				Printed on: 16/07/2020
Application No:	<b>Consultees Name:</b>	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2020/1591/P	Richard Simpson for Primrose Hill CAAC	11/07/2020 13:04:45	OBJ	ADVICE from Primrose Hill Conservation Area Advisory Committee 12A Manley Street, London NW1 8LT
	CAAC			1 July 2020
				101 Regent's Park Road (Maisonette 2nd and 3rd Floor) NW1 8UR 2020/1591/P
				Strong objection.
				No 101 Regent's Park Road forms a pair, with 99, constituting the central bay of the larger terrace, from nos 91 to 109 Regent's Park Road. The central pair are distinguished from the adjacent buildings, but compare with and balance the two end buildings (91 and 109), in having more elaborate window forms – round-headed not flat – triple rather than double window groupings, and contrasting quoins. They also, most significantly in terms of this application, have a raised parapet – contrasting with the eaves of their neighbours – with a shallow triangular tympanum to the parapet spanning both central buildings.
				It is critical to the significance of this design and its details that the roof slope behind the front parapet is plain and subservient to the forms and details of the front elevation. It is also critical that the pair, and no 101 in particular, is visible in longer views from Berkley Road.
				Changes to the roofs to both 99 and 101 have been limited to rooflights which do not change the essential form of the roof and the slate roof slope. This is consistent with the policy guidance in the Primrose Hill conservation area statement – current SPD – at PH18 which states 'Planning permission is required for extensions and alterations at roof level within the Conservation Area. Roof extensions and alterations, which change the shape and form of the roof, can have a harmful impact on the Conservation Area and are unlikely to be acceptable where:
				<ul> <li>It would be detrimental to the form and character of the existing building</li> </ul>
				<ul> <li>The property forms part of a group or terrace which remains largely, but not necessarily completely, unimpaired</li> </ul>
				<ul> <li>The property forms part of a symmetrical composition, the balance of which would be upset</li> <li>The roof is prominent, particularly in long views and views from the parks'</li> </ul>
				The proposed cutting down to form an access terrace to the front slope of the roof would disrupt the simple slope of the roof, and the balance between the roof slope and the front parapet which is key to the significance of the building and the group of buildings. Associated railings would worsen this harm. The proposals would neither preserve nor enhance the character or appearance of the conservation area.
				We have no objection to the work to the rear reaf which would not cause harm to the significance of the

We have no objection to the work to the rear roof which would not cause harm to the significance of the building and its group.

The harm to the heritage asset would not be balanced by any public benefit. We note that the residential space is essentially to the rear.

Richard Simpson FSA Chair