

NORTH, SOUTH, EAST, OR WEST - CHOOSE A  
DIRECTION; ANY DIRECTION

**LET'S GO NORTH AGAIN AND LOOK AT  
PLANNING APPLICATION APPROVED FOR:  
56 FOUNTAINHALL ROAD**

**(APPROVAL GRANTED AFTER 57 BLENHEIM PLACE LRB#2  
SUBMISSIONS)**

**NORTH (~120m) – 56 FOUNTAINHALL ROAD: FORMATION OF HUGE NEW BOX DORMER; ‘NO’ DORMER CURRENTLY ON ROOF**  
““CURRENT REAR FACING ROOF SHOWING ‘NO’ DORMER””



A roof with no dormer (ignore the small dormer to the right, that's on the next house).

And yet planning permission has been granted for a new huge box dormer, taking up most of the roof area; see next page...

**NORTH (~120m) – 56 FOUNTAINHALL ROAD: FORMATION OF HUGE NEW BOX DORMER; ‘NO’ DORMER CURRENTLY ON ROOF**

““EXTRACT FROM PLANS SHOWING PLANNED HUGE NEW BOX DORMER”“



Apologies for poor image quality; I do not have a professional editing programme.

But it is clear that where there was no dormer, planning permission has been granted for the formation of a huge new box dormer, taking up a large proportion of the available roof area.

## Planners' treatment of 56 F. R. vs 57 B. P. applications; what's going on??

	<b>56 Fountainhall Road</b>	<b>57 Blenheim Place</b>
<b>Dormer(s) currently on roof</b>	<b>NO</b>	<b>YES (x2)</b>
<b>Car park adjacent to house + gardens</b>	<b>NO</b>	<b>YES</b>
<b>Large modern office building with roof terrace within 50m of house</b>	<b>NO</b>	<b>YES</b>
<b>Planning permission for enlarged / new dormer refused by Planners</b>	<b>NO (approved 1<sup>st</sup> time)</b>	<b>YES (refused x2)</b>
<b>Increase in 'Mass on Roof' from enlarged / new dormer</b>	<b>INFINITE (no current dormer)</b>	<b>100%</b>
<b>Can be seen from Desswood Place / Blenheim Place</b>	<b>YES</b>	<b>YES (but no more than current dormer)</b>
<b>Why did 56 F. R. obtain planning permission for a completely new huge box dormer at the first time of asking, but 57 B. P. have been refused twice for an enlarged dormer??</b>	<b>I don't know...</b>	<b>You tell me...</b>

## **FINAL, FINAL SUMMARY INCORPORATING THE LATEST UNCONDITIONALLY APPROVED PLANNING APPLICATION FOR A COMPLETELY NEW LARGE BOX DORMER ON THE ROOF OF 56 FOUNTAINHALL ROAD**

- **KEY: FR = Fountainhall Road; OP = Osborne Place; DP = Desswood Place; BG = Blenheim Gate (office building); BP = Blenheim Place; all in the same Conservation Area.**
- **Initially, I thought that this LRB #2 would be decided on the arcane metric of ‘mass on roof’; it is now clear to me that this is not the case, as the Planners’ have approved many developments that have / will result in larger increases in mass on roof than that proposed for 57 BP. The ultimate example is 56 FR where there will be an infinite increase in mass on roof.**
- **Initially, I also thought that this LRB #2 would be decided on the metric of ‘reduction in area of traditional sloping slated roof’. As above, this also cannot be the case as illustrated by the many approved developments resulting in greater reductions in roof areas; especially 59 DP and 56 FR.**

**FINAL, FINAL SUMMARY INCORPORATING THE LATEST UNCONDITIONALLY APPROVED PLANNING APPLICATION FOR A COMPLETELY NEW LARGE BOX DORMER ON THE ROOF OF 56 FOUNTAINHALL ROAD**

- **Initially, I also thought that this LRB #2 would be decided on the issue of the removal or enlargement of existing dormers; again, this cannot be the case as planning permission has been granted for the removal or enlargement of existing dormers at 107 OP, 91 FR, and 59 DP.**
- **So, what am I left with, on what basis will this LRB #2 be decided?? The Planners have effectively designated my roof (57 BP) to be a 'Listed' roof, on which no changes can be made. I challenge this designation by the Planners on the basis that the relevant policies and guidelines should be applied equally, equitably, and fairly throughout the same Conservation Area.**
- **I do not believe this to be the case, and have sought to illustrate this by my review of nearby, recently approved planning applications.**
- **I hope that you agree with me; thank you.**