

**ADVICE from Primrose Hill Conservation Area Advisory Committee**

12A Manley Street, London NW1 8LT

19 August 2018

91 Regent's Park Road NW1 8UT      2018/3036/P

Strong objection.

1. The PHCAAC reviewed this application, 2018/3036/P, at our meeting on 1 August 2018. We had reviewed an earlier application, 2017/5663/P, on 20 December 2017. This 2017 application was for a three storey rear extension with mansard roof and was withdrawn. The PHCAAC undertook pre-application discussion with the applicant and his agents on 17 January 2018, on a two storey rear extension with mansard roof. We set out our conclusions in advice to the applicant dated 7 February 2018: this advice is attached.

2. Our advice on the current application is on the merits of the present application, but the Committee's views on the main planning issues, and the character and appearance of the conservation area, are consistent with our earlier considerations.

3. The Advisory Committee welcomed aspects of the new application, including retention of the laundry building, and welcomed the reduction overall by one storey.

4. However, after very careful consideration, the Advisory Committee concluded that the points in our advice on the previous application, dated 20 December 2017, at paras 3 and 5 had not been sufficiently addressed. These paras referenced the scale appropriate at this location in Erskine Road, and the form appropriate to a rear extension to the main building, 91 Regent's Park Road, and stated:

5. 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.

6. 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.

7. The Committee recognized that elements of the design could be improved. For example, the rear wall to the mansard is over-dominant – an alternative would be possible: the details of the retained laundry building could be enhanced in both proportions and details. The Committee did not, however, take the view that such improvements to the design would sufficiently mitigate the harm caused by the additional height.

8. 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.

9. 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.

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'Richard Simpson', with a horizontal line extending from the end of the signature.

Richard Simpson FSA  
Chair

Attached advice dated 7 February 2018