

<b>Application No:</b>	<b>Consultees Name:</b>	<b>Received:</b>	<b>Comment:</b>	<b>Response:</b>
2023/0043/P	Paul Thomas	24/04/2023 18:03:48	OBJ	Dear Sirs

By way of background, I wrote to planning@camden on 24 January 2023 regarding multiple breaches of planning permission ref 2022/0013/P. I am now writing to object to Planning Application 2023/0043/P, which seeks to achieve retrospective approval for works already carried out that are clearly in breach of the consent given by the council.

In the Decision Notice dated 5 April 2022, there is a section headed "Reasons for granting permission". This section includes the following narrative:

"The rear and side dormers match the window styles and sizes of the dwelling house and appear subordinate on the roofslopes. Their scale is relatively modest so as to reduce their impact to the character of the area and the host dwelling house. The materials of timber sash windows and lead dormer cheeks, which match the roofing materials, are acceptable"

These reasons were valid for the original application 2022/0013/P, but they could not reasonably be applied to the three dormers that have actually been built and for which retrospective approval is being sought via application 2023/0043/P. I say this because:

\* The scale of the dormers cannot reasonably be regarded as "relatively modest so as to reduce their impact to the character of the area and host dwelling house". Also, the dormers cannot be said to "appear subordinate on the roofslopes" because they dominate the rooflines and are more than twice the volume of the ones in the consented plans. As I have said in the past to Mr Aka (owner of No 2) regarding the dormer on the south east roof, it looks like a shed has been installed in his roof at the side.

\* Application 2023/0043/P includes timber sash windows, but the ones currently installed are uPVC casement windows. In addition, they contain only 6 panes, not 12 as per the proposed plans. Is it proposed that they will be replaced with 12 pane timber sash windows? The installed ones are clearly not in keeping with the other windows in the host house or those in all neighbouring properties. So, it would seem wrong to disapply Condition 3 to the consent, which is designed to "safeguard the appearance of the premises and character of the immediate area in accordance with the requirements of policies D1 and D2 of the London Borough of Camden Local Plan 2017.". Why have these policies if they can be ignored?

\* The surrounds to the dormer windows are materially larger than shown in either the consented plans (2022/0013/P) or those in Application 2023/0043/P. This is probably because the dormers are much bigger than consented, but the windows themselves are probably close in size to those approved. In consequence, the surrounds need to be much bigger to 'fill up the space' around the windows. I estimate that the plans show windows that 'fill' about 56% of the vertical end of each dormer. But, the actual installed windows 'fill' only 37% of each dormer end. As a result, the inappropriate windows are 'showcased' to make them look less like dormer windows and more like ones in a tiled shed wall. The use of slate tiles in the surround (rather than the consented lead sheeting) exacerbates the poor aesthetics.

\* Application 2023/0043/P seeks to change the consented lead dormer roof coverings to felt, which would not "safeguard the...character of the immediate area".

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
				<p>For the reasons above, I request that Application "2023/0043/P be refused and that Application 2022/0013/P is enforced.</p> <p>I would also question why Application 2023/0043/P seeks to remove or change Condition 4 of consent 2022/0013/P?</p> <p>Best regards</p> <p>Paul Thomas</p>

---