

Peter Davies

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: 29 September 2026 10:30
To: Peter Davies
Subject: re: DM/26/2165 (58 Bonnet Lane - Loft Conversion)

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Flagged

Hi Peter,

Thank you for taking the time to talk through our situation with me this morning.

As discussed, I'm writing to provide a little more context to the application.

Materials & Design

The materials used on the dormer not only match the existing roof, we actually reused the existing roof tiles for the facade of the dormer, so it blends in extremely well. The dormer is also situated on the inside of the roof structure, which is far less visible than a dormer on the outside of the roof structure.

The dormer is also of identical construction to several other dormers visible from our property. These dormers just happen to be located on roof slopes that are covered by Permitted Development Rights, despite the fact that one of them is far more visible from the street than ours is.

Knock-On Effects

In the event that the application were to be rejected, and we were then unsuccessful at appeal, the result would be us building a dormer on the other side of the house instead. This would be fully covered by Permitted Development Rights, as evidenced by the dormer at 46 Bonnet Lane.

This would be a negative outcome for everyone involved.

- The construction of a new dormer would be extremely disruptive to our neighbours on both sides (even more so than the original construction, as we would also need to dismantle the existing dormer)
- The construction of a new dormer would be extremely wasteful, as a large amount of the material used in the original construction wouldn't be suitable for re-use
- The construction of a new dormer would displace our solar array (which currently faces south-west, and cannot be effectively situated on the other side of the house due to the uneven roof structure), resulting in a material ongoing increase in carbon emissions
- The new dormer would be aesthetically more imposing to the street scene, as it would not be tucked away on the inside of the semi-detached roof structure

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

I appreciate that this situation is less than ideal. We regret that the application is being submitted in retrospect, but we were led to believe by our building contractor that the necessary permission had been attained before construction began.

I also appreciate that many of the points raised above are not traditionally material considerations for a planning application, but even if the council only cares about maintaining the street scene, rejecting this application will be worse for that goal in the long run.

We would not have intentionally chosen to be in this very difficult situation, but we are where we are now, and I hope that reason will prevail and we can take the least problematic route forward.

Kind Regards,

[REDACTED]