

**ADVICE from Primrose Hill Conservation Area Advisory Committee**  
12A Manley Street, London NW1 8LT

4 June 2015

54 Regent's Park Road NW1 7SX 2015/2786/P

Strong objection.

It seems necessary to remind Camden that the Council has a statutory duty to seek to preserve or enhance the character and appearance of conservation areas, and that the means of achieving this is set out in formally agreed policy.

The proposed rear addition would raise this element of the building to eaves level. This would be directly contrary to Camden's most recently approved planning policy guidance, *CPG 1* dated 2014, which implements the NPPF and Camden's LDF. *CPG 1* at 4.10 specifies that 'Rear extensions should be designed to: (1) be secondary to the building being extended, in terms of location, form, scale, proportions, dimensions and detailing; (2) respect and preserve the original design and proportions of the building, including its architectural period and style; (3) respect and preserve existing architectural features, such as projecting bays, decorative balconies or chimney stacks; (4) respect and preserve the historic pattern and established townscape of the surrounding area, ...' (our numbers added).

We advise that the surviving stair enclosure in its form and height expresses the provision of a major, formal, stair to the main floors of the building. The upper floor was accessed by a different stair, so the height of the stair enclosure itself expresses the hierarchy of levels (main levels and service levels) within the original house. The proposal would destroy this distinctive character, and so harm the character and appearance of the conservation area contrary to the specific points in *CPG 1*, that is, it would not respect or preserve the original design and proportions of the building (2), it would not respect or preserve existing architectural features (3), and it would not respect or preserve the historic pattern of the surrounding area (4).

*CPG 1* at 4.13 specifically states 'In most cases, extensions that are higher than one full storey below roof eaves/parapet level, or that rise above the general height of neighbouring projections and nearby extensions, will be strongly discouraged.' The proposal is to build to eaves level, so against this clear statement. In doing so, it harms the balance of the rear elevation and the distinctive character of the roof. It also goes above the general height of neighbouring additions. This would set a dangerous precedent in terms of harm to the character and appearance of the conservation area.

The basement: the further excavation of the basement exacerbates the already crude and disproportionate nature of the design of the approved back addition at lower ground floor level. This disproportion is clear from a comparison of the glazed area at lower ground level at no. 52 and that proposed at no. 54. It is clearly contrary to Camden's approved policies as set out in our advice above.

The application proposals would be harmful to the character and appearance of the conservation area: they would fail to preserve or enhance its character and appearance.



Richard Simpson FSA  
Chair