Addendum to objection to application 2022/3884/P

Further to the revised drawings and application:

The proposed new parapet to the rear of the building is clearly wholly unacceptable in design as it would clearly materially adversely effect the design of the building in a wholly unnecessary way; additionally it appears to provide no useful function. The additional bulk of such a structure and the profile from the side and front is at odds with the existing roof design and the design of rooves neighbouring. It is clunky and ill-thought out. There may well also be negative effects on the building structurally requiring additional alterations to it. This is detrimental to the conservation area and the building which is a positive contributor.

The head height in the proposed extension is only 1.6m, is this a permissible head height for modern residential development? Taking into account the shape of the mansard roof, does this provide good quality housing which is compliant with building regulations? Is this to be a bedroom or a day room? We are also not at all sure that the applicant is entitled to raise the chimney nor the reason therefore.

There would appear to be no existing permission for a roof terrace usage and the applicant is not applying for one in this application, but rather just for an extension. Unless the roof has permission for this use, does this not need to be applied for too? Giving permission for a roof terrace is a decision of great importance for neighbours.

Contrary to what is said in the DAS, CPG1 there will be additional harm as there is not an established mansard roof design nearby which is relevant and next door at Christchurch Hill there is an undeveloped flat roof. This highly prominent building is clearly very much an individual one, it is very unusual in this respect and it is not one of a series of almost identical 20th century ones neighbouring. Consideration of an extension of the roofline is a much more individual assessment. Standing at the front of the building it really is a very original and individual house, unlike any other nearby. This building does not suit a mansard and would not have originally had one and it is not in the interests of the building or the conservation area to further spoil it.

Contrary to CPG1 there will be additional harm to neighbours through undoubted light pollution, overlooking, loss of view and noise from use of a roof terrace and the additional structure in close proximity to the neighbouring property at 26 Well Walk. Use of external spaces can produce material extra noise, especially as sound created high up travels a long way.

 It can be seen that the flat below has the benefit of two rooflights; it is inconceivable that light will not be reduced to this property below and it is therefore entirely unsuitable for the roof area to be developed in the manner proposed. This is a specific example of harm contrary to CPG1.

In terms of detail of the roof, it appears to be proposed that the tiling changes from the diagram as the drawn design does not match the existing roof tiling.

It has not been possible to properly for the other flat owners to discuss the applicants proposals with them as a group due to the applicant’s busy schedule and, added to the paucity of information in the DAS, many uncertainties remain.

We ask that this application be refused on the numerous grounds highlighted.

Mark and Elizabeth Goodman