

Printed on: 28/05/2020 09:10:05

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2020/1280/P		27/05/2020 10:02:36	COMMENT	<p>Primrose Hill Studios are beautiful listed buildings of exceptional interest. I'm concerned that the creation of a basement flat at no 10 will spoil the integrity of the architecture and change the facade of the building from the rear. I'm also concerned about the creation of a new independent dwelling unit as there is already considerable pressure on amenities such as parking and rubbish collection.</p> <p>As the building sits on clay and the buildings are terraced I have concerns regarding potential damage to neighbouring properties from the work and I trust that the planning committee will consider all of these aspects.</p>

Printed on: 28/05/2020 09:10:05

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2020/1280/P	Richard Simpson for Primrose Hill CAAC	27/05/2020 12:20:33	OBJ	<p>ADVICE from Primrose Hill Conservation Area Advisory Committee 12A Manley Street, London NW1 8LT</p> <p>6 May 2020</p> <p>10 Primrose Hill Studios Fitzroy Road NW1 8TR 2020/1280/P</p> <p>Strong objection.</p> <p>Primrose Hill Studios are a group of artists' studio houses Listed Grade II built 1877-82. They form a group of 12 houses and a lodge built around an inner courtyard on a mainly 'backland' site with only one elevation to the public street, a rear elevation to Manley Street. The List description acknowledges the importance of both front and rear elevations, as well as emphasising the distinct types and scale of the groups of houses within the original development.</p> <p>No. 10, the applicant property, is one of the group nos 7-8 and 9-12 of two distinct types built in the second phase of building, that is the period up to 1882.</p> <p>No. 10 is one of the group nos 9-12 which could not be lit from the rear and so are differently disposed (List description) from the adjacent nos 7-8.</p> <p>This distinction is because this section of the development was built up to the boundary with Manley Street. Nos 7-8 faced on to an open space in Manley Street, and could have openings, both doors and windows, onto Manley Street. No 10 was one of the group built, in whole or part, to abut the end of the (now demolished) section of Manley Street which consisted of 2-storey terraced houses built in the 1860s. This abutment is still witnessed by the rendered survival of the end flank wall of Manley Street, with chimneys and chimney breasts with fireplace openings. The studios adjacent to no 10 towards Kingstown Street have blind stock-brick gabled walls. The elevation of the Listed group to Manley Street thus consists of three distinct parts: nos. 7-8 with door and window openings, including to original basements, nos 9-10 with survivals of the original abutting terrace which prevented the creation of original openings, and nos 11-12 where there are blank brick walls. This wall is part of the Listed Building, the rear elevations acknowledged in the List description.</p> <p>While it is true that 3 openings have been made in the rear elevation to no 10 these are modest in scale and the blank rendered wall which witnesses to the historic configuration of the group in its context, substantially survives.</p> <p>The proposal to add 4 more windows plus a front door would more than double the openings in this originally blank wall, substantially harming this historic distinction, and the evidence for the historic development of the conservation area. The proposed elevational changes would harm the significance of the Listed Building, and the Listed Buildings as a group, and neither preserve nor enhance the character and appearance of the conservation area.</p> <p>The proposal would also harm the distinction between the groups of studio-types which make up the cluster of Listed buildings. As noted in the List description, nos 9-12 were, because of their location, differently configured. This difference included having no basement. This is in clear distinction from the adjacent nos 7-8</p>

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
				<p>which had semi-basements. This historic distinction would be subverted by the insertion of a basement at no. 10 as proposed. The manifestation of the insertion would be highly visible on the Manley Street elevation, where it would be shown in the incongruous pavement-level fenestration.</p> <p>In terms of planning history, we note 2 relevant decisions.</p> <p>The application for 4 Primrose Hill Studios 2010/4630/L and 2010/4617/P, was refused on the grounds that iThe proposed basement, by reason of its impact on the external appearance, character and significance of the listed building, would be detrimental to its special architectural and historic interest contrary to policy B6 (Listed buildings) of the London Borough of Camden Replacement Unitary Development Plan 2006; policy CS14 (Promoting high quality places and conserving our heritage) of the London Borough of Camden Development Framework Core Strategy and policy DP25 (Conserving Camden's heritage) of the London Borough of Camden Local Development Framework.i The decision was not challenged on appeal.</p> <p>In the application for 8 Primrose Hill Studios 2013/2569/L, the existing basement was deepened by some 300mm and converted from storage to residential use to provide additional residential floor space including installation of a window on the rear elevation at lower ground floor level and internal alterations at ground floor level to dwelling house (Class C3). We did not object to this application, and we note that the studio had an existing semi-basement, as well as an established pattern of original openings to Manley Street, in clear distinction from the present application.</p> <p>We note our concern that any consent for the number and type of openings currently proposed in the application for no 10 would provide a precedent putting at risk the important blank walls on the rest of the Manley Street elevation to the Listed Buildings.</p> <p>We also note that harm to heritage significance can be outweighed by public benefit. We acknowledge that the creation of a new smaller dwelling unit would provide some benefit, although it would not outweigh the harm to the Listed Buildings and conservation area. We question the accessibility of the proposed unit, for example, and the tests expected of life-time homes. We also note that Camden's planning policy allows the absorption of one self-contained dwelling unit into another, so the separate flat could become an enlargement to the larger studio, losing the benefit of the smaller separate unit.</p> <p>The proposals would harm the significance of the Listed Building, and of the Listed Buildings as a group, and neither preserve nor enhance the character and appearance of the conservation area.</p> <p>Richard Simpson FSA Chair</p>