

Appendix A

Revised Planning Design Guide for the Mapesbury and Roe Green Village Conservation Areas

A full list of comments received, officer response and recommended changes

Responses from Mapesbury Residents'

- 1.0 A total of 6 comments were received from the residents' within the Mapesbury Conservation Area. Four residents supported the new guide and 2 requested amendments.
- 1.1 Allow rooflights to be installed on front roof slopes: In terms of the installation of rooflights the resident respectfully requested that serious consideration be given to allowing conservation style rooflight windows in front facing elevations in homes within Mapesbury. In their view, front facing conservation-style rooflights would deliver multiple benefits to the residents and would provide an opportunity for a modest growth to the number of bedrooms within the existing housing stock. They would also be consistent with the recent decision by the Council to allow 1 front facing conservation style rooflight windows in nearby Queen's Park Conservation Area.
- 1.2 Discussion: The Queen's Park estate has a different character to Mapesbury, and roofs are generally shallower pitch, and some of the terraces are three storey, and so the roofs are less visible. Many rooflights were installed some time ago before the conservation area was designated. Preventing the use of front rooflights does not preclude the 'modest growth to the number of bedrooms within the existing housing stock'. The Council still permits the adaptation of the roof space with a rear dormer and side rooflights.
- 1.3 Conclusion - rooflights not to be permitted on front roof slopes. The character of the conservation area is well preserved and the Mapesbury estate was not designed with such a feature. There are in fact very few front facing rooflights and those that exist either pre-date the conservation area or illustrate the harmfulness of such an installation. Prevention will better preserve the character and appearance of the conservation area.
- 1.4 Allow street facing solar panels: The resident considered the policy on street facing solar panels to be 'retrograde'. The resident went on to say that 'solar slates' and 'in roof systems' exist that protect the character of an area. The resident suggested that 'decarbonisation should come first, then concerns about preserving character'.
- 1.5 Discussion: The change of roofing materials or extension to the roof is covered by the article 4 Direction which means that solar (PV) installations need planning permission. There are currently no cases of solar installations on front roof slopes within the conservation area. As with front facing roof lights, solar PV panels will be visible from the street. Solar PV panels are retrofitted onto an existing roof, on top of the tiles or other roofing materials, using roof anchors and mounting rails. Covering the roof tiles with the panels, especially given the raised nature, would harm the character of the building and the appearance of the conservation area. Solar PV roof

tiles have a black mirrored-glazed surface, so do not replicate the undulating matt appearance of black slate or red clay tiles.

- 1.6 Conclusion: - *Solar installations not to be permitted on front roof slopes.* The character of the conservation area is well preserved and the Mapesbury estate was not designed with such a feature. There are no existing instances of such an installation within the conservation area. They are very visible on the roof and look out of place against the existing roof coverings of decorative layered slates and red plain clay tiles. Prevention will better preserve the character and appearance of the conservation area.

Responses from Roe Green Village Residents'

- 1.7 A total of 4 comments were received from the residents within the Roe Green Village Conservation Area. Three residents supported the new guide and 1 objected because they felt that single storey rear extensions should be allowed up to 3 metres in depth rather than the current 2.5.
- 1.8 Allow 3 metre deep single storey rear extensions: The resident suggested that proposals for single storey rear extensions should be increased from 2.5 metres to 3 metres. This was to help people with younger families. Three metres would give the opportunity to create a second toilet downstairs which was badly needed. The gardens are long and the resident pointed out that lots of other properties within the village already have 3 metre extensions.
- 1.9 Discussion: The cottages in Roe Green Village were originally designed as modest dwellings for aeroplane workers. They were all carefully designed and grouped, setting some back, and some forward, to a picturesque and interesting effect. The rear of the properties are often visible, especially from upper levels. Although 3 metre extensions have always been permitted on the semi-detached properties (there are 16 out of 550 properties) this is because they are generally larger in size and have longer rear gardens. However, 3 metre extensions are considered too big and bulky on other properties throughout the estate because they are flats and more modest in scale. The resident suggests that a downstairs bathroom could not be fitted in a 2.5 metre extension but it has been successfully achieved. Furthermore, the 2.5 metre extension limit has been upheld by a Planning Inspector when appealed.
- 1.10 Conclusion: - *Single storey rear extensions to remain at 2.5 metres in depth.* The character of the Roe Green Village Conservation Area is well preserved. A 3 metre single storey rear extension is considered to provide a bulky addition to the properties and harmful to the conservation area. The 2.5 metre depth limit has been upheld by the Planning Inspectorate.

General responses from Residents to both guides

- 1.11 Another resident was concerned about outbreaks of Knotweed in the conservation areas and that the Council should be notified. *A sentence about who to contact regarding Knotweed has been added.*

- 1.12 The conservation areas would benefit from more sympathetically designed lighting columns and lanterns, should the opportunity arise. *Lamp post replacement is not a priority for these conservation areas but a sympathetic design would be recommended should the opportunity arise.*

Consultee responses

- 1.13 Historic England supported the publication of the conservation area design guides. In its view they should facilitate sustainable development within the two conservation areas as required by the National Planning Policy Framework. It was specifically pleased to see that the legislative background had been clearly stated and the architectural character of the area had been carefully studied and described in easily accessible language. The management proposals logically followed on from the analysis of the areas, and it welcomed the concise explanation of Article 4 directions. Both documents were considered to be well-illustrated.
- 1.14 The Woodland Trust welcomed and supported Brent's commitment to the protection of trees in both guides. It suggested some minor rewording.
- 1.15 NHS Brent Collaborative Clinical Commissioning Group requested that the design guides recognise that there are non-residential uses within these areas and when considering planning applications the Council acknowledge that GP premises will need to be improved and modernised to continue to provide safe and accessible care.
- 1.16 Highways England; The Ministry of Defence (MOD); Natural England; Network rail; Thames Water Utilities Ltd and Transport for London had no specific comment to make on the guides.