

COMMITTEE REPORT

Planning Committee on
Item No
Case Number

12 September, 2018
04
18/1597

SITE INFORMATION

RECEIVED	27 April, 2018
WARD	Sudbury
PLANNING AREA	
LOCATION	67 Medway Gardens, Wembley, HA0 2RJ
PROPOSAL	Erection of a first floor side extension and part two storey rear extension, loft conversion with hip to gable conversion, rear dormer, subdivision of the rear garden, 1No. front rooflight and new window to front elevation to facilitate the conversion of a single family dwelling into two self contained flats (1 x 2 bed and 1x 3 bed) (Amended description 30.07.18)
PLAN NO'S	See Condition 2
LINK TO DOCUMENTS ASSOCIATED WITH THIS PLANNING APPLICATION	<p><u>When viewing this on an Electronic Device</u></p> <p>Please click on the link below to view ALL document associated to case https://pa.brent.gov.uk/online-applications/applicationDetails.do?activeTab=documents&keyVal=DCAPR_139689</p> <p><u>When viewing this as an Hard Copy</u> .</p> <p>Please use the following steps</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none">1. Please go to pa.brent.gov.uk2. Select Planning and conduct a search tying "18/1597" (i.e. Case Reference) into the search Box3. Click on "View Documents" tab

RECOMMENDATIONS

That the committee resolve to grant planning permission subject to the conditions set out below.

That the Head of Planning is delegated authority to issue the planning permission and impose conditions and informatives to secure the following matters:

Conditions

1. Time Limit for commencement
2. Undertaken in accordance with approved drawings/documents
3. Works to the vehicular crossover
4. No use of roof of extensions as balcony
5. Permitted development restriction relating to changes between a dwellinghouse and a house in multiple occupation
6. Materials for the extensions must match the existing house
7. Approval of details of hard and soft landscaping, cycle storage and bin storage

Informatives

1. CIL Liable
2. Party Wall
3. Building near boundary
4. Contact Highways and Infrastructure regarding the crossover works

That the Head of Planning is delegated authority to make changes to the wording of the committees decision (such as to delete, vary or add conditions, informatives, planning obligations or reasons for the decision) prior to the decision being actioned, provided that the Head of Planning is satisfied that any such changes could not reasonably be regarded as deviating from the overall principle of the decision reached by the committee nor that such change(s) could reasonably have led to a different decision having been reached by the committee.

That the Committee confirms that adequate provision has been made, by the imposition of conditions, for the preservation or planting of trees as required by Section 197 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990.

SITE MAP

	<p>Planning Committee Map</p> <p>Site address: 67 Medway Gardens, Wembley, HA0 2RJ</p> <p>© Crown copyright and database rights 2011 Ordnance Survey 100025260</p>
---	---



This map is indicative only.

PROPOSAL IN DETAIL

Planning permission is sought to construct a hip-to-gable roof extension and rear dormer, two-storey side extension and single-storey rear extension, and to convert the house into two flats (one x 3bed and one x 2bed), together with the provision of two parking spaces, bin storage and frontage landscaping.

EXISTING

The existing site consists of a two-storey semi-detached house and its residential curtilage. The house has a hipped roof, an attached garage to the side, and a part-width single-storey rear conservatory.

The site is situated on the western side of Medway Gardens, within an established residential area. It is not in a conservation area and does not contain any listed buildings.

AMENDMENTS SINCE SUBMISSION

The proposed plans as originally submitted showed:

- two x 1bed flats on the ground floor and one x 3bed flat on the first floor and loft floor;
- the original hipped roof retained and a two-storey side extension with a hipped roof;
- three parking spaces on the site frontage;
- the rear garden subdivided into three, with the two ground floor flats having direct access to private gardens and access to the shared garden providing cycle storage and bin storage, and the upper flat having access to the shared garden via a private driveway to the side of the property.

Revised plans were received on 31 July 2018, showing the addition of a hip-to-gable roof extension and gable roof to the proposed side extension, altering the internal configuration and reducing the number of units from three to two to provide both with direct access to the ground floor, removal of an entrance gate from the rear garden onto the adjoining private driveway, relocation of the bins from the rear garden to the frontage, reduction in parking spaces from three to two and addition of frontage soft landscaping. Neighbours were reconsulted.

