



APPLICATION 2021/6186/P

106 TORRIANO AVENUE, NW5

OBJECTION – But compromise possible.

#### CONTEXT

No.106 Torriano Avenue is part of a distinctive terrace of six houses with their roof line comprising three shared roof pediments. Apart from being viewed from Torriano Avenue - which is a wide road - the rear of the terrace is also clearly viewed from Charlton Kings Road.

#### THE UNACCEPTABILITY OF THE EXISTING ROOF EXTENSION

The Savills document submitted with the planning application clearly states that the existing modern roof extension to 106 does NOT positively contribute to the to the character of the site or the area.

It is further states “the roof extension has NOT been built in accordance with the approved plans “. “What has been built is a complete infill significantly increasing the scale and bulk to the roof”. “the existing roof extension represents a harmful addition the property. Adding more bulk and massing to the roof which can be seen from Charlton Kings Road to the rear is NOT appropriate for this location and would be considered harmful to the character of the building. It would also be considered harmful to the character and appearance of the street scene as the roof extension would be prominent from longer views from the street”.

“The local designated list also specifically mentions the well preserved nature of the site and neighbouring properties. Adding additional bulk would cause HARM to the character of the property and, as the property is a non-designated heritage asset any harm would need to be balanced against public benefit. As this is a residential property there is no public benefit from this addition.” “The extension to the existing building adds additional bulk to the roof form that is considered unsympathetic and prominent within the roof and would be considered unacceptable”

#### DEMOLITION

Clearly, given all the above official criticism of the roof extension, the only practical solution is demolition. However, as the Savills’ document indicates, the roof extension has become immune from enforcement as it was constructed in 2006 – even though it was unauthorised.

#### THE SOLUTION

The present application seeks permission for a new extension at first floor level. The solution to the unauthorised and harmful roof extension would be to ALLOW the first floor extension on CONDITION that an identical volume was removed from the roof extension. The reduction of the roof extension should take place by setting both the east and west facades further back from the facades of the main building. The permission should make it legally clear that the reduction of volume of the roof extension should be completed before construction commences on the first floor extension.

[REDACTED]