


Printed on: 08/06/2020 09:10:07

| Application No: | Consultee Name:   | Received:           | Comment: | Response:  |
|-----------------|---|---------------------|----------|--|
| 2020/1594/P     |  | 05/06/2020 13:12:26 | OBJ      | We object most strongly to this second application as we consider it to be totally out of keeping with the conservation area and in breach of the council's guidelines, in particular the need to preserve existing architectural features. These new plans would destroy the symmetry of the houses No. 1 & 2, and the original bay windows and attractive porch. The proposed extension is planned using out of character materials and would be clearly visible from the Torriano Avenue entrance and along the Cottages. We believe these plans to be detrimental to the neighboring houses and do not in any way enhance the environment of Torriano Cottages.  |
| 2020/1594/P     |   | 03/06/2020 15:28:20 | OBJ      | <p>This further planning application, while less objectionable than the first, still contains proposals which we believe to be out of keeping with the conservation area and in breach of the council's guidelines. The application repeats the erroneous assertion that the front bay window and porch are additions to the pair of houses 1 and 2 Torriano Cottages. They were original features and show on the late nineteenth century ordinance survey map of Kentish Town.</p> <p>The application wrongly states that the proposed rear extension would not be visible from the roadway. It will be highly visible. The first photograph on the 'design and access' statement although rather dark, shows how the side of the house is visible from the roadway.</p> <p>We think that the proposed rear extension does not comply with articles 3.1 at e)g)and h)of the council's Planning Guidance in that it does not respect and preserve the historic pattern and established townscape of the surrounding area and it removes a considerable proportion of an already small garden, and closes off part of an open view.</p> <p>It also breaches article 3.4 in relation to the width of the extension in that it is wider than the main bulk of the house, is visible from the street and does not respect the rhythm of existing rear extensions in neighbouring gardens. The application speaks of a 'bay window' which is to protrude to the width of the porch. It does not appear to be a bay window - it is a sizeable proportion of the whole room, and is incorporated in the roof structure. The current view of a small sloping rendered wall will be replaced with a tall protruding structure made of glass and metal.</p> <p>We are concerned that the roof structure although less tall and bulky than the previous proposal is wholly out of keeping with the rhythm of the houses, and will dominate our back garden and view from the back of our house. We particularly dislike the roof light turret. It is hard to visualise the full extent of the changes as the drawings don't have measurements. We would welcome clarification.</p> <p>The extension would be wider than the existing house. Previous applications for rear extensions to 1 and 2 Torriano Cottages were granted only insofar as the extensions were set in from and narrower than the side of the houses as we were told that an extension which was the full width of the house would not be granted.</p> <p>We think the proposal represents an overdevelopment of the garden area in proportion to plot ratio. We do not accept that the proposed extension could be said to enhance the built environment of Torriano Cottages which is a conservation area.</p> <p>We make no comments on the application to add two roof lights to the main roof of the building</p> |