for developments in town centres with good and very good public transport accessibility. Where development provides or retains off-street parking at this level then on-street parking will not be assessed. Car-free housing developments may be permitted in areas with good or very good public transport accessibility where occupation is restricted by condition to those who have signed binding agreements not to be car owners. Such persons will not be granted residents' parking permits.

Supplementary Planning Guidance

SPG17 – Design Guide For New Development

CONSULTATION

Neighbouring occupiers were consulted on 28th April 2010. Neighbours have commented on both this application and 10/0933 without specifically differentiating between them, therefore the objections are considered as relating to both applications. There are 13 in total, plus a petition of of 90 signatures from the local area raising the following issues:

- Increased noise impacting on tranquillity and use of gardens.
- Effect on character of the area and local distinctiveness suburban and open character would be harmed, existing buildings are ancillary. There is no precedent for a dwelling on Henley Road but this would set a precedent for the area.
- Loss of privacy location of a master bedroom in close proximity to neighbours gardens would impact on their use and enjoyment.
- Loss of trees if permission is given it would likely lead to requests to remove or severely lop neighbouring trees.
- Development has a cramped 'chicken coop' design and site is too small for a residential dwelling.
- Light would emanate from the proposed rooflights harming residential amenity an approved 'lantern' at the Tiverton centre has been conditioned to be lit only between 7am and 10pm in the interest of neighbouring amenity.

Another issue regarding fencing at the site has been raised, stating that the fence between the site and number 55 Mount Pleasant Road is not to be removed and is to remain at 3m in height. A 3m high fence would not affect the acceptability of this scheme and the issue of it not being removed i.e. during construction would be a civil matter which both parties would need to negotiate, this would not be a planning consideration.

Internal

Transportation:

- Existing garages providing 2 off-street spaces will be lost, however these are in separate ownership from 55 Mount Pleasant Road and are not in use.
- Proposed dwelling will attract a maximum of 1.2 car spaces.

The applicant has confirmed that the dropped kerb will be reinstated which will allow for a single on-street space.

REMARKS

The proposal is for the demolition of an existing single-storey, double-garage building to rear of 55 Mount Pleasant Road, NW10; and the erection of a new single-storey, pitched-roof, two-bedroom dwellinghouse with basement storage accommodation, removal of the existing vehicular access onto Henley Road with associated landscaping of the garden amenity area.

Introduction

The application site comprises a double domestic garage which once belonged to the dwellinghouse at No 55 Mount Pleasant Road. The site has been subdivided for more than 7 years. The garage and the dwellinghouse are now under separate ownership.

As indicated in the history section above, the application site has been the subject of several development proposals none of which have been successful. However, two have been taken to appeal and the views of the Inspector become material to the consideration of this proposal. The difficulties in the past have, in part, been due to privacy and overlooking impact from the proposed first floor level. However, in an appeal outcome for the demolition of the garage and the building of a new coach house at the bottom of the garden (Council's ref 00/1475), the Inspector had made the following comment.

"...there is no overriding reason why, in principle, part of the existing curtilage of 55 Mount Pleasant Road should not be put into more efficient use, by the erection of a new dwellinghouse, of a suitable design. A substantial garage currently occupies most of the site and the footprint of the proposed dwelling would cover a similar area. The development would not impinge significantly, on the existing garden area for 55 Mount Pleasant Road and thus, I do not consider that it would detract significantly from the spaciousness of the area....."

In these circumstances, it is considered that the principle of erecting a separate house on the site

has been established and it consequently falls to deal with the related details to ensure local amenity is not harmed.

Proposal - design

Application reference 08/1976, for a 2-storey dwellinghouse (basement and ground floor) was refused by the Council. The main reasons for refusal were for its size, scale, siting and design. This decision was taken to appeal and while the Planning Inspector dismissed the appeal it was for the reason of the level of amenity which the dwelling would provide rather than any concern about the appearance of the building or its relationship with neighbours.

The dismissed scheme was a flat roofed building with a half basement and raised ground floor level and the Inspector stated:

"..the setting of the appeal site would be able to successfully accommodate the low profile contemporary design proposed, it would add interest to the locality and contribute positively to its character and appearance".

