65 CHETWYND ROAD NW5 1BX - 2019/1930/P

Erection of dormer window roof extension to rear roof slope; replacement of front and rear fenestrations to match existing; installation of rear facing patio doors following removal of existing patio doors.

**OBJECT**

**Note**

* there is no ’proposed’ roof plan submitted.
* existing and proposed elevations Drwg Nos CRT/EX/200 and CRT/PL/200:
  + label the house numbers incorrectly, No 67 should be No 63.

No 61(part of this attractive terrace) is not shown.

* + The corner property is mistakenly labelled No 63 and does not have original windows as shown.
  + The entrance door to upper floor at No 63 (wrongly labelled No 67) is an attractive four-panelled timber door and not as show on elevations.
* The plan does not show how the site relates to the rear of No 65 see 2017/3898/P

Nos 65-67.

Dormer: The proposal is entirely out of scale and proportion with the host building. It does not comply with CPG ‘Altering and extending your home’ March 2019 item 4.2, nor the CLP 7.2, nor DPCAAMS Roof Alterations and Extensions. It would be overwhelming and contrary to the Applicant’s Design and Access Statement that it ‘meets current planning standards’. Re their reference to existing dormer at No 57, this is pre-CA designation (and an example of why CA protection was put in place). The dormer at No 61 (which forms part of this attractive terrace of four properties) was granted consent on Appeal (APP/X5210/A/03/1108098) and could not in any way be comparable to this proposal in scale and size. Nos 63 and 65 have an unaltered roof with a continuous roofline. No 61 sits slightly lower

Application Form item 30: Contrary to what is stated, the rear of this terrace and most of this roof is visible from the public highway, Bellgate Mews. The proposal would introduce an overbearing element into what is a dense and intricate area of our CA town- and roofscape. It deserves careful visual evaluation.

Windows: As the handsome Nos 61-65 terrace has matching fenestration (the façades of Nos 61-67 were entirely rebuilt in the late 1980s to match original) it is imperative that replacement windows match exactly those of its neighbours. The window schedule should show the actual window frames eg the ones shown arched have a rectangular frame with glazed corner segments which are visible when the sash is slid down. Ensure sliding sashes, no spring loading, horns, meeting rail all to match Nos 61-63. No factory pre-coated paint.

Entrance door: It should be encouraged in any refurbishment work to replace the entrance door to match the timber four-panelled existing door adjacent at No 63 (shown as No 67 on elevations)

Application Form item 7: If the Council is minded to approve habitable space in the loft which we think they should not, and thus a volume increase it is imperative that adequate space is provided and annotated as such on plan where refuse (fortnightly collections) and recycling is to be stored.
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