Further revised plans were received on 20 August 2018, correcting inconsistencies in the drawings relating to the design of the roof extension and side extension. These were not considered to materially alter the scheme and did not require further consultation.

SUMMARY OF KEY ISSUES

The key planning issues for Members to consider are set out below. Objections have been received regarding some of these matters. Members will need to balance all of the planning issues and the objectives of relevant planning policies when making a decision on the application:

Neighbour objections

This application has been referred to Planning Committee due to the number of objections received (10 in total). These relate primarily to the principle of development, design, impact on neighbouring properties, impact on on-street parking. Officers consider that the planning related objections have been resolved through the submission of revised plans.

Principle of development

The general principle of the conversion of a house into flats is generally accepted as a means of increasing housing supply providing the proposal re-provides a family size (3+ bedrooms) home with direct access to an adequately sized garden. The proposal complies with the relevant policy requirements and is acceptable in principle.

Design, scale and appearance

The physical works proposed take the form of householder extensions that would be proportionate to the original house and in keeping with its character. Similar extensions could be constructed if the property remains in single use, under existing householder permissions and permitted development rights.

Relationship with neighbouring properties

The proposal complies with all relevant guidance and would not have an unduly detrimental impact on neighbouring properties.

Residential living standards

The proposal exceeds the minimum requirements in this respect and would provide a good standard of residential accommodation across both of the proposed units.

Transportation, servicing and parking

The proposal complies with all the relevant policies and standards, and would not have an unduly detrimental impact on on-street parking or highway safety.

RELEVANT SITE HISTORY

17/5064

Full Planning Permission

Refused 14/03/2018

Demolition of conservatory and subdivision of existing single dwellinghouse into three flats (1 x 3bed and 2 x 1bed) to include erection of a rear dormer window, two storey side and rear extension and insertion of one front rooflight

This application was refused due to the inadequate provision of off-street parking and the quality of residential accommodation that was proposed.

15/2284

Certificate of Lawfulness - Proposed

Granted 16/07/2015

Certificate of lawfulness for the proposed erection of a hip-to-gable roof extension, rear dormer window and the insertion of window to the flank elevation and two rooflights to the front elevation of dwellinghouse

15/2285

Householder

Granted 23/07/2015

Demolition of single storey side extension and part single storey rear conservatory, erection of two storey side to rear extension, rear dormer window and insertion of rooflight to front elevation of dwellinghouse

15/2224

Prior Approval - houses

Prior approval not required 07/07/2015

Prior approval for a single storey rear extension to dwellinghouse, in metres:

Extending beyond the rear wall of the original house - 6

Maximum height - 3

Eaves height - 2.775

CONSULTATIONS

22 neighbouring properties were consulted by letter on 29 June 2018 and on 31 July 2018 following the receipt of revised plans.

Eight objections were received in response to the initial consultation and a further two objections to the second consultation.

None of the original eight objections were withdrawn during the second consultation, although one related only to the use of the private road, which is no longer proposed.

The objections are summarised below:

Objection (initial consultation)	Officer response
- loss of family house, no need for flats in the area, will alter character of the area	See 'Principle of development', paragraph 5
- will increase parking pressure on street,	See 'Transportation', paragraph 32

