

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2016/0845/P	Mark McCarthy	Rochester Conservation Area	15/03/2016 15:39:54	COMMNT	2016/0845/P (5 Wilmot Place) Further Comment

It has been helpful to receive replies to the points made in previous correspondence. Please can the Agent's letter and land plan be placed on the web page.

Please find below CAAC comments on the application

Nos. 4 and 5 Wilmot Place were built in the late 1840s, when the roads around Rochester Terrace Gardens, and Rochester Place behind Rochester Terrace, were set out. It is a characteristic 'late Georgian' semi-detached property. The conservation area statement specifically mentions Nos. 4-5 as "more modest properties built during the same period" [compared with Nos. 6-15 opposite].

Nos. 4 and 5 are intimately set at the back of the gardens of Nos. 1-4 Rochester Terrace, and the boundary line continues along Rochester Place as a single storey car garage at 'No. 34' and a double-storey industrial property at Nos 36-38. The back garden plots of Nos 1-4 Rochester Terrace are larger than that of 5 Wilmot.

The conservation area statement states "The rear extension of No.4 Wilmot Place faces Rochester Place and has a large Mansard roof which is out of character with the style of buildings in the street."

Rochester Terrace rear gardens add beneficially to the conservation area, are visible from many houses and – being southwest facing – are valued for sunlight. The small back garden of No 5 Wilmot Place contributes to this open area. As is stated, No 5 Wilmot Place has a 'mature', although relatively young, sycamore, in the garden near the garage. A Russian vine also has enveloped the whole back corner and side of the house up to the eaves, forming a negative feature for the conservation area.

All four houses Nos. 1- 4 Rochester Terrace have created back extensions, of different styles, in the past.

The proposal for 5 Wilmot Place to infill the side of the back extension with a roof sloping to the garden wall is modest. The more questionable aspect is the proposed further extension into the garden.

1. In an already small, enclosed space, the reduction overall by one third of the garden would be a significant loss for the Conservation Area, and contrary to Camden's policy to preserve and enhance green space.
2. The visual impact is a material concern for the conservation area. The extension would rise above the existing garden walls. The application does not have drawings of perspective from these properties, nor made a photomontage.
3. A full-width 'picture frame' sliding door would be out of character with the rest of this well-preserved late London Georgian house. [The adjacent No 4 Wilmot Place should not be taken as

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
					<p>precedent, since the development (planning application in 1986 no 8600561) was before the conservation area was created (2001) and – as noted above – the Mansard roof is described in the conservation area statement as negative.]</p>
					<p>4. It is of note that an application at 5 Wilmot Place in 1973 for a roof extension was rejected on grounds of overdevelopment, as ‘the total floor space, following the proposed extension, is considered excessive in relation to the site and the area generally’.</p>
