

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2020/4939/P	Nicholas Bradfield DPCAACC	09/01/2021 13:42:29	OBJ	<p>DPCAAC objection to 2020/4939/P 58 Twisden Road London NW5</p> <p>Allowing a modified dormer would set a highly detrimental precedent for this well preserved roofscape and its wider townscape context in this part of the DPCA. It would neither preserve nor enhance the integrity of the mainly intact roofscape character of this terrace of small houses and the heritage value of this part of our conservation area. It is vital to note that these uniform, Victorian cottage properties with an intact original roof profile extend over a wider area; in Twisden Road nos 1-23, also of same design backing these in Chetwynd Road nos 4-26 and in Twisden Road nos 16-62 bar two pre-CA full width dormers, no 52 and no 60, and a very small single at no 46. All applications and appeals for dormers within these properties have been refused since DPCA was established in 1992. The 1995 Appeal for no 62 (allowed, not built) APP/X5210/A/95/250749/P2 clearly sets out the unique situation at that property and refers in point 8, to the retention of Council general policies on roof extensions in the CA.</p> <p>This new application differs from the previous application 2019/2274/P which was refused by Camden (and dismissed on appeal) in merely showing a reduced sized dormer with traditional sash windows. Council guidance shown to have been obtained by the architect since, illustrates a standard non contextual design approach to a host building where there is adequate roof pitch suitable for a loft conversion. The roof spaces for these buildings fall well below the ability to create habitable space. Thus, the applicant justifies ignoring this standard dormer reference which specifies a 500mm drop below the ridge, by proposing to raise the dormer roof to the ridge in an attempt to comply with internal height requirements. The dormer would not retain the overall visual structure of the roof form, see drawing section no A/02/501/A.</p> <p>The rear elevational material submitted, shows a section of this terrace which includes two pre-CA dormers and some single dormers, the latter relate to a different style of property. The important open wide setting of the terrace to the York Rise estate, as acknowledged in the Inspector's appeal dismissal as highly visible, is not indicated. This setting is also raised in DPCAAMS sub-area 4 where the backs of these small two storey terraced houses are fully exposed. Due to the DPCA topography this. allows many local views of the roofscape. it is not only what one looks at but what one looks down onto as roofscape where the proposed dormer would only add discord.</p> <p>Some residents have introduced rooflights to the rear roofslope, thereby retaining its profile. The insertion of three rooflights to the front would not be significantly subordinate both in size and number to the roofslope. This would not only differ from the one or two small rooflights inserted in the front of some of this style of property but would also introduce an undesirable feature when lit after dark. Any rooflights should flush and conservation type. It is clear that the roofscape of these exceptionally well-preserved house types should remain intact and this is for example, underlined by the reasons given for refusal of 2005/0101/P at no 40 Twisden Road for rear dormers and three rooflights to the front roofslope and appeals.</p> <p>The private benefit required by the applicants growing family does not outweigh the public benefit in this instance and should not be part of the planning consideration as referred to in point 13 of the recent appeal no APP/X5210/D/20/3247346. Design policy and guidance in the CLP, the DPNP, the DPCAAMS, the CPG Design and the emerging CPG Home improvements should be upheld, and this application refused.</p> <p>(Note: no public notice is displayed at the rear of property, nor was there an entry for this application in the Council's weekly planning list.)</p>