including by visitor parking, and have adverse impact on access for emergency vehicles and road safety including for children	
- overlooking onto neighbouring properties and loss of privacy, including from loft conversion	See 'Relationship with neighbouring properties', paragraphs 15 and 18
- increase in noise due to multiple occupancy	See 'Relationship with neighbouring properties', paragraph 18
- inconvenience and noise of construction work	Construction work is governed by environmental nuisance regulations. The physical works involved in extending the house are similar to those already approved under previous applications. See 'Relationship with neighbouring properties', paragraph 19
- style of building works not in keeping with surrounding area	See 'Design, scale and appearance, paragraph 12
- nine bins would be required for three flats, and these could not be accommodated on the frontage alongside three cars	The revised proposal is for two parking spaces. See further comments under 'Transportation', paragraph 30
- bin storage would attract vermin	Bin storage is a common feature in residential areas and there is no evidence that an additional property would create this problem.
- overdeveloped building would have adverse impact on visual amenity from neighbouring rear gardens	See 'Relationship with neighbouring properties', paragraphs 14-20
- lack of access to garden and escape route for upper flat	This issue has been addressed through the submission of revised plans.
- use of private road belonging to properties in Harrow Road, including pedestrian safety concerns and obstruction caused by bin movements	This issue has been addressed through the submission of revised plans. The revised proposal does not rely on any use of the private road.
- widening the dropped kerb to accommodate three parking spaces with no soft landscaping is against Brent's crossover policy	This issue has been addressed through the submission of revised plans. The revised proposal has two parking spaces. See further comments in 'Transportation', paragraphs 29-30
- poor condition of existing rental properties in area	This is not a material planning consideration. There is no evidence to suggest the properties would be rented rather than sold, or that this affects maintenance.
- will set a precedent	There is no precedent in the planning system. Each case is decided on its own merits.
- delays in postal service	These are unfortunately beyond the Council's control, however comments can

	be accepted after the closing date at the case officer's discretion.
- objections to previous application	Although the previous application was refused this does not prevent a new application being made and each case is decided on its own merits.
- neighbours were not notified of previous proposals decided without consultation in 2015	This may relate to a Certificate of Lawful Development application, which is not subject to neighbour consultation as permitted development rights are granted by statute and not by the local authority, or to a householder application which is subject to more limited consultation than an application for full planning permission.

Additional consultees

Sudbury Town Neighbourhood Forum: No response

Sudbury Town Residents Association: No response

POLICY CONSIDERATIONS

For the purposes of Section 38(6) of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004, the Development Plan in force for the area is the 2010 Brent Core Strategy, the 2016 Brent Development Management Policies Document and the 2016 London Plan (Consolidated with Alterations since 2011).

The following are also relevant material considerations:

The National Planning Policy Framework 2018
 SPG 17 Design Guide for New Development 2002
 SPD2 Residential Extensions and Alterations 2017
 Brent Waste Planning Guide 2013
 Mayor of London's Housing SPG 2016
 Mayor of London's Sustainable Design and Construction SPG 2014

All of these documents are adopted and therefore carry significant weight in the assessment of any planning application. In addition, the emerging Draft Brent Design Guide SPD1 has been subject to public consultation and once adopted will supersede SPG17. The Draft New London Plan has also recently been subject to public consultation. These documents carry some weight in the assessment of planning applications, as emerging policies.

DETAILED CONSIDERATIONS

Principle of development

1. Core Strategy Policy CP1 seeks to concentrate housing growth in well located areas, and Policy CP2 sets out a target for delivering 22,000 new homes over the 2007-2026 period, including a target of 25% family sized accommodation.
2. Furthermore, the NPPF 2018 expects the planning system to significantly boost the supply of housing and to consider applications for new housing in the context of the presumption in favour of sustainable development, which requires applications to be approved where they are in accordance with local planning policies. It encourages the planning system to promote the effective use of land, giving substantial weight to the value of using suitable brownfield land within settlements for housing and supporting the development of under-used land and buildings. The Draft New London Plan adds further weight to this policy context, proposing substantially increased housing targets across London and a range of measures aiming to deliver these increased targets. Specifically, Policy H1 requires boroughs to

optimise the potential for housing delivery on all suitable and available brownfield sites, while Policy H2 expects them to pro-actively support well-designed new homes on small sites.

3. Policy DMP17 provides more specific criteria to protect family sized housing. For housing conversions, it requires the existing home to be 130sqm or more and the proposal to include at least a 3bedroom unit preferably with direct access to a garden or amenity space. The policy recognises the high level of need for family-sized housing in Brent, but also acknowledges that this can be provided as flats as well as traditional houses. The minimum floorspace requirement helps to ensure that conversion into separate units does not result in these being under-sized.
4. The existing property is a 3 bedroom house with a floorspace of 133sqm and the proposed extension works would increase the floorspace to 216sqm, providing a relatively generous amount of floorspace for the proposed two flats. Similar extensions could be constructed if proposed as extensions to a dwellinghouse (i.e. if a conversion to flats was not proposed), and your officers consider that extending the house to allow for its conversion represents an efficient use of land. The proposal would also include a 3bedroom flat with direct access to private rear garden space.
5. Objections have been raised regarding the principle of housing conversions. However, these are generally accepted in principle by Policy DMP17 as a means of increasing housing supply. Your officers consider that the proposal complies with the relevant policy requirements and is acceptable in principle, subject to other material planning considerations.

