

**Application reference: 06/1873/HOT**  
**BARNES WARD**

Date application received	Date made valid	Target report date	8 Week date
12.06.2006	<del>21.06.2006</del>		<del>16.08.2006</del>

**Site:**

53B Madrid Road, Barnes, London, SW13 9PQ

*1/8/06 - corrected plans received.*

*26/9/6.*

**Proposal:**

Extension to existing loft and dormer.

**Present use:**

*flat*

**Status:** Pending Consideration (If status = HOLD please check that all is OK before you proceed any further with this application)

**APPLICANT NAME**

Mr And Mrs Thomason  
13 Gilbert House  
44 Trinity Road  
Barnes SW13 8EG

**AGENT NAME**

Anne Swift Architect  
42 Temple Sheen Road  
Barnes  
SW14 7QG

**Consultations:**

**Internal/External:**

**Consultee**

**Expiry Date**

**Neighbours:**

- ~~55B Madrid Road, Barnes, London, SW13 9PQ, - 04.07.2006~~
- ~~4 Ullswater Road, Barnes, London, SW13 9PJ, - 04.07.2006~~
- ~~51 Madrid Road, Barnes, London, SW13 9PQ, - 04.07.2006~~
- ~~53 Madrid Road, Barnes, London, SW13 9PQ, - 04.07.2006~~
- ~~55A Madrid Road, Barnes, London, SW13 9PQ, - 04.07.2006~~
- ~~2 Ullswater Road, Barnes, London, SW13 9PJ, - 04.07.2006~~
- ~~55 Madrid Road, Barnes, London, SW13 9PQ, - 04.07.2006~~

**History:**

Ref No	Description	Status	Date
06/1873/HOT	• Extension to existing loft and dormer.	PCO	

**Constraints:**

**Recommendation:**

The determination of this application falls within the scope of Officer delegated powers - YES / NQ

**I therefore recommend the following:**

- 1. REFUSAL
- 2. PERMISSION
- 3. FORWARD TO COMMITTEE

Case Officer (Initials): VK.....

Dated: 29/8/06.....

**I agree the recommendation:**

Team Leader/Development Control Manager

*John Brown*  
29/8/06

Dated: .....

This application has been subject to representations that are contrary to the officer recommendation. The Development Control Manager has considered those representations and concluded that the application can be determined without reference to the Planning Committee in conjunction with existing delegated authority.

Development Control Manager: .....

Dated: .....

<b>REASONS:</b>
<b>CONDITIONS:</b>
<b>INFORMATIVES:</b>
<b>UDP POLICIES:</b>
<b>OTHER POLICIES:</b>

The following table will populate as a quick check by running the template once items have been entered into Uniform

<b>CONDITIONS:</b>
<b>INFORMATIVES:</b>

**ADDITIONAL NOTES CONTINUED FROM ABOVE:**

## DELEGATED REPORT

**Site Address:** 53B Madrid Road, Barnes

**Reference:** 06/1873/HOT

**Policies:** BLT 11, 15 and 16.

**Site/Surroundings:** No 53B is a first floor flat in a two storey, semi-detached building (with roof extension). The site is not listed, nor a BTM and is not in a Conservation Area.

**Proposal:** Erection of roof extension (extending existing dormer). The dormer would measure 3m wide, and 1.7m tall. It would be set in the same location as the adjacent dormer window (1m up from the eaves and 0.9m down from the ridge).

**Relevant History:** 83/786 Dormer extension, approved August 1983.

**Representations:** None

Corrected plans were received 1<sup>st</sup> August (as the original proposed plans had a discrepancy regarding the window width). As this is a minor alteration, and as no representations were received, re-consultation was not considered necessary.

**Professional comments:**

The proposal is considered to comply with the aims and objectives of SPG for roof extensions, being of subservient dimensions to the roof slope, and (including the existing dormer) leaving a large area of original roof slope above and below (and a small area to the side next to the chimney stack).

Taking into account the existing overlooking from the French doors on the first floor and the bedroom window of the existing dormer, the proposal is not considered to materially reduce the privacy of surrounding properties. As it sited up from the eaves and down from the ridge (and taking account of the length of the gardens to the west and the existing dormer), the proposal is not considered to have an overbearing or overshadowing impact upon surrounding neighbours.

Due to the tight arrangement of buildings in this part of Madrid Road the proposal would not be prominent in public views and is therefore considered to preserve the character of the area. Provided the materials used match those of the existing dormer, the proposal is considered to be acceptable.

**Recommendation:** Approve

**Conditions:** Three years, materials to match existing.

**Informatives:** The proposal would preserve the character of the building and the area and not cause harm to neighbour amenity through loss of light or privacy, or overbearing impact.

**Drawing numbers:** OS Extract received 12<sup>th</sup> June 2006 and 06/T/01B received 1<sup>st</sup> August 2006.

## Site Visit Proforma

It may be necessary to expand on answers when the report is prepared but the completion of this proforma will be part of that report reducing the need to repeat matters.

The 1.200 OS extract is intended to be used as a tool for use by the case officer & decision maker in reaching a recommendation/decision respectively. Some of the points below can be dealt with on the OS or accurate sketch.

1. Ref number	OL/1575/R-T	
2. Date of Site Visit(s) & Properties Visited.		
3. Conservation Area	Yes/No	
4. Listed Building	Yes/No	
5. BTM	Yes/No	
6. Type of property	House/Flat/Bungalow/Other; Detached/semi/terraced/other	
7. Trees: 1. on site 2. 2. adj land 3. 3. on street	1. Yes/No 2. Yes/No 3. Yes/No	Species & location: Use 1.200 OS to indicate as precisely as possible
8. Wildlife & Habitat e.g. ivy covered fences/buildings, log piles, non-maintained land, ponds, holes/setts	Yes/No	Use 1.200 OS to indicate as precisely as possible
9. Change in land levels	Yes/No-if Yes provide details	Use 1.200 OS to indicate as precisely as possible
10. Existing external materials	1. Roof <i>slate</i> 2. Walls <i>stack</i> 3. Windows <i>wooden</i>	
11. Boundary treatment giving height & materials		Use 1.200 OS to indicate as precisely as possible
12. Position & function of windows of adj properties Normally visiting adj property(s) is required to assess internal layout including window positions/views from them unless can be done without internal visit.	<i>near facing</i>	Use 1.200 OS to indicate as precisely as possible, + draw sketch if OS not appropriate.
13. Is BRE test necessary?	Yes/No. If Yes, complete at office using 1.200 OS or similar. If No, why not? Use adj box to answer.	

14. Other extensions &/or outbuildings to 1. app site 2. adj site(s)	1. Yes/No <i>SS new extension</i> 2. Yes/No	Use 1.200 OS to indicate as precisely as possible
15. Parking arrangement 1. on site 2. on street-if cpz, time controls	1. Yes/No 2. Yes/No	
16. Photographs (Annotate photos with date, location, ref no) Consider street scene photos	Yes/No	
17. Use 'Phone call' proforma for on-site discussions	Yes/No	
18. Check for properties not consulted, particularly flats in application property	Yes or N/A	If Yes Tech support to send letters, if TL agrees