





2016/2671/P - 9 New End

24 June 2016
13:41

| | |
|-------------|--|
| Subject | 2016/2671/P - 9 New End |
| From | [REDACTED] |
| To | Healy, Conor |
| Cc | [REDACTED] |
| Sent | 20 June 2016 21:51 |
| Attachments |  Applicatio...  IMG_3310  IMG_3311  Design an... |

Dear Mr Healy,

I am writing about the retrospective application at 9 New End. I am grateful for the additional images, which I have now reviewed.

Consultation

First please note that no-one on our side of New End was consulted under the original application or under this new application. This is unacceptable.

Original application

The design and access statement (attached) states on p5 that 'the alterations would **not** alter the front facade except the windows will be replaced with double glazing and frames similar to existing', and on p19 stated that 'the well proportioned Victorian front facade and the pitched tiled roof are **not** to be altered'. The works actually carried out completely ignored these important commitments.

Current application

I am drawing on section 3 (Description of Proposed Works) of the application form.

(a) Roof

- The form mentions badly damaged tiles and an exposed membrane and wood, however this was not raised in the original application.
- The form claims that the new slate tiles are similar to one of the sets of concrete tiles. As the photos show this is highly selective and misleading. Moreover the other side of the roof (facing our house) was not the same jumble of tiles and other junk, but clean terracotta matching the neighbouring roofs (see image 7)

- The form claims that the new slate tiles are in keeping with other roofs in the area, referring to the houses across the road. This is a misleading statement since the relevant comparison is of course with the row of houses to which 9 New End belongs.
- The form claims that the roof is not visible from the street. However it is highly visible from the houses across the road, including ours.
- The form claims that the new roof is now more consistent with neighbouring properties. This is insultingly untrue: photo 3311 shows that the new roof matches neighbouring roofs neither in colour, texture, shape or layout.

(b) Bay window

- The form claims that the new bay window is more in keeping with 11 New End next door. Photos 3310 and 3311 (attached) show this to be disingenuous: the bay window could easily have been made to match **both** the number of panels and the curvature of all the neighbouring bay windows bar one (11 New End).
- Images 13 and 14 bear no relation to 9 New End

Summary

The works carried out are in complete breach of the original application and the new application contains gross factual errors and a highly misleading selection of images. All of this shows disregard for the planning process and team, and for local residents. The changes made in contravention of the original application also detract strongly from the original aspect. None of this is acceptable, let alone in our conservation area, therefore remedial works should be imposed.

Regards

