

---

**From:** John Slater  
**Sent:** 29 November 2024 15:29  
**To:** Planning  
**Subject:** Planning Applications 16 Twisden Road, NW5 1DN  
**Attachments:** 16 Twisden Road NW5 1DN.pdf

**[EXTERNAL EMAIL]** Beware – This email originated outside Camden Council and may be malicious Please take extra care with any links, attachments, requests to take action or for you to verify your password etc.

Dear Planning

There are three current Planning Applications on this site. All three Applications should be dealt with by one Planning Officer, or by all three Planning Officers in Committee, as the cumulative impact is considerable.

It has proved difficult to make these objections on behalf of the DPCAAC directly into the current form

John Slater,

Connie Marinetto

16 TWISDEN ROAD, NW5 1DN - 2024/4596/P  
Certificate of Lawful Development (proposed)

As two separate applications have been lodged for altering/extending this property by the same agent, we have the following comments for consideration re PD.

The front of this end of terrace single family house, forms the important visual long view into Twisden Road. The DPCA Appraisal and Management plan, lists the road as an exceptionally well-preserved street and roofline. The roofscape is overlooked from a wide area due to our topography, and the rear forms the outlook for residents of the York Rise Estate blocks of flats (see Appraisal). The two-storey cottages in the terrace are handed/twinned. The design of its roofscape, original architectural features and retention of its rear building line should be an important consideration in any development.

Removal of the cement roof tiles (these were in our area grant-funded by the Council post WWII due to significant bomb blast damage to properties) is welcomed. Note, as per Appraisal that the original roof ridge tiles in the terrace are plain grey (not contrasting red).

Encourage the reintroduction of a missing original finial to the gable (terrace Nos 16-62).

The proposed rear extension beyond the rear building line should be discouraged, particularly as a parallel application proposes a more common side infill extension, as was granted consent for No 18 adjacent, and other properties in the terrace.

#### Fenestration:

Reinstatement of an original design four panelled front door is welcomed.

Replacement of existing and new windows to be sliding sashes.

Rooflights to front elevation - Whilst complying with PD, as the front elevation is read in the important long view with adjacent No 18, the proposed top front rooflight should match it, in size, location and design. The proposed elevational drawing does not show this rooflight with a central CA style divide.

The lower rooflight would detract from the appearance of this front roof slope. As it has no significant function would best be omitted. Similarly, the small front rooflight in the gable would have a protrusion in profile and be visually discordant. The rooflight set further back in this hipped roof and beyond the chimney less so, as would the solar panel strip below it.

The rear rooflight strip to the loft space would match that of No 18 adjacent.

There is annotated 'render' above the front door. There is no render here. Adjacent house No 18, had pre-CA its front brickwork painted. Two similarly painted properties in the road, post CA designation, had this cleaned off, thus re-exposing the original brick and thus reuniting the visual uniformity of the terrace. Not subject to an Article 4 direction, but to note.

Demolition of front boundary wall above 1m is we understand not PD.

The basement shown as Utility and Cellar. Currently there is limited ceiling height here. Will any excavation of the basement not be subject to Article 4 basement constraints?

16 TWISDEN ROAD, NW5 1DN

**2024/4744/P**

The DPCAAC strongly objects to this application for the insertion of a dormer at rear in this end of terrace hipped roof property.

**Note** there is no customary legal public notice displayed at the rear on the York Rise Estate where the back of the Twisden Road terrace roofs is fully exposed and provides their outlook and forms an important part of the Estate's townscape setting.

This objection is to be read in conjunction with comments re PD already submitted under the Certificate of Lawfulness (Proposed) application 2024/4596/P.

The DPCA Appraisal and Management plan, lists Twisden Road as an exceptionally well-preserved street and roofline. The roofscape is overlooked from a wide area due to the DPCA topography. The rear of the terrace forms the outlook for residents of the York Rise Estate blocks of flats (see Appraisal sub-sections). The two-storey cottages Nos 16-62 forming this terrace are handed/ twinned. The design of its roofscape, original architectural features, retention of its roof form and rear building line should be an important consideration.

