

	<b>Planning Committee Map</b>
Site address: 86 Wrentham Avenue, London, NW10 3HG	
© Crown copyright and database rights 2011 Ordnance Survey 100025260	



This map is indicative only.

**RECEIVED:** 13 June, 2011

**WARD:** Queen's Park

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

**LOCATION:** 86 Wrentham Avenue, London, NW10 3HG

**PROPOSAL:** Extension of the roof to the rear and side including a rear dormer window, installation of 1 rooflight across the proposed flat roof and side roofplane and 1 front rooflight.

**APPLICANT:** Ms Rachel Whetstone

**CONTACT:** Dr Bill Thompson Architect

**PLAN NO'S:**

Ordnance Survey 1:1250

Ordnance Survey 1:500

Front elevation

Ground floor plans

First floor plans

Second floor plans

Roof and basement plans

Long section

Side elevation

rear elevation and short section

Drawing to show main adjoining windows

---

**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**

Cllr Colwill

Cllr B M Patel

Cllr Kansagra

**Date and Reason for Request**

4th August 2011

We do not believe that it would be detrimental to the area and in fact it will enhance and protect surrounding areas.

**RECOMMENDATION**

Refusal

**EXISTING**

The subject site is a 2-storey semi-detached building on the southern side of Wrentham Avenue, the site is in an 'Area of Distinctive Residential Character'.

## **PROPOSAL**

See description

## **HISTORY**

11/0330 Refused

Extension of the roof to the rear and side including a glazed rear elevation at second floor, removal of part of rear roof and increase to height of rear elevation to form balcony, installation of 1 rooflight to the flat and side roofplane and 1 front rooflight.

*The proposed extensions and alterations to the rear elevation and roof, by reason of the break in the eaves, the increase in height of the party parapet wall, the proposed roof shape, the loss of the roof of the bay feature and creation of a roof terrace, are harmful to the character of the building, the relationship with the semi-detached neighbour in an area of distinctive residential character as well as neighbouring amenity and privacy contrary to policies BE2, BE9 and BE29 of Brent's UDP 2004 as well as SPG5: Altering and extending your home.*

00/1309 Granted

External extension between basement and ground floor and the installation of a new rear patio door (as revised by letter and plans received 13/11/00)

## **POLICY CONSIDERATIONS** **UDP 2004**

**BE2** - Townscape

**BE9** - Architectural Quality

**BE29** - Areas of Distinctive Residential Character

SPG5: Altering and extending your home

## **CONSULTATION**

Neighbouring occupiers were consulted on 29th June 2011. One comment has been received raising concerns:

- concern about possible effect of infilling the area between the front and rear roof areas.
- difficulty visualising from ground level the reduction in visible sky that the extension would cause from the neighbouring property.
- could be considered detrimental to the architecture of the building but can only be seen from the 2 neighbouring flats.

## **REMARKS**

The proposal involves a number of extensions and alterations to the property at the roof and loft floor which is proposed to become a habitable second floor.

The property is one of a pair of semi-detached buildings. In an Area of Distinctive Residential Character policy BE29 of Brent's UDP 2004 requires particular attention be paid to the design, height and space between buildings in order to protect their special qualities. The area is considered to have a coherent design which unsympathetic development could threaten.

### **Existing roof form**

The building narrows to the rear where the width of the main front part of the building narrows into the three-storey rear projection. A side extension means the footprint in plan form does not narrow but the roof shape maintains the character of the subservient rear projection.

The rear projection is 4.9m wide, a mono-pitch roof, 2.7m in width, slopes down from the parapet wall between the 2 dwellings and from there on the roof is flat to the eaves. At the end of the rear projection the roof again has a ridge at a right angle to the parapet wall between the pair of buildings and the roof plane fills the whole 4.9m of the rear projection.

This roof form is mirrored by the other half of the pair of semi-detached buildings. Both buildings have a bay feature to the rear, in the case of the subject property it is positioned on the corner of the rear projection while on the neighbouring building it is positioned quite centrally on the rear elevation of the rear projection.

### **Proposed**

The rear roof plane of the attached buildings is currently uniform in its eaves and ridge height with a party parapet wall running between the two properties, the proposed extension across the rear projection of the building would notably alter this relationship.

It is proposed to increase the flank wall of the rear projection upwards by about 0.9m and also to raise the party parapet wall between the attached buildings by about 1m. This is to enable an extension to the roof between these 2 raised elements resulting a part flat part pitched roof over the rear projection.

Viewed from the rear it is envisaged that the ridge height of the rearmost roof plane on the subject building would be increased by about 1m in height and so would be 1m higher than the attached building, with a small dormer positioned on the extended rear roof plane.

Officers are of the opinion that this alteration to the rear part of the roof and specifically the increase to the height of the party wall and ridge height of the rearmost roof plane, would have a detrimental impact on the character of the building and the appearance and coherent design of the pair of semi-detached buildings.

As described above the dwellings currently differ in the positioning of the rear bay features which is an original part of the design, otherwise the roof shape and height is uniform. Rather than an enhancement to the character, as the bay features could be suggested to be, the alteration to the roof is considered to be incongruous and would not respect the specific qualities of this pair of buildings within an Area of Distinctive Residential Character. Viewed from gardens to the southwest the appearance would be of a parapet wall projecting up by about 1m beyond the ridge of the attached building, this would be a negative impact on the original roof form. While these 2 properties are of a different design to those neighbouring them a uniform ridge height to the rear projection is a common feature throughout.

The rear projection of the building is subsidiary to the front part of the building which is both wider and higher. The proposal would significantly alter this relationship as the roof of the rear projection would take on a much bulkier form. The connection of the two independent roof elements would completely change the character of the side elevation, reducing the original architectural expression and subsequently the buildings contribution to the ARDC.

A small single rooflight is proposed to the front roof plane and would be acceptable.

### **Neighbouring amenity**

Concern was previously raised in an earlier application about the potential impact of the extensions on light and outlook to the habitable room windows positioned in the flank wall of the building to the east of the site. A plan has been provided to clarify the position of windows identified as habitable in relation to the space where the extension is proposed. The 2 windows towards the rear are considered to be sufficiently off-set from the extensions, as well as being aligned with the existing high chimney. There is more scope for the front most window to be impacted upon but it is considered, on balance, that the relationship would be acceptable.

**RECOMMENDATION:** Refuse Consent

**CONDITIONS/REASONS:**

- (1) The proposed extensions and alterations to the roof, including the increase in the height of the party parapet wall and the ridge of the rear roof plane, are considered to be incongruous and would not respect the specific architectural qualities of this pair of semi-detached buildings, in particular, and the Area of Distinctive Residential Character, in general. As a result the proposal is contrary to policies BE2, BE9 and BE29 of Brent's UDP 2004 as well as SPG5: Altering and extending your home.

**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