Design, scale and appearance

6. Policy CP17 aims to protect suburban areas from inappropriate development including infilling of plots with out-of-scale buildings that do not respect the settings of the existing dwellings, while Policy DMP1 requires the scale, type and design of development to complement the locality. The NPPF also emphasises that good design involves responding to local character and history and reflecting the identity of local surroundings and materials, while not discouraging appropriate innovation.
7. The physical works would take the form of extending the existing house, and Brent's Supplementary Planning Guidance 2 (Residential Extensions and Alterations, 2017) provides specific advice on the design of such extensions.
8. The first element of the works involves conversion of the hipped roof to a gable roof with a rear dormer window. SPD2 permits this form of extension. Furthermore, the roof of the adjoining house in the semi-detached pair has already been extended in this way. This element of the proposal was suggested by your officers as it would restore the symmetry of the pair of houses and would therefore be preferable in design terms to retaining the original hipped roof.
9. The second element of the works involves constructing a two-storey side and rear extension in the place of the existing single-storey garage. SPD2 states that two-storey side extensions should be of a size, shape and height to complement the house. They should normally be no more than two-thirds of the width of the house, be set back from the main front wall at first floor level, have a roof to match the pitch angle and a gable end where the main roof is gabled, with the ridgeline set to a minimum of 0.5m below the original ridgeline. The proposal complies with all of these requirements. The first floor would be set back from the main front wall by 1.5m and, whilst SPD2 normally requires a distance of 2.5m, it accepts a 1.5m set back where the extension will not result in a terracing effect being dwellings. The reduced set back is considered acceptable in this case as, although not on a corner, the site adjoins a private road and the extension would not therefore create any terracing effect.
10. The two-storey extension would extend to the rear beyond the original rear wall. SPD2 provides advice on rear extensions in relation to neighbouring amenities, and this issue is discussed further under 'Relationship with neighbouring properties'. The extension would be of a modest depth and less than two-thirds the width of the original house and the gable end roof design would complement the main gable roof while the ridgeline would be set down from the main ridge so as to appear subservient. The rear dormer would be set in from the main ridge and eaves, and would not project onto or over the two-storey extension, and this also complies with the requirements of SPD2.
11. The final element involves a 6m deep single-storey rear extension. SPD2 allows these to extend across the full width of the house, and imposes a limit of 6m in depth in order to protect the original character of the house (subject to the consideration of impact on adjoining properties, discussed in the next section of this report). In design terms the extension is considered to be acceptable and in keeping with the

character of the house, in accordance with SPD2.

12. Objections have been raised regarding the works representing over-development and not reflecting the character of the area. However, your officers consider that the works are typical of householder extensions found throughout the borough, that they are acceptable within the surrounding street scene and that they comply with the design requirements of SPD2. The visual impact upon the street scene and surrounding area would not be significantly different to that created by implementing the existing householder permissions.
13. Materials are indicated on the plans as matching the existing materials.

