RECEIVED:	29 October, 2010
WARD:	Kensal Green
PLANNING AREA:	Harlesden Consultative Forum
LOCATION:	14D Wrottesley Road, London, NW10 5YL
PROPOSAL:	Erection of rear dormer window, gable end roof extension and installation of two front rooflights to first floor flat
APPLICANT:	Mr A Oraha
CONTACT:	Graham Associates
PLAN NO'S:	

See Condition 2.

## RECOMMENDATION

Grant Consent

#### **EXISTING**

The application site is a first floor flat within a 2-storey semi-detached converted dwelling containing 4 flats on the southern side of Wrottesley Road, NW10. The site is not within a conservation area nor is it a listed building.

#### PROPOSAL

Erection of rear dormer window, gable end roof extension and installation of two front rooflights to first floor flat.

#### **HISTORY**

There is no planning hostory relating to this site. However, works to the roof of the building have already taken place without the benefit of planning permission. There is an enforcement record (E/10/0652) set up and this application was originally submitted to try and regularise the situation.

Planning Officers site visit 08/12/2010 confirm detail of works recorded by enforcement officers.

Certificate of lawfulness (ref: 09/1381) granted proving the existing use as 4 self contained flats to be lawful.

#### POLICY CONSIDERATIONS UDP 2004

BE2, BE7, BE9.

#### SPG5

Character and appearance of the dwellinghouse and surrounding streetscene Amenity of neighbouring residents.

## CONSULTATION

16 letters dated 23/11/2010 sent to neighbouring owner/occupiers.

2 objections received, main points raised were;

- The applicant did not obtain planning permission before carrying out the works
- The dormer window and hip to gable extension appears more as an addition of an extra storey than a moderate roof extension.
- The dormer as a result of its oversize, results in significant overlooking issues into the neighbouring dwelling.
- The works are out of scale and character with the street. The few dormer windows that have been built on the street are of a scale more appropriate for the existing dwellings.
- There has been a lack of consideration for the neighbouring dwellings during construction in relation to debris and untidiness ]

Following revisions to the proposal, these two objectors were sent photocopies of the revised plans.

#### **Response**

After conversations with planning officers, applicants have proposed a significant reduction in the scale and amount of development from what has already been built - resulting in a proposal that is commensurate with the Councils supplementary guidance, the building itself and the surrounding area. To ensure existing breaches are dealt with as timely as possible, an informative will be placed on any permission granted informing applicants that unlawful alterations to the roof would need to be removed and new works completed within a period of three months from the date of approval to avoid further enforcement action.

#### **Statutory Consultees**

Health and Safety Executive (HSE) - Site is within consultation distance of a hazardous pipeline. HSE do not advise, on safety grounds, against the granting of planning permission in this case.

#### REMARKS

#### **Amendments**

The initial plans were submitted as per the works which constitute the enforcement breech. This entailed; a hip to gable and rear dormer extension that combined to form a single wrap around roof extension with a flat roof. A brick parapet side wall formed the gable end elevation that was flush with the side elevation for the rear dormer. The rear dormer was 6.1m wide, constituting 90% of the existing roof width taking into account the proposed hip to gable extension. It was set up from the eaves by 0.6m and 0.3m from the ridge of the existing roof.

Officers recommended an omission from the plans of the hip to gable extension on grounds that the distance to the neighbouring dwelling fell short of SPG5 requirements to enable an extension of this sort and because hip to gable extensions are not a predominant feature of the street, bar the small minority where these had been built under permitted development. Officers also requested applicants scale down the rear dormer to a size compliant with SPG5 guidelines.

The first set of amendments responded by reducing the hip to gable extension to a side dormer window and also the scale of the rear dormer window. Officers considered that the side dormer was still not in keeping with the character of the street given that there was no planning history for

Wrottesley Road relating to side dormers and none in existence. Therefore the proposal would be contrary to policy UDP policies BE9 and SPG5 specifications. The rear dormer, although much smaller than the previous full width dormer, was not compliant with SPG5 guidelines relating to rear dormers. Officers communicated this to the agent who subsequently submitted amended plans that form the final plans this determination is based on, which are considered acceptable.

## Discussion

The final plans consist solely of a rear dormer window and front roof light. It also will reinstate the form of the original roof from the works that constitute the breach. The rear dormer is half the width of the average width of the roof, set up from the eaves by 0.5m and down from the ridge by 0.3m. Its positioning is slightly off centre, however this position lines up well with the windows in the main dwelling establishing a comfortable relationship. The design replicates windows in the existing dwelling. These dimensions and proportions are commensurate with SPG5 guidelines from rear dormer extensions. The proposals will also reinstate the hipped roof feature bringing the dwelling back into a state that is in keeping with the street. The proposed front roof light is also in accordance with SPG5 guidelines.

## Conclusion

The final plans which this determination is based on are in keeping with the existing dwelling and street character, consistent with UDP policies BE7, BE9 and H21 and the guidelines of SPG5. Due to the enforcement pretext of this case, and existing breech established, these works must be implemented urgently. An informative is attached to this permission requiring demolition of unlawful works and completion of approved plans within 3 months of this permission to avoid further enforcement action to ensure the existing breech does not stay in existence for any longer than this said amount of time.

# **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

SPG5 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):

6138/01A, 6138/02A, 6138/03A, 6138/17.12.10/04C, 6138/17.12.10/05B

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

# **INFORMATIVES:**

(1) The applicant is notified that un lawful alterations to the roof need to be removed and new works as per approved plans completed within a period of three months from the date of this approval to avoid further enforcement action.

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: 14D Wrottesley Road, London, NW10 5YL

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

