

The Conservation Area Statement seeks to protect the character of Rochester Place buildings 'of low mews type ... generally between one and two storeys high'. The Conservation Area Statement says:

ROCHESTER PLACE

The street opens in a gentle curve off Rochester Road and lies south of Rochester Terrace rear gardens. Rochester Place is characterised by low mews type buildings, originally built from the 1870s to serve the properties in Rochester Terrace. The street provides an interesting contrast to the wide roads and villa style properties that dominate the Conservation Area. The narrow street is paved in rectangular granite sets and is characterised by small-scale intimate development, containing a mix of light industrial and residential uses. Early development of Rochester Place began after 1870, limited to a few properties. Later sporadic development began after 1932 and has continued until the present day. The street therefore encompasses a wide range of architectural styles, dating from 1870-1990. In common with traditional Mews development, the earliest buildings in Rochester Place have a limited number of architectural elements and detail and are generally uniform in plot width and in construction. All buildings spring from the narrow footway without physical front boundaries and vary in scale, but generally, are between one and two storeys high. Typical architectural features of the Mews style properties include: coachhouse style front doors with



window base panel in matching timber board construction (Nos. 54, 60, 62 & 64); box windows with gauged arch heads and stone cills (Nos. 54, 62, 66); shallow pitch slate or tile clad roofs (Nos. 52, 54, 60, 62) and timber gates on upper floor levels (Nos. 64). Originally, No. 66 would also have had timber gates; however, alterations to this building have since taken place. Nos.42 & 44 Rochester

And 'features which detract':

Rochester Place: The rear extension of No.4 Wilmot Place faces Rochester Place and has a large mansard roof, which is out of character with the style of buildings in the street.

And on p. 21-22:

There has been a gradual erosion of many elements that contribute to the character and appearance of the Conservation Area, especially to residential properties ... including ... alteration and addition to roofs and parapet walls

LB Camden's advice CPG1 states:

3.7 We will only permit development within conservation areas, and development affecting the setting of conservation areas, that preserves and enhances the character and appearance of the area

5.7 Additional storeys and roof alterations are likely to be acceptable if ... there is an established form of roof addition or alteration to a terrace or group of similar buildings and where continuing the pattern of development would help to reunite a group of buildings and townscape; [or] There are [is] a variety of additions

or alterations to roofs which create an established pattern and where further development of a similar form would not cause additional harm.

5.8 Unacceptable ...

[or] buildings already higher than neighbouring properties where an additional storey would add significantly to the bulk or unbalance the architectural composition;
[or] buildings are part of a group where differing heights add visual interest and where a roof extension would detract from this variety of form

This proposal will detract from the character of the area because it will grossly change the established roof line, detract from the current visual contrast in heights raise height excessively – to block views of, and compete with, the surrounding villa houses, rather than subservient to them;

The raised height of No 40 in recent years was within the existing roof height.

The proposal claims 'highest roof level' for Rochester Place, but this is the height of the (1840s) building 5 Wilmot Place, not of the mews.



The proposal is not a 'roof', but a new storey and **increase in height of 50%**

