



NTA PLANNING LLP
TOWN PLANNING CONSULTANTS

46 James Street, London W1U 1EZ
T. 020 7636 3961
F. 020 7636 8131
info@ntaplanning.co.uk
www.ntaplanning.co.uk

The Planning Inspectorate
3/B Eagle Wing
Temple Quay House
2 The Square
Bristol
BS1 6PN

Ref: 1371

25 April 2025

Dear Daniel Reid,

**RE: 48 MAZENOD AVENUE, 2ND FLOOR FLAT, LONDON, CAMDEN, NW6 4LR (REF:
APP/X5210/W/25/3360469)**

We represent the Appellants at 48 Mazenod Avenue, 2nd Floor Flat, London, Camden, NW6 4LR. We seek to respond to Camden Council's ('the LPA') statement on the above appeal.

Response to Point 1 (Character and Appearance, Bulk and Mass and Materials)

The LPA state that *'the combined bulk and massing of the two large dormer windows would result in the roof extension appearing dominant within the roofscape. This impact would be increased due to their relative lack of glazing and large amount of grey zinc cladding that would be unduly prominent. This would lead to a top-heavy, dominant and overbearing appearance to this currently unaltered roofslope.'*

As set out in the Statement of Case submitted on behalf of the Appellant, the LPA's assessment is considered unjustified. It is submitted that the design and choice of materials for the dormer windows are appropriate for this location and do not result in an unduly dominant addition to the rear roof slope. It should be clarified that the amount of glazing and the proportions and materials used are consistent with the host property, and that the extent of zinc cladding is comparable to that found on other developments in close proximity.

Additionally, the LPA states that *'there are an array of dormers to the rear roof slopes along Mazenod Road between Nos. 34–6 (even); however, these are solely to the rear roof slope and do not result in a combined roof extension incorporating the roof above the rear outriggers.'*

While it is acknowledged that there are indeed several dormers to the rear roof slopes along Mazenod Avenue between Nos. 34–6 (even), the LPA's statement is factually inaccurate. There is, in fact, a

dormer window that extends across both the rear roof slope and the outrigger at No. 28 Mazenod Avenue.

Response to Point 2 (Design and Character)

The LPA states that *'that the introduction of the rear dormer on the roofslope would result in the potential for additional overlooking of neighbouring properties, albeit it would not introduce overlooking at the rear where none exists already'*.

This claim is wholly contradictory, as the LPA suggests that the dormer on the rear roof slope could result in potential overlooking, while simultaneously asserting that it would not introduce overlooking where none currently exists. This inconsistency reinforces the assessment made in the Appellant's Statement of Case—namely, that the Council cannot substantiate the alleged *potential* for overlooking, and that the proposal will not result in any adverse impact on residential amenity in this regard. This conclusion is further supported by the tight urban context, as well as the considered positioning and alignment of both existing and proposed windows, which ensures there is no material change in overlooking compared to the existing situation. Accordingly, the development integrates appropriately with the existing built environment and does not negatively affect the surrounding context.

Response to Point 4 (Surrounding Permissions)

With regard to relevant surrounding planning history and presence of dormer and roof alterations, the LPA claim that *'some of these either were granted prior to current policy or guidance or have no planning history and are therefore not considered as precedent.'*

As set out in the Statement of Case, the Council's CPG for Home Improvements states: *'The pattern of development in neighbouring buildings, including both historic extensions and recent developments, is also taken into account. Additionally, the presence of other approved roof extensions in neighbouring buildings, whether granted through a planning application or permitted development, is considered to ensure consistency within the area.'*

Therefore, the LPA is clearly contradicting its own guidance. The existence of roof alterations, even where they have occurred without express permission, should not be disregarded when assessing the prevailing character and context of roof development in this location. The surrounding developments form part of the established character and appearance and must be given due consideration.

Based on the information provided, and as set out in detail within the Statement of Case, the proposals are considered to be acceptable. As such, it is submitted that the LPA's decision should be overturned the appeal allowed and planning permission granted.

Kind regards,

Rory Kyle
Planner, MRTPI

NICHOLAS TAYLOR + ASSOCIATES