ARCHITECTS



Helaina Farthing Planning Solutions Team London Borough of Camden 5 St Pancras Square London N1C 4AG

21 June 2016

Dear Ms Farthing

PLANNING APPLICATION 2016/2694/P – 9 CLIFF ROAD ROOF EXTENSION by email only, to helaina.farthing@camden.gov.uk

I am writing to object to this application on the following grounds:

- 1. The drawings are schematic with many elements which could not be built as sketched out. For instance, roofs and walls are much too thin for the likely structure and insulation. The internal floor is shown flush to the roof terrace which has no feasible method of drainage.
- 2. Many elements as drawn would not satisfy the Building Regulations, and the appearance of the proposal would therefore be significantly different from the drawings submitted. Here are two examples:
- 2.1 It is very unlikely that the existing roof insulation would meet current standards and therefore the terrace level would inevitably rise. The front parapet is already drawn as being about 900mm high, whereas the minimum required quarding height is 1100mm.
- 2.2 No provision is made for raising the chimney stacks, which would prevent any of the fireplaces in Nos. 8 or 9 being used for either open gas fires or smokeless coal. The party wall stack and the rear corner stack to No. 8 would all need to be raised well above the new roof line and this would have a significant visual impact.
- 3. The rear elevation is easily seen from Camden Park Road, and as such has a bearing on the Camden Square Conservation Area. The boarded rear elevation would make this building higher than all nearby structures and the effect would be harmful.
- 4. The extension as drawn would be visible from Cliff Road when viewed up the gap between Nos. 9 and 10. In the pre-application comments cited in the design and access statement, it appears as if the planner was not aware that this is a semi-detached building, since it is referred to as being 'mid-terraced'. The SW side wall would be well above the side parapet.
- 5. It appears that the ridge of the new roof would be visible from the opposite pavement of Cliff Road, at least when viewed at an angle. Evidence would be needed to show the extent to which it would be visible, as the ridge would harm the appearance of this buildings which is cited as making a positive contribution to the Camden Square Conservation Area.

6. The general form of the roof extension with a front-to-back central ridge would be obtrusive and relate poorly to the existing structure with its plain parapet walls front and rear. This would be an incongruous form to the host building.
Yours sincerely
Dale Loth