The proposed dwellinghouse is L-shaped with a high pitched roof. The proposed building site within a 45 degree angle from 2m in height at the boundaries as per the guidance of SPG17, however the pitched roof means that rather than a 'low profile contemporary design' the proposed pitched roof has an obtrusive appearance. The maximum height of the main pitched roof is approximately 4.1m, over 0.5m higher than the existing flat roofed garage and officers' consider that its scale, height and bulk is inappropriate to its setting and would have a dominating impact on neighbouring gardens.

The nature of buildings on Henley Road has traditionally been ancillary to the frontage buildings of Mount Pleasant Road and Hanover Road, and while the principle of the residential use is not considered to conflict with planning policy the impact of this particular design of building is considered to significantly alter this traditional 'ancillary' character. There is an example of a single storey building with a pitched roof to the rear of 96 Hanover Road, fronting Henley Road, for which there is no planning history. It is apparent that the design of the roof of this building has a much more pronounced impact on the road than the flat roofed garages and it is not considered that replicating this design is appropriate as it would be harmful to the somewhat suburban and open character of the streetscene.

More over the pitched roof results in a design which is not obviously contemporary nor traditional in its appearance and is not considered to exhibit a consistent design approach as required by Policy BE9. There is also an incongruous relationship between the pitched roof over the main part of the building and the lower pitched roof over the forward projecting bedroom, which appears almost as a separate building.

The front elevation includes large glazed windows/doors facing the frontage of the site and the main fenestration from bedroom 2 faces the garages at the rear of 98 Hanover Road, no part of the scheme would impact on the privacy of neighbouring occupiers in terms of overlooking.

As noted above objections have been received with regard to noise and privacy, however as described the proposal is considered to comply with the Council's policies and guidance in these areas and the Planning Inspector did not consider that the noise level from a new dwellinghouse would be unacceptable.

The proposal provides 2 bedrooms, a family sized dwelling, with adequate internal floorspace plus a basement for utilities/storage. The reason for the Planning Inspector's dismissal of the previous scheme was the quality of accommodation which would be provided by the basement level habitable accommodation. In the current design the basement would be a utility and storage room, not requiring windows and as such the level of amenity in terms of light and outlook provided by the proposed dwellinghouse would be acceptable.

Amenity space

The amenity space for the proposed dwellinghouse is located to the front which provides over 50sqm which is the minimum required by SPG17. In addition, the floor plan currently indicates new silver birch trees and a high quality landscaping scheme could be sought. The location of the amenity space also reduces the potential overlooking and privacy impact to the nearby neighbours.

Transportation

The existing garage can accommodate 2 off street parking spaces however the site is under separate ownership to No 55 Mount Pleasant Road and it is not currently in use. The proposed dwelling will result in an increase in parking attracting up to 1.2 spaces in accordance with the Parking Standard 14 of Unitary Development Plan 2004. In order to ease the parking spaces on Henley Road, the existing 6m dropped kerb serving the garages could be reinstated to pedestrian footway and would allow room on street for a vehicle space to serve the dwelling, although this will not be restricted in anyway.

Conclusion

The proposed dwellinghouse by reason of its design and specifically high pitched roof, results in a height, scale and bulk detrimental to the amenity of neighbouring occupiers. Furthermore the design of roof would dominate the streetscene detrimental to the character of the road while also failing to exhibit a consistent and considered design approach. As such the proposal fails to comply with policies BE2, BE7 and BE9 of Brent's Unitary Development Plan 2004 as well as SPG17.

REASONS FOR CONDITIONS

RECOMMENDATION: Refuse Consent

CONDITIONS/REASONS:

(1) The proposed dwellinghouse by reason of its design and roof design, results in a height, scale and bulk detrimental to the visual amenity of neighbouring occupiers, in particular, and the locality, in general. Furthermore the design of roof would dominate the streetscene detrimental to the generally open character of the road while also failing to exhibit a consistent and considered design approach. As such the proposal fails to comply with policies BE2, BE7 and BE9 of Brent's Unitary Development Plan 2004 as well as SPG17: Design Guide for New Development.

INFORMATIVES:

None Specified

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

Q E N A

Planning Committee Map

Site address: Garages rear of 55 Mount Pleasant Road, Henley Road, London

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

