

Ben Farrant  
Planning Solutions Team  
London Borough of Camden  
2nd Floor, 5 Pancras Square  
c/o Town Hall, Judd Street  
London  
WC1H 9JE

3<sup>rd</sup> Sept 2017

**RE: PLANNING APPLICATION 2017/4274/P**

Dear Ben,

I am writing to object to the above application our reasons for objecting are all the same as the objection that our neighbour at 32 Torriano Cottages has already made – copy of which is enclosed.

We will in particular be impacted by overlooking of the proposed roof terrace and double doors that are at a considerable height. This will look straight into our master bedroom which is at the back of our property, and also into our garden and the conservatory/dining room and kitchen at the back of our property.

Yours sincerely,



Robin Owens

31 TORRIANO COTTAGES  
KENTISH TOWN  
LONDON  
NW5 2TA

The proposal eliminates the definition of the roof as a separate storey, undermining the character and proportions of the original property. This approach creates an overbearing presence towards the homes on Torriano Cottages in terms of bulk and design: an approach already visible in the cliff-like character of the extended rear elevations of 65-67 Torriano Avenue which, if replicated, would transform the character of the terrace as a whole. This proposal is not in accordance with CPG1 5.19 which states that for valley or butterfly roofs the parapet should be retained in order to maintain the character of the original building.

In order to create an acceptable massing and impact on the existing building, the parapet should be retained on the rear elevation and any roof extension – if agreed – be consistent with the mansard form adopted on the front elevation.

#### **Scale and Visual Prominence: Projection of Rear Extension from the Rear Wall of 61 Torriano Avenue**

The footprint of the existing single storey extension to 61 Torriano Avenue extends well beyond the adjacent three storey extension on 63 Torriano Avenue. The proposed extension appears to maintain the footprint of the existing single storey building and would, therefore, project beyond the line of the adjacent buildings.

To create a reasonable massing, and reduce visual dominance, the rear façade of the proposed extension above lower ground floor level should not project further than the contiguous rear extension to 63 Torriano Avenue: this would reflect a similar configuration of 59 Torriano Avenue where the rear extension also steps back above lower ground floor level.

#### **Construction Access**

The application property has its access and address on Torriano Avenue. However, it also abuts at its rear a passage and gate into Torriano Cottages.

Torriano Cottages is an un-adopted road which is a narrow, mews type street without pavements or room for vehicles to pass. The street is managed by the Torriano Cottages Association. The scale and character of Torriano Cottages makes it unsuitable for construction access which is, therefore, highly disruptive (when essential for the properties on Torriano Cottages itself, access requires careful management and coordination). The gate to the rear of 61 Torriano Avenue is also immediately adjacent to entrances into 32 and 33 Torriano Cottages and two garages, all of which require unobstructed access: use of this gate for construction access would have a particularly high impact on residents of these properties.

Properties on Torriano Avenue – including number 69 which is currently undergoing similar works – gain construction access from Torriano Avenue. We are requesting that a condition should be attached to any consent given for these works requiring that a Construction Management Plan is submitted which confirms that construction access will be via Torriano Avenue and that no access will be made via Torriano Cottages.

As neighbours, living in the home directly behind 61 Torriano Avenue, we are writing to object to the current application. We are not objecting to development in principle, but to several key aspects of the current scheme.

Some features of the application resemble alterations at roof level, and the provision of external roof terraces, which have in the past been carried out to other near-by properties. These alterations are, however, in some cases highly unsympathetic to the character of the original building, or have had significant impact on the amenity of neighbouring properties. Previous examples of harmful development should not justify the repetition of similar features regarding the provision of a roof terrace and treatment of the roof extension at 61 Torriano Avenue.

**Impact on Residential Amenity: Creation of a Second Floor Roof Terrace**

The proposal creates a large (approx. 4m x 2.75m) roof terrace at second floor level with perimeter railings which provide no screening for noise or privacy. Planning Guidance CPG1 5.23 suggests that roof terraces can provide useful amenity space where this is not available elsewhere for property, although highlighting that they also can create problems in terms of privacy and noise. 61 Torriano Avenue benefits from a large garden and, consequently, does not have a requirement for amenity space, but the proposal does impact on neighbours in terms of noise and privacy.

Roof terraces of the scale proposed are more than simple balconies and can accommodate groups of people who, because of the elevated location, create highly intrusive noise for neighbouring properties: this is a significant existing problem with other similarly scaled terraces in the neighbourhood and we are very concerned about the prospect of an increased impact in terms of noise on ourselves and neighbours and the effect this will have on residential amenity.

Planning Guidance CPG6 notes that to protect privacy “roof terraces should be carefully designed to avoid overlooking” and adds that the most sensitive areas to overlooking include “the part of the [neighbour’s] garden nearest the house.” The proposed roof terrace is only 10m away from the garden of 32 Torriano Cottages, a small patio immediately adjacent to the house, and looks down into it from a height of three storeys. Whilst views are currently partly obscured by a tree, this does not provide permanent protection of privacy throughout the year, or in the longer term.

We are objecting in principle to the creation of a roof terrace at second floor level due to the impact on residential amenity of noise and overlooking.

**Scale and Visual Prominence: Replacement of Parapet on Rear Elevation with Full Storey Height Brick Façade**

The property is in the middle of a sequence of three retaining their original butterfly roof valley gutter configuration with a parapet at front and rear. The proposal maintains the parapet at the front of the property, with the addition of a mansard roof, but creates a full additional brick storey at the rear.