Relationship with neighbouring properties

14. Any development will need to maintain adequate levels of privacy and amenity for existing residential properties, and further advice on amenity issues in relation to householder extensions is given in SPD2, with guidance in relation to development generally provided in SPG17 and draft SPD1.
15. The proposed hip-to-gable roof extension and rear dormer are in line with SPG2, and are not considered to have an unduly detrimental impact on the light, outlook or privacy of neighbouring properties. Similar works could be carried out under permitted development rights if the property remains in use as a single dwellinghouse, and are generally not considered to have unduly adverse impacts on neighbouring properties.
16. The two-storey side and rear extension would comply with the 1:2 guidance given in SPD2 in respect of the adjoining house at No 65 Medway Gardens, as the depth beyond the main rear building line would be less than half the distance from the flank wall of the extension to the centre of the nearest habitable room window at No 65.
17. The single-storey rear extension would project to a depth of 6m from the main rear wall. However the adjoining house at No 65 has an existing extension to a depth of 3m. The proposed extension would therefore project 3m beyond the existing rear wall of No 65, with a height of 2.75m. This complies with the requirements of SPD2 with respect to single-storey rear extensions.
18. Although concerns have been expressed regarding the impact on privacy to neighbours sharing the rear boundary, the extended part of the house would maintain a distance of over 20m from the rear boundary by virtue of the depth of the rear garden. This complies with the separation distances required in SPG17 to maintain privacy of neighbouring properties. There would be no side elevation windows to cause concerns regarding overlooking onto adjoining properties, and the general noise and disturbance associated with two properties is not considered significantly greater than that of a single property. The potential use of the flat roof of the single-storey rear extension as a balcony can be prevented by condition.
19. Concerns have been raised regarding the inconvenience and noise of construction work. However, the physical works involved would be similar to those that could be undertaken under existing householder permissions and permitted development rights, and it is considered that it would be unreasonable to impose additional restrictions on these. Additionally, the control of construction works falls under legislation outside of planning and therefore cannot be covered by the scope of this consent.
20. Subject to the condition above, the proposal is considered to comply with the relevant policies and not to cause any adverse impacts on the residential amenities of neighbouring properties.

Residential living standards

21. Consideration must be given as to the standards set out in the Mayor's Housing SPG (including minimum internal space standards based on Technical Housing Standards – Nationally Described Space Standard 2015), and with Brent Policy DMP19, which requires private amenity space of 20sqm per 1bed or 2bed flat and 50sqm for family housing including ground floor and 3bed or 4bed flats. Single aspect units should be minimised, particularly if north-facing.
22. The proposed units would both occupy more than one floor, with the 2bed unit essentially occupying the footprint of the existing former garage and the proposed loft conversion. The existing property has a separate front entrance door to the former garage and this would be utilised to provide a separate entrance to the 2bed unit.

23. The 3bed unit would have total floorspace of 116sqm and the 2bed unit would have total floorspace of 102sqm, and both would be generously sized compared to the minimum requirements of 102sqm and 79sqm for 3b6p and 2b4p duplexes respectively (there is no minimum standard for 2bed three-storey dwellings, however the proposed floorspace is considered to be more than adequate to accommodate the additional stairwell). Bedroom sizes would all comfortably exceed minimum standards, each unit would be dual aspect, and the internal configuration would avoid any noise impacts from adverse stacking between flats.
24. The rear garden would be divided into two portions, with each flat having direct access to their private garden space. The garden for the 3bed flat would be approximately 146sqm and the garden for the 2bed flat approximately 115sqm, both comfortably exceeding the minimum standard.
25. Overall the proposal is considered to comply with all of the relevant policies and to offer a very good standard of accommodation for future residents.

Transportation, servicing and parking

26. Policy DMP12 is relevant with regard to the consideration of parking.
27. Medway Gardens is a local residential access road and, although on-street parking is unrestricted, its narrow width prevents parking on both sides and footway parking is commonplace. However it is not noted as being heavily parked at night. The site has poor public transport accessibility (PTAL rating of 2) and therefore the higher residential parking standards set out in Appendix 1 of the Development Management Policies 2016 apply. The existing three bedroom house has a maximum parking allowance of 1.5 spaces (although this allowance would increase to two spaces if the previously approved extensions to the property granted in 2015 were constructed). The existing driveway for one to two cars provides parking broadly in line with standards, although it does not meet requirements for soft landscaping as the site frontage is entirely hard surfaced, and is served by an existing crossover.
28. The proposed two flats (one x 3bed and one x 2bed) would have a maximum parking allowance of 2.5 spaces. The proposal includes two off-street parking spaces, accessed via the existing crossover. This represents 80% of the maximum allowance, which is considered sufficient to prevent additional demand on on-street parking and addresses the concerns raised in relation to the previous application 17/5064 with regards to overspill parking.
29. To facilitate vehicular access to both spaces without vehicles driving unlawfully over the footway, highways officers have requested that the crossover to the site is widened by 1.3m at the applicant's expense, and this would be required by condition. In addition, an informative is recommended advising the applicant to contact the Head of Highways & Infrastructure to arrange for the crossover works to be undertaken on their behalf.
30. The proposed site layout also shows the replacement of existing block paving on the southern part of the frontage with planting, thus increasing the soft landscaping within the site from zero to 35%, which is welcomed and would ensure effective drainage of the site. There would also be a front boundary wall of 0.8m, separate pedestrian access and a storage area for bins which would be in a convenient location for collection and would be large enough to accommodate one x 140L and one x 240L bins, to meet the Council's requirements for a house conversion to two households.
31. Cycle stores are shown located in the rear gardens and these would be large enough to accommodate two cycles each, in compliance with London Plan standards which require two cycle parking spaces for 2bed and larger flats.
32. Although neighbour objections have been received on these points, the proposal is not considered likely to increase on-street parking pressure or to impact on access for emergency vehicles or road safety. It is considered to comply with all the relevant policies in this respect. A condition is required, for the submission and approval of further details of hard and soft landscaping, boundary treatments, cycle storage and bin storage, and a further condition will require these facilities to be provided and retained.

