

| Application No: | Consultees Name: | Received: | Comment: | Response: |
|-----------------|------------------|---------------------|----------|---|
| 2020/4202/P | Duncan Gilbert | 11/11/2020 15:30:52 | OBJ | <p>As an owner of a share of the freehold of 43 Fitzroy Road, I would not be able to support the extension on the upper ground floor to the full 4 meters. I think it is a bold planning application that has no precedent on the terrace. I feel it would be over development in terms of massing for the flats and the terrace. It will effect the balance and harmony of the property and the terrace by insensitive scale in the conservation area. This destruction of the architectural grain of the terrace within this conservation area by this development would set a precedent that would damage the locality and is not in compliance with your own conservation policies. Its clear that the Architect/applicant has not referenced the Primrose Hill Conservation area polices as stated below re Rear extensions/ conservatories.</p> <p>In particular:</p> <p>PH25 Extensions and conservatories can alter the balance and harmony of a property or of a group of properties by insensitive scale, design or inappropriate materials. Some rear extensions, although not widely visible, so adversely affect the architectural integrity of the building to which they are attached that the character of the Conservation Area is prejudiced.</p> <p>PH26 Rear extensions should be as unobtrusive as possible and should not adversely affect the character of the building or the Conservation Area. In most cases such extensions should be no more than one storey in height, but its general effect on neighbouring properties and Conservation Area will be the basis of its suitability.</p> <p>PH27 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. The acceptability of larger extensions depends on the particular site and circumstances.</p> <p>PH28 Rear extensions will not be acceptable where they would spoil an uniformed rear elevation of an unspoilt terrace or group of buildings.</p> <p>Furthermore, as a leaseholder of the lower ground floor, the effect of such a development above my planned extended flat, would remove the day light in to the habitable rooms at the centre of my property. The sky light (1.2meters by 1.5m approx) in the flat roof of the granted planning application (Application ref: 2019/6375/P) is designed to replicate the daylight/right to light enjoyed by the flats current layout through the glass door and windows existing. I object to the planning application as it will create a very dark flat on the lower ground floor and therefore effect the daylight coming in to the rear of the property at a high level.</p> <p>The plans for the upper ground floor acknowledge there is an issue getting light to the middle of the property by the introduction of a fan high level above their windows. I would therefore also object on these right of light issues as it would vastly reduce the daylight entering my flat.</p> <p>The design and Access statement provided is basic and confusing as the approved lightwell in the basement flat is not clear. It is also noted that the elevation plans submitted don't show the roof light in on my flat roof. This roof light is clearly visible on the Application ref: 2019/6375/P (granted) but not shown on the application ref: 2020/4202/P that is currently being considered.</p> <p>I would strongly object to the application on the above planning terms and the fact that is is not in compliance with your own Primrose Hill Conservation area polices on rear extensions.</p> <p>Best Duncan Gilbert</p> |