

54 Trisden Road, Dartmouth Park, London NW5 1DN, UK

11 October 2016

Laura Hazelton
Planning Solution Team 1
Development Management
Planning and Regeneration
Camden Town Hall, Judd Street
London WC1H 9UD

Dear Laura Hazelton

2016/2430P and 2016/2519/L - 106 Highgate Road, NW5

Demolition of outbuilding, extension lower ground floor level, full width rear extension at lower and upper ground floor; restoration of pitched roof and creation of sunken terrace at rooftop level; various internal alterations

Further to our telephone conversation today, below is my **strong objection** to roof alterations to this Listed building which forms an integral part of the group valued Fitzroy Terrace. Unauthorized roof alterations were reported to Camden's enforcement team in 2013, when balustrading and decorated painted chimney walls indicated the creation of a roof terrace. Balustrading was lowered but is still visible, as too remain the painted walls (see attached photos).

Submitted drawings

"Existing" elevations and roof/sections

These drawings show the unauthorized layout of the roof. Not its original roof form. This is very misleading both to consultees and councillor decision makers needing to judge the impact of a true "before and after" situation for this significant listed terrace roofscape. This building sits as an integral component second in from the end of terrace.

Proposed elevations and roof/sections

Again misleading, as these do not show the full elevational/plan context in relation to its neighbours. Neither do the photographs submitted provide this by only showing the partial roof configuration. Accurate records are vital for reinstatement monitoring.

Dartmouth Park CA designation

This part of the DPCA predates its 04/02/1992 designation in originally being designated in 1/11/1985 as an extension to the Highgate Village CA. This early protection reflected the importance of Highgate Road as the early historic route North out of London with its early linear development. This is acknowledged in the road being lined with many significant Listed Buildings from its start at Kentish Town via Highgate West Hill to Highgate Village.

DPCA Appraisal and Management Plan

Character Sub-Area 1 Highgate Road

As "Existing" drawings should show the original roof configuration referred to in Appraisal as "... elegant terrace (listed) with mansard roof dating from 19C..." (this is **wrong should read late 18C Georgian although one historic reference dates it 1815**) and "although not visible from the road, the terrace has an unusual, attractive rear elevation". **Note:** With regard to the setting, this roofscape is seen by top flats opposite, especially when trees not in leaf, and by higher level housing on the Ingestre Road Estate to the east.

Cont/...

Management Plan

Listed Buildings:

"... form a very important part of the historic quality and character of the area. ..."

Roof Alterations and Extensions: refers to "... retains the clear historic rooflines which it is important to preserve: ...fundamental changes to the roofline,... can harm the historic character of the roofscape and will be resisted.". "Roof alterations or additions are likely to be unacceptable where a building forms part of a complete terrace or group of buildings which have a roofline that is largely unimpaired by alterations or where its architectural style would be undermined by any addition."

Quality erosion and loss of architectural detail:

Note: some chimney pots on the distinct tall chimneys have been removed. Should these not be reinstated across the terrace? Roof Telecommunication equipment affixed - should this be subject to consent on a listed building? Remove the latter if redundant.

Proposed Roof terrace

The roofscape of this group value listed terrace is in my view too historically significant to allow the proposed changes; it should be disallowed and reinstated to original. The proposed shows an amended roof terrace from the larger unauthorized one, but any such terrace apart from destroying the integrity of the original uniform roofline, **would in use** be highly discordant; with people visible above roofline, Building Regulation requirement balustrading glass will reflect sunlight, placing of terrace furniture, planting, trellising etc which when freestanding would be visibly intrusive and would not be enforceable against; Introducing visually harmful changes during the day and any lighting installation also after dark. Similarly terraced arrangements have frequently introduced a loss of amenities to neighbours by way of noise and overlooking.

Proposed replacement rear top window

The elevation does not specify detail, but for the avoidance of misinterpretation should it be annotated to match the original in materials and detail. If it is a (sliding) timber sash should this be with/without horns? Adjacent at No 104 the front top floor window replacements are an example of wrong detailing and use of contemporary glazing.

Rear ground/semi-basement extension

With this listed terrace's handsome, distinct, rear elevation it would be respectful for a new extension to continue a common design and use of material principle as per any previously approved. Perhaps a reminder that remedial work to brickwork is done in lime mortar.

For the above reasons I **object most strongly** to any roof terrace in this location. The original roof should be reinstated to original in order to 'preserve and enhance' the terrace's roofscape and retain its importance in visual value to a much wider CA roofscape setting.

Kind regards



cc: Sarah Freeman Conservation officer

enc

2016/2430F . 2016/2519/L

106 HIGHSATE ROAD, N.W.5



NEWS SHOW
UNAUTHORIZED
ROOF CHANGES
FRONT + REAR
OCTOBER 2016