

Application No:	Consultees Name:	Received:	Comment:	Response:
2020/4202/P	Richard Simpson for Primrose Hill CAAC	23/11/2020 12:04:40	OBJ	ADVICE from Primrose Hill Conservation Area Advisory Committee 12A Manley Street, London NW1 8LT

18 November 2020

43 Fitzroy Road NW1 8TP 2020/4202/P

Very strong objection.

The proposed infill extension at ground, first, and second floors directly fails the conservation area policy guidance for rear additions. See Primrose Hill conservation area appraisal (2001), the current SPD, '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. 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. 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.'

The proposed extension disrupts the pattern of rear extensions in the terrace, and is excessive in height – in effect 3-stories where guidance provides for 1. We note that the rear of the houses is visible from publicly accessible space, notably the access to the Primrose Hill Studios.

We also note that the Studios are Listed buildings, whose setting would be diminished by the proposals. We also note that the proposed balcony at the second floor, as well as the windows to the proposed extension at that storey, would allow overlooking of the habitable space in the Studios, especially due to the large studio roof lights. This would be severely harmful to the Listed studios.

We further note the potential loss of light to the lower ground floor flat at no. 43, as detailed by the leaseholder of that flat.

We support the neighbours in their objections.

The proposals would harm the amenity of neighbours, diminish the setting of the Listed Studios, and neither preserve nor enhance the character and appearance of the conservation area.

Richard Simpson FSA
Chair