

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2017/4274/P	Elisabeth Harris	1 Torriano Cottages Nw5 2ta	06/09/2017 10:44:13	COMMEM PER	<p>I object to this application. The provision of a roof terrace will cause noise nuisance when it is used, and it overlooks neighbours. The property is visible from my house. The full height brick rear extension looks large and unsightly. A mansard type roof would be preferable if any permission is given.</p> <p>This property abuts a conservation area and bit by bit the general and unique look of the area is being degraded by oversized development.</p> <p>As a final point, please would you ensure that any planning permission which is granted requires all building and preparatory work to be carried out from Torriano Avenue. Torriano Cottages is a private road.</p>
2017/4274/P	Ann Sedley	3 Torriano Cottages NW52TA	06/09/2017 17:52:12	COMMEM PER	<p>I live in Torriano Cottages, facing the junction with Torriano Avenue and looking into the rear of 61 Torriano Avenue.</p> <p>My main concern is that Torriano Cottages might be used for access to the rear of 61 Torriano Avenues where there is a passage and a gate through to the Cottages. This end of the Cottages is narrow, has no pavements and there is no room for vehicles to pass. I am worried that it might get blocked if used for construction access. I am also concerned that the proposed roof terrace overlooks numbers 31-33 Torriano Cottages and that the proposed additional storey would dominate Torriano Cottage residents on that side.</p> <p>69 Torriano Avenue is currently undergoing similar work with access from Torriano Avenue. I would ask the Council to attach a condition to any consent given for these works requiring a Constructon Management Plan is submitted confirming that constructon access will only be via Torriano Avenue and not via Torriano Cottages. Thank you.</p>

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2017/4274/P	Gavin Henderson	32 Torriano Cottages London NW52TA	04/09/2017 12:49:02	OBJ	<p>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.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>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.</p>

Application No: **Consultees Name:** **Consultees Addr:** **Received:** **Comment:** **Response:**

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 rear 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 rear extension and would, therefore, project beyond the line of the adjacent buildings up to the proposed three storey height.

To create a reasonable massing, and reduce visual dominance, the rear façade of the proposed extension, above the existing rear extension, 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 steps back above lower ground floor level to reduce its massing at high 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

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2017/4274/P	Janet and Giles Taylor	7 Torriano Cottages London NW5 2TA	08/09/2017 15:42:51	COMMNT	Avenue and that no access will be made via Torriano Cottages. This development appears to be yet another intrusion on the privacy of the residents in Torriano Cottages. We would like to see a restriction on any access to the site at the property into Torriano Cottages. This is a very narrow unmade up road which is maintained by the residents. It provides the only access to the houses at that end of the Cottages for emergency vehicles and it is therefore imperative that the road is not blocked in any way. Other properties have been developed in Torriano Avenue without recourse to using Torriano Cottages and we would like to request that if this construction goes ahead it should have a no access to Torriano Cottages clause applied to the work.
2017/4274/P	Ms Torriano Cottages Association	5 Torriano Cottages London NW5 2TA	04/09/2017 10:21:11	COMMNT	The Torriano Cottages Association (TCA), which represents residents of the street, requests that any consent for works at this property include a condition requiring that all construction access to the site be from Torriano Avenue and not from Torriano Cottages. Torriano Cottages is a narrow unadopted road without pavements, maintained by the TCA on behalf of and at the expense of residents. It is used frequently by pedestrians including children from Torriano Primary School. Any use of the road by large delivery or construction vehicles creates obstruction to residents' cars and dangers for pedestrians. The TCA considers that permitting the use of the pedestrian gate from the rear of 59 and 61 Torriano Avenue onto Torriano Cottages for construction access to no 61 would be detrimental to residents. It would create noise and debris as well as preventing residents and their visitors from using the road. Access to nos 32 and 33 Torriano Cottages, and their garages would also be directly obstructed. We believe construction access to no 61 should be from Torriano Avenue, as it is for other properties in the same terrace. Mary Goyder, Chair, TCA