

Retrospective Planning Application 47 Montpelier Grove NW5 2XG
Application Number: 2018/5480/P

We strongly object to the Retrospective Planning Application for the following reasons:

- The rear dormer was initially granted with the understanding that it 'would maintain the dormer as a subordinate feature on the roofscape and reflect design dimensions in CPG1'. Although none of the plans show any measurements it is clear to see from the built structure that none of CPG1 guidelines have been considered and therefore not a subordinate feature on the roofscape.
- The Dormer changes are not 'minor' nor are they 'slightly higher in height & width' than the consented design. The agents, who are professionals, will be quite aware that 'changes in construction' should be notified to Camden and so this argument is disingenuous at best. The dormers were built completely differently from the original planning application - presumably with the hope that the massive increase in size would go unnoticed. The rear dormer was also initially granted with the understanding that 'Guidance in CPG1 considers a roof extension that reflects an established roof form or that is architecturally sympathetic to the age and character of the building to be considered acceptable'. That too has been ignored because the new large dormers are neither architecturally sympathetic to the age and character of the build and its surrounding buildings.
- It is also important to point out that concerns about the size of the new dormers were expressed to the builders carrying out the work and one was told that the new sizes were of course permitted and the builder would not dare vary the size as they knew they would be forced to demolish the dormers and rebuild them – so the builder was fully aware of the infringement and tried to deceive one about this.
- The retrospective amended drawings in no way reflect the appearance of what has actually been built. In particular, the rear dormer is significantly higher and wider than it is in the drawings provided in the retrospective application. The attached photograph clearly shows height of the rear dormer is causing a shadow and effecting the incoming light of the adjacent properties skylight and also indicates how out of scale the new dormer appears and how it dominates all those around it.
- The ridge tiles appear to be no different in design, size or dimensions to the original ones (and the planning approval would have insisted on this) and so it is unclear why this has been used as an argument that a new larger dormer is needed.
- The argument that drainage changes necessitated the design changes are spurious, in fact these changes are being used as an excuse to raise the height of the dormers because the existing drainage design could have been maintained at both the front and rear of number 47 without increasing the height of the dormers.
- The argument that the height of the rear dormer was needed because the height of the ceilings on the third floor level is also invalid. Owners & their agents should not be allowed arbitrarily to raise the height of permitted plans due to internal aesthetic concerns that affect only the owner of a building.
- Number 47's rear dormers outlook is imposing in relation to the smaller terraced houses and gardens of Countess Road and to the houses and gardens of Ospringe Road. Number 47 is already a house of significant size particularly with its newly added ground floor additions (as part of the same, initial planning application) and the overbearing dormer construction is an unnecessary over development.
- The planning statement in the retrospective application where the agent states 'the rear dormer is not dissimilar to many rear dormers visible from the rear of number 47' is misleading and incorrect. The rear dormer is out of keeping with its immediate surroundings and it is also disproportionate and out of character within the block of five terraced houses on Montpelier Grove. Additionally, the argument that 'the additional height however it is not dissimilar to many rear dormers visible from the rear of nr.47' is also irrelevant as what is more important here is how the huge new dormers on number 47 are seen by the surrounding properties and not from number 47.

- The huge new number 47's dormer cannot not be compared to developments in Ospringe Road because the road is not within a conservation area unlike Montpellier Grove. The statement also incorrectly compares number 47's dormer to dormers on Countess Road. There are no dormers on Countess Road as these houses have valley roofs and no infills with dormers have ever been approved on Countess Road.
- The Kentish Town Conservation Area Appraisal and Management Strategy states that 'previous unauthorised or undesirable development or inappropriate alterations will not be taken as an acceptable precedent for new work', therefore reference to existing structures in the area in support of this application should be dismissed.
- If this Retrospective Planning Application is granted it will set an unacceptable precedent for the area in the future. It is my belief that the application should be refused by Camden planning and the owners should remove the offending oversized and ugly dormers and replace them with the original, permitted structures.

