

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2016/4932/P	David Lewis	43 Platts Lane London	17/10/2016 11:02:58	OBJ	We are residents at 43 Platts Lane.

We have read the retrospective application for planning permission and would comment as follows:

- The application is "in denial" in that it suggests that the garages building has been replaced "like for like". This is not the case in a number of material respects a) it is substantially higher than it was previously if one measures from the floor to the flat roof alone (as is evidenced in photos we submitted to the planning enforcement officer and the fact that our fence which was previously flush with the roof is now significantly below the new roof level) b) the "flat" roof now contains very prominent (white plastic/metal) skylights which protrude from it where none existed before; drawing even greater attention to the building than before. The skylights are not at all in keeping with the conservation area in terms of materials
- The application is misleading in that the photos provided by the applicant do not give a view of the flat roof from above (only the side) and show the elevation from a deceptive angle. We have therefore taken some photos which give a true sense of the concern we have. Unfortunately, this form does not seem to allow for photos to be inserted so please do contact us for such photos (which can be emailed). We think such photos should be a material factor in your decision making process.

The statement from the architect which follows the "like for like" purported explanation from the owner's representative speaks volumes by what it does NOT say

"I would confirm that the rear wall of the garages which is the boundary wall with no. 43 Platts Lane to the north; the boundary wall with no. 1 Briardale Gardens to the west, and the east wall of the garages are unaltered." ie it impliedly concedes that the roof has been extended in height and width so it is now closer to 1 Briardale Gardens and as outlined above.

- This development would have been the correct opportunity to replace the materials with a more eco-friendly grass roof in accordance with Camden's policy on this point

Accordingly, we are strongly opposed to the development that has occurred and had we been consulted in advance (as we clearly should have been) would have pushed strenuously for a green roof, for the height to be maintained as it was and against the insertion of the unsightly skylights. Whilst we do not wish to force unnecessary cost on neighbours, we firmly believe planning laws are there for a reason and any such cost could have been avoided had the appropriate processes been followed.