

RECEIVED: 2 November, 2010

WARD: Brondesbury Park

PLANNING AREA: Kilburn & Kensal Consultative Forum

LOCATION: 34 Mount Pleasant Road, London, NW10 3EL

PROPOSAL: Demolition of attached garage and erection of a two storey side extension to dwellinghouse

APPLICANT: Mr Misha Ivanovic

CONTACT: Webb Architects Limited

PLAN NO'S:
See condition 2.

RECOMMENDATION

Grant Consent

EXISTING

The subject site, located on the north-western side of Mount Pleasant road, is occupied by a two-storey detached dwellinghouse. The site is not in a conservation area.

PROPOSAL

Demolition of attached garage and erection of a two storey side extension to dwellinghouse

HISTORY

10/1129 -Certificate of lawfulness granted for proposed side dormer window, installation of two front and one side rooflights and installation of cabrio balcony to rear roof slope of dwellinghouse.

POLICY CONSIDERATIONS

Brent UDP 2004

BE2 – Townscape; Local Context & Character

BE7 – Public Realm: Street scene

BE9 – Architectural Quality

SPG

SPG 5 – Altering and Extending Your Home

Considerations;

Design & appearance of extension

Effects on neighbouring properties

Character of existing dwellinghouse and streetscene

CONSULTATION

Neighbours representees

7 neighbouring properties consulted

6 objections received plus petition of objectors to proposals with 11 signatures, 4 of which also sent in aforementioned objections

Initial points raised

- Proposals will create a terraced appearance in the street.
- houses were originally designed with decorative art Decco windows to let light into the stairwell. Proposals will block light.
- Proposals will create overlooking issues at rear.
- Proposals will reduce side passage area.

8 neighbouring properties re consulted 30/11/2010 on amendments

(applicant revised plans as follows -2.5m 1st floor setback, levelling of eaves with existing and reconfiguration of roof to match existing)

- 2 initial representees reiterated earlier objections post this amendment. 1 of these representees on behalf of no 36 acknowledges amendments addresses SPG5 requirements but still objects on grounds of impact on character and neighbouring amenity.

8 neighbouring properties re consulted 07/12/2010 on amendments

(applicant revised plans as follows - implemented a set back from the boundary with no 36 creating a 1m gap between flank wall elevations)

- 3 initial representees reiterate earlier objections despite amendment and 1 new objector sent in representation bringing total to 6.

Statutory Consultees

Transportation Officers consulted gave no objection to the loss of the garage on grounds that it would actually bring the level of on-site parking more in line with UDP policy PS14 given the existence of on-site parking in the front driveway. Also recommended was a more comprehensive reconfiguration of the parking area to increase quantity of soft landscaping, introduce a front boundary treatment to close unauthorized access point, and provide secure cycle parking and refuse collection.

REMARKS

Discussion

The proposal is for a two storey side extension to the existing large detached dwelling house. The side extension would be 2.9m high on the single storey element and will be built on the joint boundary with the neighbour. As the distance from the boundary is less than 1m, the first floor is set back 2.5m from the front elevation wall in accordance with SPG5. The eaves of the side extension are level with those in the existing dwelling and the roof to the extension is in keeping with the character of the property and is set down from the main roof, ensuring it remains subservient to the original roof. The set back, eaves level and roof design were submitted as an amendment (29/11/2010) as requested by officers in order to address SPG5 specifications.

The first floor of the extension is set off the boundary to facilitate a 1m gap between flank walls. The amended plans include this set back for reasons of preserving, as far as practicable, outlook from the neighbouring reception and stairwell area and also to enable access for maintenance. This was deemed necessary as in the previous iteration the extension was right up to the boundary meaning the gap between flank walls was less than a metre. In design and character terms SPG5 does allow for two storey side extensions to be built up to the boundary, irrespective of the

relationship with the neighbouring building. Obviously, if there were windows which would provide the sole source of outlook and daylight to a habitable room in the neighbour this could be a separate problem. In this instance, however, although there are not any habitable room windows affected, your officers took a balanced view that the main leaded light flank wall window that brings daylight into the reception and stairwell area, would benefit from this separation distance.

The approach about how to deal with two storey extension proposals of this kind is set down in SPG5, as discussed above, but is also dealt with in a site specific document such as the Barn Hill Design Guide. This covers the Barn Hill Conservation Area and, as far as the matter of assessing the impact of the proposal on the character of the area indicates that the retention of a 1.0 metre gap between buildings is allowed, providing that the first floor element of the extension is set back 1.5 metres from the front wall. Although the ground floor element of the extension here is built to the boundary, the first floor element would be set back 2.5 metres from the front of the house, in excess of the Barn Hill guidance. It is considered that this helps to illustrate that, in terms of the impact that this proposal would have on the streetscene and character of the area the extension would be acceptable.

