

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

28 March 2017

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

Dear Laura Hazelton

106 Highgate Road, NW5

2017/1226/L

Alteration of existing butterfly roof to a flat roof with terrace and access hatch (retrospective)

2017/0923/P

Alteration of existing butterfly roof to a flat roof with terrace and access hatch (retrospective)

I **object most strongly** to this retrospective application. The roof was not merely altered but demolished entirely to form a flat roof with roof terrace.

Statement / Submitted Drwgs:

drwgs HIRFT-E001 and P005 existing (unauthorized), E101 and P105 pre-existing, show in elevation the adjacent fenestration but misleadingly fail to show on elevations and on plan the existing butterfly roofs of the adjacent properties. Similarly in Statement page 11 drwg. The Statement contextual aerial photo, OS maps and Proposal Map are out of date.

Site and Area: The demolition of this roof has destroyed the integrity of the uniform roofline of the very attractive and unusual roof formation (mansarded rear topped by butterfly roof with fine chimney stacks) of the elegant Fitzroy Terrace. The Statement 2.5 refers to 'The application building in general is typical of a London Victoria terrace'. This is a Georgian terrace, not Victorian.

Unauthorized changes to this roof were reported to the Council in 2013 when painted party chimney walls appeared together with balustrading, indicating alterations and use as terrace. Building Regulations compliance require the recording of such roof alterations.

Contrary to what is implied in Statement 2.5 there is no authorized use of roof voids for this terrace for amenity purposes.

Planning Policy: The Statement 3.11 quotes precisely the reason why the application should be disallowed; as do the quoted LDF policies CS14 and DP25 where the demolition of the roof clearly fails to comply by not preserving and enhancing (not 'and/or' as stated).

Fitzroy Terrace has group value and an unusual roof configuration over five houses Nos 100-108, with No 98 a matching narrower single-window frontage. The terrace's very attractive roof form is seen from rear, and taller buildings including those on higher ground within and outside the CA. Eg see photo attachment to my objection letter 11/10/2016 to withdrawn

2016/2430P and 2016/2519/L

Access Considerations: The stated limited anticipated use in 5.1 with its current access arrangements, ie only used during particularly good weather and season, is irrelevant. Its availability for use would extent beyond the occupancy of the current applicant. Any future changes to internal arrangement of the property, or occupancy use, and thus frequency of use, would if permitted to remain, not be subject to planning control.

Cont/. . .

Dartmouth Park CA designation / listed terrace

Fitzroy Terrace was built by the Fitzroy family for their servants and at designation in 1974 was also noted to retain good original internal features. Its particularly attractive roof form, mentioned in its designation, is, I believe, the only terrace in our CA of such design. This area of the DPCA (designated 04/02/1992) formed part of an earlier designation (01/11/1985) as an extension to the Highgate Village CA. This early CA protected status along the eastern side of Highgate Road incorporated previously listed buildings, and so protected the historic character setting of the early linear development of the route North out of London; from Kentish Town to Highgate Village and beyond. The topography of the neighbourhood is one of rising ground northwards and eastwards, which is why preservation of historic roofscape is specifically singled out as important. Views from taller buildings within and from outside the CA looking into it should call for the protection of such fine heritage roofscape.

DPCA Appraisal and Management Plan

Character Sub-Area 1 - Highgate Road

The Appraisal states "... 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". With regard to the setting, this roofscape is seen from surrounding taller buildings, especially when trees not in leaf, and by higher level housing such as the nearby Estates in and outside the CA.

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. These should be reinstated. Roof Telecommunication equipment affixed - should this be subject to consent on a listed building? Remove the latter if redundant.

2017/0923/P - Proposed retention of the unauthorized roof terrace

Note that the drwg HIRFT-P105 and P005 show that this single-family dwelling has a front and a rear garden for amenity purposes. The latter is under a separate parallel application **2017/1227/L and 2017/0924/P** proposed to be enlarged by the removal of the existing rear outbuilding, thus allowing the area to be used as an increased rear garden space. The creation of a roof terrace is not required for amenity use and its purported limited use does not outweigh the loss of an historic distinctive roofscape, which by its unauthorized development has introduced harm to a unified roofscape of the terrace.

Cont/...

The proposed retention of the roof terrace would clearly not make a positive contribution to the CA, as it does not support the need to preserve local distinctiveness. Roof terraces apart from here breaking up an existing integral roofline run, introduce loss of amenity in use to neighbours. The building is surrounded by residential properties. People standing on this roof terrace are visible from the public realm above the low front parapet. Glass balustrading reflects sunlight, current metal railing is visible and discordant with the terrace roofline, the placing of terrace furniture, planting, trellising etc when freestanding may also be visible from the public realm and detrimentally would not be enforceable against. Invariably such roof terraces not only introduce visual harm during the day but also are discordant when lighting is used after dark. In use there often is loss of amenities to neighbours by way of noise and overlooking. With future occupancy use not controllable safeguarded against this is very difficult.

Reinstatement: The applications should be refused. The original roof form reinstated, with original roofing materials used, to drawings Pre-Existing HIRFT-E101 Front/Rear elevations and HIRFT-P105 roof plan. Any remaining exposed paint removed from party walls and missing chimney pots reinstated, in order to preserve the integrity and character of the roofscape of this group valued historic terrace.

Allowing the unauthorized alteration to remain would set a very harmful precedent in our CA and would, in my view, fail in ones duty of stewardship to preserve and enhance this CA.

Kind regards

A black rectangular box redacting the signature of Nori Howard.

Nori Howard

cc: Sarah Freeman Conservation officer