Density

33. Development of the site is expected to conform to the density range set out in the London Plan of 150-250 hr/ha for suburban sites (or 40-80 units/ha) with a PTAL score of 2, unless a higher density can

be justified as a result of a scheme being acceptable in planning terms. The proposed density of approx. 149 hr/ha or 42 units/ha sits comfortably within the London Plan density range and the density is therefore considered to be appropriate to the site.

Conclusion

34. Your officers consider that the proposal is acceptable in principle, that the physical works proposed are acceptable in design terms and there would be no adverse impact on neighbouring amenities, that the development would offer a good standard of accommodation, would make adequate provision for parking, cycle storage and bin storage and would not have any adverse impacts on the highway network, and that it would be of an appropriate density given the character and accessibility of the area. The application complies with all of the relevant policies and approval is recommended on this basis.

CIL DETAILS

This application is liable to pay **£27,272.16*** under the Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL).

We calculated this figure from the following information:

Total amount of eligible** floorspace which on completion is to be demolished (E): sq. m.

Total amount of floorspace on completion (G): 216 sq. m.

Use	Floorspace on completion (Gr)	Eligible* retained floorspace (Kr)	Net area chargeable at rate R (A)	Rate R: Brent multiplier used	Rate R: Mayoral multiplier used	Brent sub-total	Mayoral sub-total
Dwelling houses	216	133	83	£200.00	£35.15	£23,195.54	£4,076.62

BCIS figure for year in which the charging schedule took effect (Ic)	224	224
BCIS figure for year in which the planning permission was granted (Ip)	313	
Total chargeable amount	£23,195.54	£4,076.62

*All figures are calculated using the formula under Regulation 40(6) and all figures are subject to index linking as per Regulation 40(5). The index linking will be reviewed when a Demand Notice is issued.

****Eligible** means the building contains a part that has been in lawful use for a continuous period of at least six months within the period of three years ending on the day planning permission first permits the chargeable development.

Please Note : CIL liability is calculated at the time at which planning permission first permits development. As such, the CIL liability specified within this report is based on current levels of indexation and is provided for indicative purposes only. It also does not take account of development that may benefit from relief, such as Affordable Housing.

DRAFT DECISION NOTICE



Brent

DRAFT NOTICE

TOWN AND COUNTRY PLANNING ACT 1990 (as amended)

DECISION NOTICE – APPROVAL

Application No: 18/1597

To: Mr Harling
C49 Architecture Ltd
S2 Spring Mill
Main Street
Wilsden
Bradford
BD15 0DX

I refer to your application dated **27/04/2018** proposing the following:

Erection of a first floor side extension and part two storey rear extension, loft conversion with hip to gable conversion, rear dormer, subdivision of the rear garden, 1No. front rooflight and new window to front elevation to facilitate the conversion of a single family dwelling into two self contained flats (1 x 2 bed and 1 x 3 bed) (Amended description 30.07.18)

and accompanied by plans or documents listed here:
See Condition 2

at **67 Medway Gardens, Wembley, HA0 2RJ**

The Council of the London Borough of Brent, the Local Planning Authority, hereby **GRANT** permission for the reasons and subject to the conditions set out on the attached Schedule B.

