

From: Richard Simpson
Sent: 15 April 2022 18:24
To: Amy Ly
Subject: Re: Consultee letter for PlanningApplication Application: 2022/0488/P

[EXTERNAL EMAIL] Beware – This email originated outside Camden Council and may be malicious Please take extra care with any links, attachments, requests to take action or for you to verify your password etc. Please note there have been reports of emails purporting to be about Covid 19 being used as cover for scams so extra vigilance is required.

Hello Amy,

I'm sorry that this advice is a little late and hope you can still use it. Please let me know if anything needs clarification.

I hope you have a good Easter break,

all good wishes,

Richard

PRIMROSE HILL CONSERVATION AREA ADVISORY COMMITTEE
12A Manley Street London NW1 8LT

6 April 2022

Flat 1st and 2nd Floor 47 Fitzroy Road NW1 8TP 2022/0488/P

Strong objection.

1. We advise that although this is a rear elevation, the rear elevations and especially the roofs of this group of houses are visible from the publicly accessible courtyard to the Primrose Hill Studios. Such rear areas and their views are characteristic of the conservation area. The houses are acknowledged to make a positive contribution to the character and appearance of the conservation area. The roofs sloping to an eaves are distinctive in such groups of terraced houses in the conservation area where roofs behind parapets are more normal: this distinction is important.

2. We advise that the change from the shallow pitched roof to a mansard would be harmful to the character and appearance of the conservation area. It would disrupt the original set of roof slopes: although dormers have been accepted, they have been inserted into the retained slope of the roof. This is not the case in this proposal.

3. We refer to *Camden Planning Guidance – Altering and extending your home* at part 4.2 (p. 16) which states ‘A roof alteration or addition is likely to be unacceptable ... [in] Buildings whose roof construction or form are unsuitable for roof additions such as shallow pitched roofs with eaves.’

4. The dormer, sitting so close to the line of the rear elevation, is excessively dominant and harmful. We refer again to *CPG*, this time to part 4.4 (at p. 17) which states ‘Roof dormers should be designed sensitively so they do not dominate the roof plane. This means they should sit within the roof slope so that the overall structure of the existing roof form is maintained.’ The application conflicts fundamentally with this guidance.

5. The metal finish to the proposed mansard gives further prominence to the inappropriate dominance of the proposed extension.

6. The proposals harm the character and appearance of the conservation area: they neither preserve nor enhance its character or appearance.

Richard Simpson FSA
Chair