

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2020/2910/P	Rae Fether	29/08/2020 18:45:59	OBJ	<p>I strongly object to this Proposal. The property partly abuts the end of my property and I will have a clear view of it especially in winter.</p> <p>In 2007 the adjoining property no 57 added another storey to their house with a mansard extension clad in grey artificial slates. It was extremely sad to lose another butterfly roof which are such a treasured feature of our conservation area. In its place the looming blank grey face of the mansard is a depressing sight.</p> <p>Now the proposal at no 59 will twin with no 57 adding yet more to my loss of amenity; the outlook, light and privacy of my garden.</p> <p>It will create a precedent which will lead to the gradual loss of the remaining butterfly roofs that form a clear historic roofline in Spencer Rise. Many of these have been protected in the past by officer's appeal decisions: 1, 49, 65 and 47 Spencer Rise have all had their appeal to extend dismissed. The argument they would complete a terrace of already extended roofs cannot be supported as nos 51, 53 and 55 are all pre conservation area designation.</p> <p>The proposal increases a modest two storey two bedroom house to a three storey four bedroom house. This is overdevelopment and will reduce the stock of much needed smaller houses in the area. It can surely not be right that the circumstances of the applicant is a consideration in the planning process, when with permission granted, he could move on at any time, before or after building the extension.</p> <p>This proposal will have an adverse effect on my amenity and that of my neighbours. Not only that, the loss of this original butterfly roof which will inevitably lead to more mansard extensions, will be irrevocably harmful to the Conservation Area.</p> <p>If the Council is minded to grant this application, which I think they should not, then real slate tiles should be used. The DPCAAMS notes that reroofing in unsympathetic materials is a negative feature affecting the whole of the CA. The blank effect of artificial slate tiles facing the mansard at no 57 illustrates how unsympathetic this material is and it should not be used in the CA in spite of their use at no 57. The dormer window is inappropriate on the 70 degree sloping face of the mansard; the two rooflights at no 57 are correct and should be matched.</p>