

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2016/1987/P	Pam White for Primrose Hill CAAC	45 Princess Road London NW1 8JS	23/06/2016 18:23:06	OBJ	<p>ADVICE from Primrose Hill Conservation Area Advisory Committee 45 Princess Road London NW1 8JS</p> <p>15 June 2016</p> <p>14 Manley Street NW1 8LT. 2016/1987/P</p> <p>Strong objections.</p> <p>1.0 Harm to the conservation area:</p> <p>1.1 The houses in the terrace are recognized as positive contributors to the character and appearance of the conservation area. They are exceptional in the area as a rare survival of houses built for workers – in this case for railway workers in response to the development of the railways adjoining the area in the 1860s. Their small scale and plain brickwork – lack of stucco – express their original purpose, as do the original back additions which provided service space, like kitchens and wash-houses. The even smaller scale, lower height, and simple form of the back additions are a key component in the original character of the houses. In the case of nos 12 and 14 the back-additions form a pair, with the original roof slopes to both sides of the rear yard surviving: only two of these pairs now survive. The back additions consist of one lower-ground-floor storey and one ground-floor storey, this last with its rooms in part of the roof space: these small scale volumes are important survivals, witnessing to the history of the area, as well as contributing to its character. (Primrose Hill conservation area statement pp. 25, 16)</p> <p>1.2 The current (revised) proposal would destroy the roof slope, and so destroy this surviving historic balance of forms and substantially harm the scale of the rear additions. This would do substantial harm to the character of this part of the conservation area.</p> <p>1.3 We note that the existing raised roof terraces in Manley Street were all created either before the designation of the conservation area, or before current policies were in place and therefore do not provide a valid precedent for the present application.</p> <p>1.4 We also note that the application before revision showed a roof terrace set back within the roof slope, showing that it might be possible to provide a roof terrace which retained critical heights and slopes of the surviving roof: this would retain matching eaves heights, for example, between 12 and 14 Manley Street. We note that we welcome the removal of the glass box at roof level from the previous application.</p> <p>1.5 We note that policy guidance in Primrose Hill conservation area statement at PH18 states that ‘Roof extensions and alterations (our emphasis), which change the shape and form of the roof can have a harmful effect on the Conservation area and are unlikely to be acceptable where: it would be detrimental to the form and character of the existing building.’ This is clearly the case here.</p> <p>1.6 We also note that the raising of the parapet to no. 14 in solid brickwork would have a harmful effect</p>

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
					<p>on the sense of enclosure of the tightly constrained rear yards, which are the only amenity space for two residential units. We note that the application property already has a roof terrace at the main roof level.</p> <p>2.0 Daylight and sunlight:</p> <p>2.1 We are very concerned that no daylight and sunlight study has been provided as part of the application. It is very clear that the raising of the parapet to no. 14 in solid brickwork would have a significantly harmful effect on the daylight and sunlight in habitable rooms (including the only bedroom) in 12A Manley Street.</p> <p>2.2 We are also concerned that any screening to protect from overlooking (see point 3) would further worsen the impact on daylight and sunlight to habitable rooms in adjoining properties.</p> <p>3.0 Overlooking</p> <p>3.1 The proposed roof terrace would overlook three neighbouring residential units, nos 12, 12A, and 16 Manley Street. The roof terrace would give direct views into the habitable rooms of these three properties, harming amenity and quality of life for three households.</p> <p>3.2 Again, we note that any screening to protect from overlooking would further worsen the impact on daylight and sunlight to habitable rooms in adjoining properties.</p> <p>Pam White Vice-chair PHCAAC</p>
