

Hazelton, Laura

From: paul@paul-o-architects.com
Sent: 01 July 2015 23:20
To: Hazelton, Laura
Subject: 17 Edis Street. Roof Extension . Planning 2015/2696/P
Attachments: PL-321 proposed section .pdf; PL-124 A proposed loft plan .pdf; PL-125 proposed roof plan .pdf; PL-220 A proposed rear elevation .pdf

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Completed

Dear Laura

Further to our email correspondence and telephone conversations please find attached our revised dwgs for the roof extension at 17 Edis Street. Please note as follows:

1. We have reduced the size of the dormer and centred it on the window below
2. The dormer sits 500mm below the ridge and 500mm from the neighbouring property.
3. We have retained the line of the butterfly roof to the same extent all nos 18 and 19 Edis road have been retained
Please note that all the houses adjacent to 17 Edis Street have lifted the line of the rain water hopper and Also have a pitch of greater of 70 degrees or a vertical section of tiled roof and then a pitch of 70 degrees. This
Is because without doing this there would not be enough head room in the staircase (please refer to the section) We have copied number 19 Edis street and have a vertical section of roof and then a 70 degree pitch.
4. We have not changed the line of the glazing at the front of the house as the room would simply not work if the glazing were brought back . The room would too small and unusable as a bedroom .
We contend as outline in our statement that:
 - a) The glazed windows set back from the elevation would not be detrimental to this particular part of the conservation area because there is i) no dominant pattern of dormer windows as one finds elsewhere in Primrose hill ii) other houses on the street have roof extensions with terraces and vertical glazed windows iii) The extension will be barely visible from the street.
5. In response objections received we note as follows:
 - a) In response to the Advice from Primrose Hill Conservation Area Advisory Committee.
 - i) The photo submitted by the Chair, Mr Richard Simpson, shows clearly that like most London Terrace houses none of the rear elevations of the Edis street houses are the same. Over time residents have added different roof extensions, dormers and skylights as well as extensions at Ground floor . The continually changing rear elevations with their adhoc creates a charming picturesque massing that reflect the wealth, taste and aspirations of the residents who have occupied the houses. This is we contend a fundamental and significant characteristic of the conversation area. The garden elevations are a contrast and counterpoint to the more rigid uniformity of the street elevations . It is a great shame that the Primrose Hill conservation area wants now preserve these houses in their current state preventing these houses from changing.
 - ii) In saying that we have as noted above reduced the size of the dormer (even though we contend that the oversized dormer at number 20 Edis street contributes the picturesque massing, looking like a large window of Artist studio that one might find on a Arts and Crafts house, and house opposite have terraces and vertical glazed sliders over looking the garden) and have retained the line and memory of the butterfly roof.
 - iii) The Letter from the Primrose Hill Conservation Area Advisory Committee notes that they would
“ Prefer to see the front elevation designed to follow the dominant forms of the front elevation, that is a pair of windows at roof extension level following the pattern of the original front elevation”

As we have noted in our design and access statement the dominant form of roof extension in this part of the conservation is not a double dormer as one see in Fitzroy road. There are no two roof extensions the same and majority, on both sides of the road, have terraces, some accessed via sliding doors and some by full height doors in deep dormers .

As Architects we are very aware of the need to preserve the rigid formality, repetition and uniformity of the front / street elevation below the line of the parapet . By setting the roof extension back front the line of the parapet the consistency of the front elevation is maintained and retained.

We therefore contend the proposed loft extension DOES follow the dominant forms of the front elevation.

We also draw your attention to:

- policy PH19 in the conversation area statement which sets out properties not suitable for roof top extensions. Number 17 is not on this list.

- Policy DP25 seeks to preserve and enhance the character and appearance of the conservation area.

To do so the character of this particular part of the Conservation area needs to be assessed. The conservation area statement states that where a roof extension is acceptable the type of extension likely to be acceptable depends on the existing roof form and predominant form of extensions within the a building group.

Regards

Paul Acland |for Paul+O Architects Ltd.

Unit 8, 73 Maygrove Road, London NW6 2EG | 020 7604 3818 | 07753 982 715 mob. | www.paul-o-architects.com