A longitudinal section is submitted, but no cross section. The latter would clearly show the hipped roof configuration and the very restricted available floorspace to ceiling height (even with a dropped ceiling). It would not comply with Housing habitable room standards. This cottage-type terrace has an extremely shallow roof space. The three-bed house has always provided excellent accommodation for family use, and since 1960s was occupied by the same family. The property has the extra benefit of a lower ground basement space over the entire main building, which is shown proposed to be utilized in the parallel application 2024/4796/P, by adding a utility room and usable cellar to the building envelope.

Allowing the proposed dormer would introduce significant visual harm and have a detrimental effect on the existing character of the unspoiled unbroken roof form of the terrace Nos 16-50, bar the very small pre-CA at No 46 and the setting of the York Rise Estate. It would neither preserve nor enhance the CA character but clearly negatively impact and form harm to the existing roof form of the terrace. The application refers to the dormer at No 58: this was by exception permitted following negotiations with LBC CA officer Antonia Powell in not setting a precedent, as its location is at a stepped lower level roof height between two pre-CA full width roof extensions. The other dormers in the street referred to form part of an entirely different grander terraced building type.

The front elevation as per existing drwg shows the CA style front rooflight with divide at No 18 and a non-matching style proposed for No 16. The front elevations here form the important lead visual aspect on entering Twisden Road and rooflight fenestration details should match.

We have no objection to the insertion of roof lights at the rear to match those at No 18, thus retaining the building and terrace's existing roof form, as is shown on application 2024/4796/P by the same applicant.

16 TWISDEN ROAD, NW5 1DN

**2024/4796/P**

The DPCAAC objects to the design of this proposal.

**Note:** there is no customary legal public notice displayed at the rear on the York Rise Estate where the back of the Twisden Road terrace is fully exposed, provides the outlook for their residents, seen from the slip road and forms an important part of the Estate's townscape setting.

Below to be read with our response to two parallel applications for this property: our objection to rear dormer 2024/4744/P and the comments re various PD to 2024/4596/P.

The DPCAAMS, lists Twisden Road as an exceptionally well-preserved street and roofline. The roofscape is overlooked from a wide area due to the DPCA topography. The rear of the terrace forms the outlook for residents of the York Rise Estate blocks of flats (see Appraisal sub-sections). The two-storey cottages Nos 16-62 forming this terrace are handed/twinned. The design of its roofscape, original architectural features, retention of its roof form and rear building line should be of important consideration. The west elevation roofs are on full view from the public access pathway from Twisden Road leading to the York Rise Estate.

While many of the street's properties have a side infill, as they are paired, and in this location very closely overlooked by residents of Stephenson House, the infill should match in footprint and roof form that of the infill approved for No 18 (see officer's report 2016/0643/P), ie have a sloping roof to preserve the form of the existing rear outrigger. Whether the sloping infill roof is glazed or clad in (artificial) slate (to match the building's welcome reroofing), whilst PD, it seems an excessive requirement to add more 'clip on' solar panelling at this level at the loss of leaving an attractive roof finish exposed.

Re fenestration, in order to preserve the character of the terrace, no sliding sashes at rear should be replaced by, or new inserted, as casement windows. Similarly, rooflights at main roof front and rear, though PD, should be encouraged to match No 18 in size, number and configuration.

Cross and longitudinal sections would helpfully show if excavation is required to provide for the proposed creation of usable basement space as part of an increased building volume. Is this subject to an Article 4 basement constraint in our area? Currently there is limited ceiling height in this void.

We note a proposed internal interconnecting arrangement over two floors at the outrigger, the rear of the main front building. This arrangement could facilitate creating an independent unit of the rear of the property by vertical division, as direct access from the road exists via a side entrance path. The separate PD application further proposes to extend this rear part of the building, by adding a room beyond the rear building line. If such arrangement at any future stage becomes a proposition this would trigger a S106 re car free accommodation. Perhaps officers could refer to this by way of an Informative.