



Dear Mr Ogunleye,

I am writing to you about Planning Applications: **2020/1417P**, "Erection of 2 dormer windows with balconies and rooflight to rear roof slope, and alterations to existing rear dormer including revised glazing detail and replacement of hipped roof with flat roof", and **2020/1418/P**, "Erection of single storey lower ground rear extension with external roof terrace above together with new external patio with new stepped access to rear garden, external alterations to property including replacement of ground floor rear window with french doors, installation of new window and enlarged window to ground floor side elevation and installation of new entrance door off front porch to provide access to upper floor flats".

I have been trying to work out my comments about these applications, but it is impossible. The developer needs to go back to the drawing board and start again. He has submitted two separate applications for different works he wishes to carry out, one for the lower ground floor extension (1417) and one for the roof alterations and dormer windows (1418). It may be that your rules allow him to do this; however he is not proposing works to a single flat, but a

combination of works which effect the whole house, and also the house to which it is attached. It looks, on the face of it, as though he has broken them down to hide their scale.

The submitted Existing and Proposed Drawings lack detail and do not give enough information in the following areas:

- • The proposed materials and finishes are not shown. The elements proposed for change should be clearly labelled and defined. There is no consistency between the drawings, with the side elevation showing what is assumed to be a glass balustrade and the rear elevation showing metal, or perhaps even another material.
- • The applicant wishes to change the windows of the existing dormer and remove the pitched roofs. This would require the entire existing dormer to be demolished and replaced, with an attendant effect on the conservation area. While the current plans show the additional roof terrace surrounded by what appears to be balustrading - again not labelled, and with no connection between the two dormers - this is not stated on the drawings.
- • It is also unclear if the intention is to push back the new dormer line out to the facade line as shown in the section, or if it is stepped back as shown in the plans. Again, this inconsistency and lack of clarity, and clear annotation between the Existing and different Proposed drawings demonstrates the ill-considered nature of the application.
- • Existing rear elevations and sections do not provide either the levels of existing dormers and flat roof eaves and ridge heights, or the overall building roof ridge height and pitch of the existing roof. These levels are also not shown on the Proposed Drawings, in order to confirm that there is no plan to change the roof angle, and how the heights and levels relate to neighbouring properties, especially 29's mirror house, 27. Again, a worrying lack of clarity and definition; the finished product could have a seriously detrimental effect on both neighbours and the conservation area.
- • The existing drawings of the neighbouring properties also appear to misrepresent what is actually there. (I should explain that 25 has had no terraces added to the original house. The modest terraces of 27 and 31 were added over 35 years ago, long before the granting of conservation area status in 2001, and decades before the start of the present plague of fifth wave gentrification from which our area is now suffering: it would clearly be inappropriate for even those small terraces to be given the go-ahead now, when the purpose of the conservation area is to conserve and enhance.)

These two planning applications need to be withdrawn and re-presented, as they are so deficient in detail that any comments made to you would be incoherent and irrelevant.

A copy of this goes to Andrew Parkinson, as he may have comments.