

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

2 September 2015

48 Regent's Park Road 2015/4619/P

Strong objection.

1. We welcome the Planning Inspector's dismissal in April this year of the appeal on the previous application, 2014/4714/P, APP/X5210/W/15/3008862. We note that our advice in 2014 was consistent with the Council's refusal and the Inspector's decision.
2. Our advice on this application 2015/4619/P is also consistent with the Inspector's decision. We do not set out the policy relevant as that is clearly provided in the Inspector's decision letter. We do, however, draw attention to key parts of his letter relevant to the present application.
3. Our fundamental objection remains to the addition of a roof extension which would: (1) change the shape and form of roofs in this location (contrary to *Primrose Hill CA Statement* PH18 19), and (2) would harm the gaps between the buildings 48 and 50 Regent's Park Road.
4. In addition to the Inspector's finding on gaps (his para 6) we note that since the Council's decision on the 2014 application, Camden's *Policy Guidance 1 Design* has been adopted, and this reinforces the policy over such gaps between buildings, at 4.17, where the following is specially relevant:

The infilling of gaps will not be considered acceptable where: ...
the architectural symmetry or integrity of a composition is impaired;
5. The gap between 48 and 50 Regent's Park Road is now a rare example of the survival of this original form. Most were compromised in the years before the designation of the conservation area in 1971. It was precisely this type of harm which designation was to stop: they are not a valid precedent.
6. We note that the Inspector states at his para 7 'It is unarguable that the proposed development fails to meet the overwhelming majority of the provisions of the policies set out above.' The same is obviously true of the current proposal, which is, if anything more damaging by being even higher and more obtrusive, thus more harmful to the surviving integrity of the gap and composition of which the open gap is a key part.
7. The Inspector's comments on visibility explained that the 2014 proposal would be visible and prominent. This is even more true of the higher proposal now.
8. Because the appeal was a householder appeal we were unable to submit further evidence in support of our advice that the gap was especially visible because of longer views from Albert Terrace Mews. We attach photos to this advice which show that the new proposal would be seriously harmful in these views from the public realm.
9. Our photos 2 and 3 was taken from within the public right of way in Prince Albert Mews, and shows that the rear wall of no. 48 would be clearly visible. We have sketched in a block suggesting the visibility of the proposed addition: it would clearly also have a side elevation which would be visible, and because of its steeply sloping roof, intrusive and seriously harmful.

10. This view reinforce the Inspector's main grounds for dismissal of the appeal and support for the refusal of the current, more harmful proposal.

11. The use of more traditional materials, and the diminution of light pollution does not significantly mitigate the harm caused by the addition of an alien mass in this location.

12. If the harm is judged less than substantial, we note that the Inspector's finding that there is no countervailing public benefit also stands in the current application.

Please contact me if any of our advice is unclear, or further advice would be helpful.



Richard Simpson FSA
Chair

A note on visibility.

The applicant's projection (drawing 111 rev A) suggests that the rear wall of the main house would not be visible from the public street above the existing parapet, and that the new build below that line would not be visible from Regent's Park Road. This is shown here not to be wholly correct in all views from the Regent's Park Road footway opposite.



Photo 1

In the view from Albert Mews, also publicly accessible, it is even less true. The proposed extension would be visible and clearly harm the perception of the gap which is a surviving feature of the architectural composition at this point.



Photo 2

View from public right of way in Albert Terrace Mews – flank wall of 48 suggests visibility of proposed addition.



Photo 3

estimate of intrusion excluding side elevation of extension