

The Council considers the current dormer ‘too wide and too close to the roof hips and (...) incongruous to the existing roof slope.’

The design team has made minor adjustments to the proposal so it does not touch the roof hips and accurately shows its relation to the existing roof slope. Unlike other dormers to the street, this proposal has been designed to remain recessed from the side elevation in a way to reduce its impact on the overall roof structure. This translates into having high level windows rather than doors to what is essentially two new bathrooms to the third-floor bedrooms. The council’s suggestion that these windows should replicate the doors to the rear elevation, is therefore non applicable.

The client and the design team struggle to accept that the adjacent neighbour’s dormer should be taken as the maximum width allowed, when the wider context of the street shows a number of equally wide dormers that do not match their adjacent neighbouring properties. The design team has carefully analysed the existing context and would like to point out the dormer seen on No. 43 (Fig. 1) as well as No.s 67, 75 and 79 (Fig. 2) as examples of significantly larger dormers that give our proposal a good precedent base. The idea that our submission could be refused based under this reason, causes significant distress to our client who fears that our submission is being unfairly judged in favour of a single unfounded objection made by the Belsize CAAC.



Fig. 1 Large side dormer of 45 Belsize Park Gardens in its neighbouring context of mismatching side dormers



Fig. 2 Large side dormers of 67, 75 and 79 Belsize Park Gardens in its neighbouring context of mismatching side dormers