

<b>Delegated Report</b>		<b>Analysis sheet</b>		<b>Expiry Date:</b>	15/04/2024
		N/A		<b>Consultation Expiry Date:</b>	10/06/2024
<b>Officer</b>				<b>Application Number(s)</b>	
Alex Kresovic				2024/0640/P & 2024/1839/L	
<b>Application Address</b>				<b>Drawing Numbers</b>	
61-63 Cartwright Gardens London WC1H 9EL				See draft decision notice	
<b>PO 3/4</b>	<b>Area Team Signature</b>	<b>C&amp;UD</b>	<b>Authorised Officer Signature</b>		
<b>Proposal(s)</b>					
<p><b>Planning Application:</b> Erection of a cladded external lift to rear elevation and associated external alterations.</p> <p><b>Listed Building Consent:</b> Erection of a cladded external lift to rear elevation and associated external alterations. Internal alterations to accommodate lift access.</p>					
<b>Recommendation(s):</b>		Refuse Planning Permission & Listed Building Consent			
<b>Application Type:</b>		Full Planning Permission & Listed Building Consent			
<b>Conditions or Reasons for Refusal:</b>		Refer to Draft Decision Notice			
<b>Informatives:</b>					
<b>Consultations</b>					
<b>Adjoining Occupiers:</b>		No. of responses	0	No. of objections	0
<b>Summary of consultation responses:</b>		Press Notice: published 16/05/2024, expired 09/06/2024. Site Notices: displayed 17/05/2024, expired 10/06/2024.  No objections were received during the statutory consultation period.			
<b>Local Area Groups</b>		No objections were received from Local Groups during the statutory consultation period.			

## Site Description

The application building was originally three Georgian town houses which form part of a wider crescent with 46-63 Cartwright Gardens. They are all listed at Grade II. The special architectural and historic interest of the buildings come from their architectural design, elevational hierarchy and their contribution to the wider listed group. Whilst the interior has been altered significantly, it is still of interest for parts of the plan form and surviving historic fabric.

The subject property is located within the Bloomsbury Conservation Area. The Bloomsbury Conservation Area is Camden's largest and covers much of the borough south of the Euston Road. The area is mixed in character with a variety of building styles and uses, however there are a large number of Georgian and Victorian town houses which reflect its origins of the expansion of London outwards from 1660-1840. Interspersed amongst the area are a number of institutions, churches, schools and uses.

## Relevant History

### The application site.

**2023/1760/P** (Erection of external lift to rear elevation and associated external alterations) & **2023/2307/L** (Erection of external lift to rear elevation and associated external alterations. Internal alterations to accommodate lift access) – **Non-Determination: Would have REFUSED (07/03/2024).**

**2018/1266/PRE** - Installation of an 8 person lift into Harlingford Hotel building. **Pre App advice issued.**

## Relevant policies

### National Planning Policy Framework (2023)

### London Plan 2021

#### Camden Local Plan 2017

A1 Managing the impact of development

A2 Noise and vibration

D1 Design

D2 Heritage

DM1 Delivery and monitoring

#### Camden Planning Guidance

CPG Design 2021

CPG Amenity 2021

### London Plan Guidance

#### Draft Camden Local Plan (2024)

The council has published a new [Draft Camden Local Plan](#) (incorporating Site Allocations) for consultation (DCLP). The DCLP is a material consideration and can be taken into account in the determination of planning applications, but has limited weight at this stage. The weight that can be given to it will increase as it progresses towards adoption (anticipated 2026).

## Assessment

### 1. Detailed Description of Proposed Development

1.1. The applicant seeks permission for the following:

Planning Application:

Erection of a cladded external lift to rear elevation and associated external alterations.

Listed Building Consent:

Erection of a cladded external lift to rear elevation and associated external alterations. Internal alterations to accommodate lift access.

## 2. Design & Heritage

2.1. The Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 (“the Listed Buildings Act”). Section 72(1) of the Act requires that special attention shall be paid to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character or appearance of a Conservation Area when considering applications relating to land or buildings within that Area.

2.2. The application site lies within sub area 13 of Bloomsbury Conservation Area. The appraisal elaborates on the character and appearance of this part of the conservation area in paragraphs 5.225 to 5.229. It describes the interest of the sub area coming from the formal early 19th century street pattern, layout of open space and relatively intact surviving terrace houses. Mention is also made of the importance of timber sash windows which decrease in height with each storey above.