Date: 04/09/2018

Signature:

Alice Lester
Head of Planning, Transport and Licensing

Notes

1. Your attention is drawn to Schedule A of this notice which sets out the rights of applicants who are aggrieved by the decisions of the Local Planning Authority.
2. This decision does not purport to convey any approval or consent which may be required under the Building Regulations or under any enactment other than the Town and Country Planning Act 1990.

DnStdG

SUMMARY OF REASONS FOR APPROVAL

- 1 The proposed development is in general accordance with policies contained in the:-

London Plan 2016 (Policy 3.4)
Brent Core Strategy 2010 (Policies CP2 and CP21)
Brent Development Management Policies 2016 (Policies DMP1, DMP12, DMP17, DMP18 and DMP19).

- 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):

2017073(0-)01
2017073(0-)02 Rev H

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

- 3 Prior to commencement of the development the applicant shall enter into an arrangement with the Council's Head of Highways and Infrastructure to enable works to the public highway comprising the widening of the existing vehicle crossover to 1.3m to be carried out. The dwellings hereby approved shall not be occupied unless the works have been completed in full.

Reason: To ensure safe and lawful access to on-site parking is provided for the development, in the interest of highway flow and safety.

- 4 No access shall be provided to the roof of the single storey rear extension by way of window, door or stairway and the roof of the extension hereby approved shall not be used as a balcony or sitting out area.

Reason: To preserve the amenity and privacy of neighbouring residential occupiers.

- 5 The residential units hereby approved shall not be used other than as a dwellinghouse within Use Class C3, and shall at no time be converted from Use Class C3 (residential dwellinghouse) to Use Class C4 (small HMO), notwithstanding the provisions of Schedule 2 Part 3 Class L of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) Order 2015 (or any order revoking and re-enacting that Order) without express planning permission having first been granted by the Local Planning Authority.

Reason: To ensure that an adequate standard of accommodation is maintained in all of the residential units.

- 6 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.

- 7 Prior to development commencing, further details of hard and soft landscaping shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority, including hard landscaping

materials which shall be permeable or porous or otherwise make provision for drainage within the site, planting species, bin storage and cycle storage, and proposed boundary treatments.

The hard and soft landscaping, including the planting, parking areas, accesses, drainage, cycle and bin storage shall be implemented in full prior to first occupation of the development and shall thereafter be permanently retained and not used other than for purposes ancillary to the flats hereby approved.

Any planting that is part of the approved scheme that within a period of five years after planting is removed, dies or becomes seriously damaged or diseased, shall be replaced in the next planting season and all planting shall be replaced in the same positions with others of a similar size and species, unless the Local Planning Authority first gives written consent to any variation.

Reason: To ensure a satisfactory standard of appearance and setting for the development and to ensure that the proposed development enhances the visual amenity of the locality, in the interests of the amenities of the occupants of the development, in the interest of highway flow and safety, and to prevent excessive surface water run-off and the potential for flooding.

INFORMATIVES

- 1 The applicant is advised that this development is liable to pay the Community Infrastructure Levy; a Liability Notice will be sent to all known contacts including the applicant and the agent. Before you commence any works please read the Liability Notice and comply with its contents as otherwise you may be subjected to penalty charges. Further information including eligibility for relief and links to the relevant forms and to the Government's CIL guidance, can be found on the Brent website at www.brent.gov.uk/CIL.
- 2 The provisions of The Party Wall etc. Act 1996 may be applicable and relates to work on an existing wall shared with another property; building on the boundary with a neighbouring property; or excavating near a neighbouring building. An explanatory booklet setting out your obligations can be obtained from the Communities and Local Government website www.communities.gov.uk
- 3 The applicant must ensure, before work commences, that the treatment/finishing of flank walls can be implemented as this may involve the use of adjoining land and should also ensure that all development, including foundations and roof/guttering treatment is carried out entirely within the application property.
- 4 The applicant should contact Brent Highways & Infrastructure to arrange for the crossover works to be undertaken on their behalf. Details of how to apply to have the crossover works undertaken can be found on the Council's web site.

Any person wishing to inspect the above papers should contact June Taylor, Planning and Regeneration,
Brent Civic Centre, Engineers Way, Wembley, HA9 0FJ, Tel. No. 020 8937 2233