

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2017/5663/P	Edward Gold	1a Ersine Road	18/12/2017 12:21:30	OBJ	I live directly opposite at 1a Erskine Road and am worried as it is too high and bulky compared with the front of the building. All the buildings in Regents Park Road have low level buildings behind the building on the front of Regents Park Road. There would therefore be as a result loss of light and new housing should not be built at the cost of damaging the conditions of other people's homes
2017/5663/P	Lisa Murphy	89A Regent's Park Road NW1 8UY	18/12/2017 11:06:40	COMMNT	I object to the planning application for 91 Regent's Park Road We live directly opposite the proposed build. It is too bulky and too tall in comparison with the frontage building. The build would loose the openness of the street. There are a number of low level buildings in the street ie next to 89B Regent's Park Road. There is a gap between the full height terraced houses. We are also concerned about the loss of natural light for other neighbours on Regent's Park Road. New homes are welcome but not at the cost of damaging the current housing.
2017/5663/P	Matthew Storey	3 Erskine Road London NW33AJ	18/12/2017 12:44:16	OBJ	I would like to object to planning application 2017/5663/P (91 Regent's Park Road NW1 8UT). Having looked at the plans in detail, the additional structure is 1: Too bulky/large and 2: Too high in relation to the front of the building. The street is small and an additional structure on that scale would directly lead to a loss of openness. The site sits within a conservation area and traditionally the buildings directly behind the main street are low. Lemonia (89 Regent's Park Road NW8UY) on the opposite corner is a good example of this with a gap between the terrace houses on Erskine Road and the Lemonia frontage. Finally, I would have genuine concerns about the resulting loss of light to the neighbours in the immediate vicinity. Very happy to see new homes built but not at the disadvantage of others.
2017/5663/P	Edward Gold	1a Ersine Road	18/12/2017 12:21:36	OBJ	I live directly opposite at 1a Erskine Road and am worried as it is too high and bulky compared with the front of the building. All the buildings in Regents Park Road have low level buildings behind the building on the front of Regents Park Road. There would therefore be as a result loss of light and new housing should not be built at the cost of damaging the conditions of other people's homes

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2017/5663/P	Richard Simpson for Primrose Hill CAAC	12A Manley Street NW1 8LT NW1 8LT NW1 8LT	21/12/2017 11:27:44	OBJ	<p>ADVICE from Primrose Hill Conservation Area Advisory Committee 12A Manley Street, London NW1 8LT</p> <p>20 December 2017</p> <p>91 Regent's Park Road NW1 8UT      2017/5663/P</p> <p>advice in 2 pp.</p> <p>Strong objection.</p> <p>1. While the PHCAAC would normally welcome new residential provision, especially of smaller units, in the CA, such new provision should also fulfil the need to preserve or enhance the character and appearance of the conservation area. This application does neither: it is harmful to the conservation area.</p> <p>2. The PHCAAC notes that it has not been engaged in pre-application discussion by the applicant, contrary to guidance in the NPPF. The PHCAAC took the view that the application is of exceptional importance in the conservation area, has undertaken discussion with residents in the CA, and discussed and agreed this advice in the course of two PHCAAC meetings, on 6 and 20 December 2017.</p> <p>3. 91 Regent's Park Road is recognized in the Primrose Hill Conservation Area Statement, the formal SPG for the CA, as making a positive contribution to the character and appearance of the conservation area (Statement audit p. 26). The importance of the building, and especially the side elevation to Erskine Road, is given special recognition as one of 'Two prominent corner buildings [which] define the entrance to Erskine Road' (Statement p. 18). This prominence and significance partly depends on the scale of the main building, but also on the contrast with the low building to the rear, that is, in the case of 91, the single-storey 'laundry' building. This significance is enhanced by the parallel massing of the building facing on Erskine Road, no. 89 Regent's Park Road, which, too, has a single-storey building to the rear. This pattern is significant in the character of Erskine Road the entrance to which is 'defined' (Statement p. 18) by these two facing buildings. This significance is further enhanced by the distinctive massing of the north side of Erskine Road, where the neighbouring building to the application site is also a single storey 'lodge', with the substantial former organ factory (currently being restored) beyond. This pattern of lower and higher massing is also characteristic of the conservation area. It also contributes to a sense of openness which is an important element in the character of the conservation area. The present application would seriously harm the character and appearance of the conservation area.</p> <p>4. The proposal also proposes the demolition of the rear 'laundry' building. This building is evidently consistent in its form and stucco details with the main terrace, and also contributes positively to the character and appearance of the conservation area (Statement map p. 25). Its demolition is not acceptable in the conservation area. The replacement</p>

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Consultees Addr:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
					<p>proposed is a poorly conceived pastiche, which fails to preserve or enhance the character and appearance of the conservation area.</p> <p>5. We advise that the proposal would also constitute a rear extension to the main building, and as such falls to be assessed under the policy guidance for rear extensions in the PHCA Statement, PH25-27 at p. 33, which makes clear that some rear extensions 'can adversely affect the architectural character of the building to which they are attached', so prejudicing the character of the CA (PH25); such extensions in most cases should be no more than one storey high (PH26); and 'extensions should be in harmony with the original form and character of the house and the historic pattern of extensions within the terrace or group of buildings' (PH27). The PHCAAC advises that the application goes against all these tests.</p> <p>6. The PHCAAC is very concerned that new development should not be at the cost of loss of amenity in existing dwellings. We note that the proposed rear addition would be located to the south and west of the habitable rooms in properties adjacent to no 91, that is in nos 93 onward. The loss of natural light and sunlight is of considerable concern and supports our objections.</p> <p>7. The application fails to preserve or enhance the character and appearance of the conservation area, rather, substantially harms it. We advise that the application be refused.</p> <p>Richard Simpson FSA Chair</p>

---

2017/5663/P	Lisa Murphy	89A Regent's Park Road NW1 8UY	18/12/2017 11:06:27	COMMNT	<p>I object to the planning application for 91 Regent's Park Road We live directly opposite the proposed build. It is too bulky and too tall in comparison with the frontage building. The build would lose the openness of the street. There are a number of low level buildings in the street ie next to 89B Regent's Park Road. There is a gap between the full height terraced houses. We are also concerned about the loss of natural light for other neighbours on Regent's Park Road. New homes are welcome but not at the cost of damaging the current housing.</p>
-------------	-------------	-----------------------------------	---------------------	--------	---

---