

**Conservation Area Advisory Committee**

Advisory Committee                      Dartmouth Park

Application ref                              2021/3530/P

Address                                        10 Chetwynd Road London NW5 1BY

Planning Officer                            Miriam Baptist

Comments by                                 14 Nov 2021

Proposal                                      Rear infill extension at ground floor, rear roof dormer, three rear rooflights and one rooflight to the front.

Cooke Fawcett Architects  
Responses to objection  
17.11.2021

Objection                                      Yes

Comment                                      Yes

Observations                                DPCAAC objects to the insertion of a dormer into the roof of this attractive two storied house, part of a terrace of similar houses, nos 4-26, which all have an intact and characteristic roof form with distinctive gable to the front. It backs onto Nos 1-23 Twisden Road, a row of identical cottage style houses with a similarly intact roofline. Nos 2 - 64 Chetwynd Road is listed in DPCAAMS as buildings making a positive contribution.

1. It is understood that the DPCAAC's position is to object to any changes as a matter principle, regardless of the proposals. This is a copy-paste introduction from the objection to no. 23 Twisden Rd.

3. There is no visibility to the rear roof from Hampstead & Highgate to North & NW. This appears to be a copy-paste error from their objection to 23 Twisden Rd.

2. Crucially, this run of houses is NOT listed in DPCAAMS as being "significant due to unbroken roofline". Front elevations are the reason for incusion as positive contribution in DPCAAMS.

5. Sadly not, after much studying of options for stairs this is the minimum size to enable safe access to a top floor, even when lowered to need fewer steps

4. As shown in the DAS (p.10-11), the proposal is mostly not visible from the street. It could be visible only from one specific location - extremely limited due to raised party wall, and only when trees not in leaf, and does not affect roofline or sillouhette

6. Not correct, precedents also relate to the smaller type on Twisden Rd and generally observe an acceptance of the principle of allowing small dormers in order to provide safe stair access only

8. Client is happy to omit front rooflight from proposals

9. Rear extension complies with all guidance for side-return extensions, and is identical to consented rear extensions at no. 16 & 18. Objection is confusingly written (e.g. is not on front elevation?)

**Due to the Dartmouth Park topography its roofscape is looked down on by properties from the rising slope up to the Hampstead and Highgate Ridge and can also be seen from the western leg of Twisden Road when trees are not in leaf (note also trees are not permanent).** Although a small dormer, it would nevertheless set a damaging precedent in this attractive terrace. **Access to the loft space for storage or study could surely be achieved by other means. Examples of dormers given in the applicants Design & Access Statement are irrelevant as they refer to different three storey style of houses and not the distinctive cottage style of this terrace. Crucially a dormer was recently refused in 13/10/2021 to an identical house at no 23 Twisden Road, directly backing onto the Chetwynd Road terrace.** The front rooflight example noted by the applicant at no 18 Chetwynd Road was unauthorised and should not set a precedent

The rear extension fails to comply with CPG Home Improvements 2.1.2 - side extensions should:  
- be set back from main front elevation.

7. Note this dormer is hugely much smaller than the 23 Twisden proposal, so this is not a relevant example. Far more relevant is the consent at no. 41 Twisden Rd (also larger than proposed here), which dealt with similar issues of visibility and a dormer in an unbroken run of houses

Conservation Area Advisory Committee

10. I would instead argue that the proposals comply with Camden Local Plan 2017 policy D1 points (a)-(f), (m), (n) - esp. if omit the front rooflight.

Also that it does preserve character of conservation area, as D2 (e).

11. Please note also (as DAS p.3, 8-9) that the proposals would comply with:

- Dartmouth Park Neighbourhood Plan DC3 (e), DC4 (f), plus align to justifications for these policies (small extensions as way for residents to afford to stay in the area)

- Camden Planning Guidance - HOME IMPROVEMENTS part 2.2 ("not every unbroken roofline has value; these are identified in local CA plan"); 2.2.1 (e.g. Dormers should be subordinate in size to the roof; Innovative approaches are encouraged; materials complementary to house)

No details entered

- respect and duly consider the amenity of adjacent properties with regard to light pollution/spillage and privacy. Also see DPCAAMS "Roof alterations and extensions" p.55.

The proposal fails to comply with Camden Local Plan policies D1 and D2. The dormer would have a harmful visual impact on the integrity of the roofline of this terrace, detracting from the form, style and character of the building. It fails either to preserve or enhance the character and appearance of the DPCA.

12. No impact on the roofline of the terrace, as demonstrated in DAS (seems to be a copy-paste from no. 23?). Disagree about harmful impact on the form/ style/ character of the house. Character of CA would be preserved.

About this form

Issued by Contact Camden  
5 Pancras Square  
London N1C 4AG

Form reference 21725096

Data Protection

No personal information you have given us will be passed on to third parties for commercial purposes. The Council's policy is that all information will be shared among officers and other agencies where the legal framework allows it, if this will help to improve the service you receive and to develop other services. If you do not wish certain information about you to be exchanged within the Council, you can request that this does not happen.