### *Rear Elevation*

2.3. Visually the proposed lift will only have an impact on the rear of the building. Whilst the rear of the building is not as decorative as the front, it is of architectural and historic interest. The more restrained façade, built from stock brick with a hierarchy of windows ascending the elevation is a common feature of this type of building and reflects its status.

2.4. Similar to the front elevation, there is a uniformity to the rear façade through the repetition of features, which include the canted bays which rise up to first floor level.

2.5. Whilst some windows have been altered, the general arrangement of the openings, arched soldier courses and sash windows all contribute to the overall composition.

### *Proposed Lift*

2.6. The proposed lift would introduce a harmful addition to the rear elevation of the building due its form, scale, appearance and relationship with the existing façade.

2.7. The rear elevation is characterised by low level extensions at basement and ground floor level. Canted bays feature on the right of the façade all along the group. This repetition and relative uniformity is an important feature of the rear of the group. In contrast the slender and full height extension is out of place on the rear and would harm the overall composition. The use of brushed aluminium cladding gives the lift shaft a more solid appearance when compared with the previous glazed version, it is still an alien material which is harmful to the building.

2.8. In the submission, the applicant has referred to the modern London School of Hygiene and Tropical Medicine behind the site as precedence. Whilst this is a strikingly modern building, its overall scale, function and appearance clearly distinguishes it as separate from the application buildings and cannot be taken into consideration when assessing the subject proposals.

### *Loss of Historic Fabric*

2.9. To provide access to the lift, two windows openings would be lowered. The rear façade is

constructed from stock brick, but the upper floors appear to have undergone changes as the brick is much cleaner. Bomb damage maps shows that the buildings were undamaged during the Second World War. Both the brickwork and the first floor window appear to be historic and would contribute to the special interest of the listed building. The loss of these contributes towards the harm caused.

#### *Impact on Plan Form/Interior*

2.10. The ground floor rear wing is of limited interest, so the impact the lift would have on this space is not of concern.

2.11. For the reasons outlined above, the lift enclosure would have a harmful impact on the rear elevation of the host building and the wider terrace. Whilst it is acknowledged that the lift would not be visible from neighbouring streets, it would be visible from other properties and private areas.

### **3. Other Options**

3.1. In the heritage statement, an alternative option is presented for an internal lift. It is agreed that this would be unacceptable due to the impact on the internal plan form and fabric. There is no alternative location than can be suggested that might be acceptable due to either the impact on the external appearance of the building, or the impact to the building's interior. The 2018/1266/PRE application related to an internal lift, in which Council advised that it would not be supported. This advice remains unchanged.

### **4. Benefits of the Scheme**

#### *Heritage Benefits*

4.1. In terms of heritage benefits, two are put forward by the applicant. The first is the replacement of the ground floor front windows with a design to match the original seen on the rest of the crescent. The existing windows are not particularly harmful to the appearance of a building of this age and style. It is only when viewed in the wider context of the terrace that they appear out of place. It is acknowledged that this offers a small improvement to the building's appearance, however this would be limited.

4.2. Repairs are also proposed to the front railings, including the reinstatement of missing finials. Again, a limited heritage benefit is acknowledged here.

#### *Other Benefits*

4.3. The main driver for the proposals is the desire to improve access to the upper floors for visitors with heavy luggage. However, limited weight can be given to this as it is noted that the building is still accessed up front entrance steps, the lift does not serve the basement rooms and on most levels, it can only be accessed via a flight of steps, thereby minimising any functional benefits.

### **5. Public Sector Equality Duty (PSED) & Access**

5.1. The proposed external lift will be used for visitors with heavy luggage to carry baggage from the reception area to the upper floors only. The applicant hadn't outlined any specific personal need for the lift. As such, Council Officers have had due regard to the PSED in line with the Equality Act 2010 and consider the proposal to not provide advancing equal opportunities in line with the aims of the PSED.

## **6. Amenity**

6.1. The introduction of an external lift to rear elevation is not considered to adversely harm the neighbourhood amenity in respect to sunlight/daylight, loss of privacy, noise disturbance, and outlook. The proposals are acceptable in terms of policy A1.

## **7. Conclusion**

7.1. Refuse Planning Permission and Listed Building Consent for the following reason:

The proposed development would cause less than substantial harm to designated heritage assets, including to the listed building at 61-63 Cartwright Gardens, the setting of 46-60 Cartwright Gardens and the character and appearance of the Bloomsbury Conservation Area. The public benefits of the scheme are not considered to outweigh the harm caused, and the proposal is contrary to policies D1 (Design) and D2 (Heritage) of the Camden Local Plan 2017.