
Conservation Area Advisory Committee

Advisory Committee	Primrose Hill
Application ref	2016/3597/P
Address	1 Fitzroy Road London NW1 8TU
Planning Officer	Nora-Andreea.Constantinescu
Comments by	17 Aug 2016
Proposal	Amalgamation of two residential units (Class C3), demolition and replacement of existing side extension with a new side/rear extension, extension of lower ground floor and provision of a basement level with rear lightwell and associated alterations and landscaping. (Amended Description)
Objection	Yes
Observations	<p>ADVICE from Primrose Hill Conservation Area Advisory Committee</p> <p>12A Manley Street, London NW1 8LT</p> <p>20 July 2016</p> <p>1 Fitzroy Road NW1 8TU2016/3597/P</p> <p>Objection.</p> <p>1. We have been pleased to undertake pre-application discussions of these proposals. These consisted of a site meeting of the PHCAAC chair with the applicant and his architect (21 April), a review of the scheme following that meeting by the PHCAAC (4 May), followed by a further review of the architect's response to our advice. We then reviewed the scheme as submitted at our meeting on 20 July 2016.</p> <p>2. We acknowledge the sophistication of the architectural approach, but advise that the bulk and mass of the proposed additions at the side and rear of the building are harmful to the significance of the building and to the character and appearance of the conservation area which</p>

Conservation Area Advisory Committee

these aspects of the scheme do not preserve or enhance.
We regret that we were not able to reach an agreed scheme.

3. The Committee noted that the building is recognized as making a positive contribution to the character and appearance of the conservation area (CA), and that that contribution in part derives from the exceptional form of the building as half of a symmetrical pair of villas, in brick, following, exceptionally for this section of the CA, the earlier known plans for the development of the area. While we acknowledge later alterations, this gives the plan form of the building exceptional significance in the CA.

4. We acknowledged that the symmetrical, unspoiled, hipped roof and roofline is a key element in the CA, and accepted that its preservation might justify the addition of basement space.

5. We primarily object to the degree to which the original house would be enclosed â wrappedâ in side and rear extensions. These are excessive in scale and bulk in terms of the main, original, house.

6. While we acknowledge the benefit of reducing the width of the existing side addition (which records suggest predates the designation of the conservation area) to allow for a better separation of building from the boundary, the increase in height would be harmful to the balance of the symmetrical house, and in particular to the significance of the front porch. We would ask to see the side addition reduced in height to allow the original massing to remain dominant.

7. The Committee was happy with the elevational approach to the blind, recessed brick panel detail to the proposed side addition. We were concerned by the proportions of the blind panels on the front elevation, but the requested reduction in height and proportionate adjustment of width could address this issue and better respect the proportions of the original house.

8. At the rear we would wish to see the existing footprint of the house retained at garden level and above. The proposed

Conservation Area Advisory Committee

brick enclosure counters policy for rear additions in the area, and in a house of this importance in the conservation area, this is a key consideration, and objection, for the committee. The policy guidance (SPG at Primrose Hill conservation area statement PH 26, 27, 28) refers to the need to be in harmony with the original form and character of the house and the historic pattern of extensions within the terrace or group.

9. We see the rear additions as seriously harmful to the historic character of the conservation area. We do not see the proposals offering any public benefit which would outweigh that harm even if the harm were judged to be less severe. The wider protection of the balance of built/unbuilt space in the conservation area â another recognized aspect of significance â would be undermined if this application were recognized as a precedent.

Richard Simpson FSA
Chair

Documents attached

No details entered

About this form

Issued by Contact Camden
5 Pancras Square
London N1C 4AG

Form reference 20673003

Data Protection

No personal information you have given us will be passed on to third parties for commercial purposes. The Council's policy is that all information will be shared among officers and other agencies where the legal framework allows it, if this will help to improve the service you receive and to develop other services. If you do not wish certain information about you to be exchanged within the Council, you can request that this does not happen.