It is evident that the adjoining property at No.36 has had extensive roof extensions, including additions to the side of the roof, and in terms of considerations relating to the reduction in the sense of space between buildings, these extensions have already served to close the gap between properties. This application proposal needs to be seen in this context.

Impact on neighbouring amenity

SPG5 in relation to two storey side extensions has been developed to find a balance between the enlargement/extension of one's home whilst at the same time having regard for neighbouring amenity and the quality of environment. The proposals are consistent with the guidance. Officers recognise that it will inevitably result in some loss of outlook to the neighbouring dwelling. However, none of the windows affected are habitable room windows and, on balance, it is considered that this should not preclude the extension of the dwelling as proposed. In order to ameliorate the impact still further it is proposed that the flank wall of the extension be rendered and painted in a light colour. As explained above, the consideration is a balanced one, but a combination of the increased separation distance and this treatment of the flank wall should, as far as possible, make the impact acceptable.

Loss of off street Parking

The two storey extension is a replacement of an existing 7.8m deep, 2.45m wide garage. In terms of a loss of an off street parking space, parking standards for residential development set out in PS14 of the UDP-2004 state that a house with 4 or more bedrooms can be permitted a maximum of 2.0 car parking spaces. At present, the front garden provides two car parking spaces, and the garage potentially a third space. From this point of view the reduction in car parking can be allowed.

The proposals will involve the loss of a garage space which would be likely to result in a more intensive use of the front driveway. Furthermore, it is evident that the application property has created a gap in the front boundary wall treatment to facilitate them to drive through an existing car parking bay on-street. Transportation Officers have identified a number of issues with the front driveway that need to be dealt with through this application. These are;

- Refuse and recycling storage, to comply with Policy TRN34 of the UDP-2004;
- Secure, covered cycle parking, to comply with Policy TRN11 of the UDP-2004;
- A revised boundary treatment closing the unauthorised vehicular access point, in the interests of highway and pedestrian safety. The driving of a vehicle through the parking bay will not be allowed;
- A higher proportion of soft landscaping, at a minimum provision of 30%, in order to comply with Policy BE7 of the UDP-2004 and related Transportation policies.

A condition will be placed on this permission requiring details of required works to the front driveway and a new boundary treatment, as per Officers points raised above, to be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority before any work on the extension is commenced.

Summary of representations

Representations have been received raising the issue of loss of light to the dwelling next door, before and after the final amended plans were received. Officers acknowledge that there may be some reduction of daylight as a result of the extension, however the rooms affected will not be habitable.

Representations also made reference to the semi detached character of the street, commenting that the works would fill a gap, in doing so detracting from the established character of the area. This is an important point and is dealt with through SPG5. The 2.5m setback is a means contained within the Councils adopted planning guidance, of allowing for two storey side extensions whilst ensuring the original semi detached urban grain is still apparent in the built form. Its adherence with this standard therefore addresses satisfactorily the Councils means of mitigation for two storey side extensions in semi detached areas. In this case the first floor extension is also set in from the boundary so that a gap of 1m is retained between the building - meaning that there will be even more sense of space retained between the buildings.

There were some concerns expressed with regard to potential overlooking into the neighbouring garden from the first floor rear windows of the extension. Officers note that the neighbouring garden at no 36 has a outbuilding close to the boundary that restricts overlooking into the garden. Also the first floor room window is a dressing room so does not carry the same kind of concerns with regard to overlooking attached to habitable room windows. In any event, views from neighbouring houses into gardens is not uncommon throughout the borough.

Conclusion

Subject to a condition requiring the two-storey side extension to be finished externally with materials to match the existing house, and landscaping condition as explained above, the proposed extension would be in general accordance with the guidance contained in SPG5. Approval is recommended accordingly.

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

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):

1045.01.02(a), 1045.01.03(a), 1045.01.05(-), 1045.01.05(-) (Existing ground site plan, 1045.01.00(-), 1045.03.01(a), 1045.03.02(a), 1045.03.03(a)

1045.01.12(e), 1045.01.13(e), 1045.01.15(c), 1045.03.10(d), 1045.03.11(d), 1045.03.12(e)

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) Details of the front garden layout shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority prior to the commencement of the development. All detailed works shall be carried out as approved prior to the:-

(a) use of the building/extension hereby approved. Such details shall include:

- (i) a greater proportion than existing of the front garden area for planting with shrubs and/or trees;
- (iii) provision of front garden wall other form of boundary treatment to block of unauthorised vehicular access point,
- (v) waste and recycling storage facilities;

Reason: To ensure a satisfactory appearance and in the interests of local amenity.

INFORMATIVES:

None Specified

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: 34 Mount Pleasant Road, London, NW10 3EL

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



This map is indicative only.