

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2022/2543/P	Robin Imray	10/08/2022 13:44:05	OBJ	<p>There was correspondence earlier this year between myself (and other neighbours) and Camden Planning /Planning Enforcement about building activity at 20 Churchill Rd, where unauthorised (and therefore presumably illegal) work to flatten the valley roof started in February.</p> <p>This was, I believe, ordered to be stopped in April, and nothing has happened since, though it seems that the main structural elements necessary for flattening are already in place.</p> <p>The applicant now seeks retrospective approval to continue.</p> <p>Camden has previously refused permission (2011/5064/P) to alter the roof at this address (in that case by adding a mansard extension) for the following reason:</p> <p>The proposed roof extension, by reason of its scale, location and detailed design, would be detrimental to the character and appearance of the host building, the wider terrace, and the Dartmouth Park Conservation Area, contrary to policy CS14 (Promoting high quality places and conserving our heritage) of the London Borough of Camden Local Development Framework Core Strategy; and to policies DP24 (Securing high quality design) and DP25.</p> <p>The adjacent property (no 18) had some years earlier had an application (2004/3679/P) for a mansard addition turned down on appeal:</p> <p>The proposed roof extension would have an adverse effect on the character and appearance of the building and the Dartmouth Park Conservation Area due to the introduction of a mansard roof extension in a group of buildings with a roof line that its largely unimpaired by extensions, contrary to EN24 [Roof alterations and extensions] and EN31 [Character and appearance of Conservation Areas] of the London Borough of Camden Unitary Development Plan 2000.</p> <p>And applications for mansards in neighbouring Spencer Rise have also been rejected on the grounds of breaking runs of valley roofs, leading to the loss of a characteristic architectural feature in this conservation area. [Incongruously, for some reason, a small number of applications for mansard extensions have been granted, leading already to the loss of consistency in the terraces.]</p> <p>As I have written before to the planning department (21.2.2022):</p> <p>... even flattening would be as detrimental to the line of rooftops as the refused mansards would have been, and in terms of precedent, if one valley goes, all of them could.</p> <p>I believe therefore that to be consistent with the planning policies and guidelines referred to in the above cases, not only should permission to flatten the roof be refused, but the owner of 20 Churchill Rd should be required to remove the unauthorised elements and restore the roof to its prior valley state.</p>