**Objections as of June 15th (replacing our objections from June 7th)**

It has been brought to our attention that a document dated May 19th by the architect expresses an intention to rectify some of the many disparities between the approved drawings and the build. We are surprised that the statement was not made visible on the Camden website until June 11th (when the deadline to submit comments is June 14th).

The statement by the architect brings some light to the intentions and more clarity to the plans dated May 1st posted on the Camden website, which we had understood to be “as built” and not suggestions for amendments to the building work done.

Therefore, our comments below supersede our earlier comments from June 7th.

1. We welcome the intention to reintroduce the splay on the roof and we wonder how that can be done technically. We would oppose it being done through further increasing the width of the roof towards our house, as it would protrude over our boundary.
2. We welcome the intention to amend the North dormer roof to introduce the flat upper section as per the approved drawing.
3. We insist that the protuberant black pipe on the North dormer (not approved) should be removed.
4. We disagree with the North dormer extending further towards the North than the initially approved drawings, because it appears more dominant on our property.
5. We disagree with the ridge of the roof being longer than originally approved. The ridge extends to the West of the dormer, further than on the approved drawings. Equally well it extends to the East, in alignment to the chimney, which is further than on the approved drawings. This too makes the roof feel larger and oppressive, as seen from our windows.
6. We strongly oppose the claim that the roof was not raised. The photo montage produced by the architect with his own pictures clearly shows that the roof is raised as seen against the church spike. We have lived in the house for 20 years and have seen the view daily. No one is better qualified than us to know what the view was like. We are making this point to highlight that this is yet again another discrepancy between the drawings and the build, which is not yet acknowledged, and that raises concerns. The bottom of the roof having been brought up by 3 courses of bricks, it demonstrates the consistent intent of enlarging internal volume by all means, thus making the volume of the roof bigger. The raised ridge and eaves design is both harmful to the conservation area and our amenities through appearing too bulky and reducing daylight.
7. We oppose that the dormer is now positioned higher than approved (resulting from the bottom of roof being raised) and that the window itself is closer to our house than was approved. This has impact on our daylight, as the distance is so short between the two houses.

The series of proposed amendments contribute to harming us through loss of outlook and loss of daily light as well as the invasive feel, because of the overbearing mass of the overall structure and its oppressive effect, a mere 2.5 meters away from our South facing windows.

Over the last several months, various sets of drawings have been shared, each time conceding more of the discrepancies between the approved drawings and the reality of the building work. This raises concerns and discredits the claim under point 6 (that the roof was not raised).

Generally, we find it difficult to imagine that it is acceptable to build something different from the approved drawings and to obtain agreement after the facts. This is not right and creates a precedent that is not in the interests of the community.

We would like Camden to come as a neutral body and to assess the validity of our claims.

We argue that it is not technically possible to modify the existing roof in order to create a splay without raising the gutter line or taking it further towards us (which we oppose). The alternative is to build the roof as per the initially approved drawings, with the height brought back to what it was, which would preserve the character of the conservation area. The proposed amendments as presented fail to preserve the character and are considered harmful to our amenities.