

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2023/0666/P	Jenny Headlam-Wells	14/04/2023 15:28:47	COMM	<p>I am writing as the Ward Councillor of Kentish Town South to object most strongly to this Planning Application for extensions to a property directly adjacent to a Kentish Town Conservation Area.</p> <p>I quote and endorse the email from Mr Gavin Henderson on 2.4.23. which thoroughly sets out the grounds for refusal of this application:</p> <p>'We are objecting to the current proposals on the following basis:</p> <p>1. Scale, massing and impact on context</p> <p>The proposed massing has been justified in the application as based on the precedent of the existing roof-level extensions to numbers 65-67 Torriano Avenue.</p> <p>Consent for the roof-level extensions to 65-67 Torriano Avenue pre-dated the designation of the area of the Kentish Town Conservation Area immediately adjacent to the site and should not be taken as a precedent. The Conservation Area has its boundary on the curtilage of the Torriano Avenue properties and within the adjacent Conservation Area the roof level additions to 65-67 Torriano Avenue have a dominant, overbearing massing and are visible from multiple locations. Of the ten original domestic properties along this stretch of Torriano Avenue the others all retain their original butterfly roofs behind parapets. If the form of numbers 65-67 was replicated at number 61 and, potentially, on other properties the impact of the change in scale would have significant harm on the context of the Conservation Area and impact on residential amenity for neighbours on Torriano Cottages.</p> <p>The Torriano Avenue properties are three-storey where they front the street, but due to the change in ground level are already four-storey at the rear where they address the Conservation Area. The addition of a brick-built roof-level extension would create a five-storey façade which is significantly out of scale with the residential context.</p> <p>For numbers 59-63 this massing would have heightened impact, being highly visible from the public realm, not only from the backs of other properties, due to way Torriano Cottages turns past the end of the terrace to join Torriano Avenue.</p> <p>2. Roof Form</p> <p>The application is described a "mansard roof" but this is clearly not the case as it takes mansard form only on the Torriano Avenue frontage, creating a full, additional storey at the rear. This does not meet the approach outlined in the Council's own planning guidance documents for roof level extensions.</p> <p>The Council's 'Home Improvements' planning guidance states that roof-level extensions should be "subordinate to the host building." This would usually be understood as requiring a separate roof-level structure, rather than simply a vertical extension of the main building volume. The proposed brick façade at roof level on the rear of the property is not subordinate to the building below.</p> <p>The planning guidance also states that on traditional properties a mansard arrangement is preferred, with the extension set back behind existing parapets and a parapet gutter. If development does take place then this approach on the rear of the building, as well as on the front, would reduce its visual impact and maintain visual continuity with the adjacent parapets on numbers 59 and 63 Torriano Avenue.</p> <p>We also have the following comment:</p> <p>61 Torriano Avenue has front access via Torriano Avenue, but also a narrow pedestrian access at the rear via Torriano Cottages. Torriano Cottages is a narrow, mews-type street with no pavements and is largely used by pedestrians, including children and families accessing the adjacent primary school. It is not suitable for construction traffic and, for properties entered solely from Torriano Cottages, works and deliveries require</p>

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
				<p>advance-warning and careful co-ordination in order to maintain access and safety.</p> <p>Recent works to properties on Torriano Avenue have made use of Torriano Cottages for access, without any advance warning or discussion with affected residents. This has resulted in access for residents being blocked, concerns about pedestrian safety and multiple occasions when Council waste collections have been cancelled.</p> <p>We request that the Council places a condition on any approval such that the primary construction access, delivery and waste removal for works should be via Torriano Avenue. Torriano Cottages is an un-adopted street and is managed by the Torriano Cottages Association. We request that the condition also requires that if an exceptional access is required from Torriano Cottages this is agreed in advance and in writing from the Torriano Cottages Association so that neighbours can be notified and works can be planned and scheduled to minimise disruption.</p> <p>I support this objection and request that any future application should respect the Planning Guidance that Mr Henderson cites.</p>

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2023/0666/P	Meric Apak	14/04/2023 15:11:21	COMM	<p>I am writing as the Ward Councillor for Kentish Town South to object most emphatically to this Planning Application. I quote and endorse the statement from Mr Guy de Jonquieres on 6.3.23 which clearly sums up the objections of residents:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The proposed two storey addition is totally out of keeping with the character and design of the mid-19th century residential properties in the Rochester Terrace Conservation Area that it immediately adjoins and within which my house is situated. 2. The proposed two new storeys would tower above properties in the conservation area, almost all of which are no more than three storeys high, and would be visible from a considerable distance throughout the surrounding area. 3. Properties adjoining 26-28 Rochester Place, and particularly those on Rochester Road, Wilmot Place and Rochester Mews will suffer serious loss of privacy, since they and their gardens will be directly overlooked by and visible from the proposed two additional storeys. 4. According to the developers, the project will reduce by almost half the sunlight they currently enjoy. This is a very serious loss of amenity. 5. The proposal for a fully glazed top floor and a "glazed lantern" on top of the building will create light pollution in the surrounding area at night and will make the proposed addition even more conspicuous and intrusive. 6. The construction of the existing building caused considerable inconvenience and anxiety to local residents. Many of the properties in the area do not have solid foundations and were exposed to potential structural damage by the powerful vibrations caused by heavy construction equipment and radiating several hundred metres from the site. The equipment also generated extremely loud noise throughout the day. It is unreasonable that residents should be expected to endure any such disturbances again in the future.' <p>I totally agree with these objections, which are echoed by a very large number of residents and request that you refuse this objection outright.</p>