

Delegated Report		Analysis sheet	Expiry Date:	01/04/2013
		N/A	Consultation Expiry Date:	14/03/2013
Officer			Application Number(s)	
Rachel Miller			2013/0462/P 2013/0484/L	
Application Address			Drawing Numbers	
54 - 55 Birkenhead Street London WC1H 8BB			Please refer to decision notice	
PO 3/4	Area Team Signature	C&UD	Authorised Officer Signature	
Proposal(s)				
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Replacement of existing UPVC windows with timber glazed doors, and of existing railings around 1st & 2nd floor rear flat roof areas with black metal railings and willow screens to form external terrace amenity areas, and installation of new railings at basement level. 2. Replacement of existing UPVC windows with timber glazed doors, and of existing railings around 1st & 2nd floor rear flat roof areas with black metal railings and willow screens to form external terrace amenity areas, and installation of new railings at basement level. 				
Recommendation(s):		(i) Refuse Planning Permission (ii) Refuse Listed Building Consent		
Application Type:		(i) Full Planning Application (ii) Listed Building Consent		

Conditions or Reasons for Refusal:	Refer to Draft Decision Notice					
Informatives:						
Consultations						
Adjoining Occupiers:	No. notified	04	No. of responses	01	No. of objections	01
			No. electronic	00		
Summary of consultation responses:	<p>Site notice displayed from 13/02/2013 until 06/03/2013 Press notice displayed from 21/02/2013 until 14/03/2013</p> <p>One letter of objection received with the following comments:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Object to the use of the flat roof as amenity space. Properties on Crestfield Street would be overlooked in this area. If this application were approved then it would set a precedent for other buildings to do the same. The property already has amenity space. • The design of the railings is totally unacceptable. The design is not like the railings at street level. There is no objection to the railings at basement level to make the steps safer at basement level. 					
CAAC/Local comments: *Please Specify	groups* Bloomsbury CAAC – no comment					

Site Description

The site contains two terraced buildings, which are three storeys plus basement and mansard level. The buildings are Grade II listed and located within the Bloomsbury Conservation Area.

The site is currently used by Women @ the Well (a registered charity) as training rooms, meeting rooms, administrative offices and overnight accommodation for field charity workers and as residential convent accommodation by Mercy Sisters of the Institute of Our Lady of Mercy. Women @ the Well provide support to vulnerable women particularly those involved in street prostitution.

To the rear there is a yard which is used for parking and amenity space. The vehicular access is via a garage door fronting St Chad's Street.

Proposal

Planning permission and listed building consent are sought for the replacement of two UPVC windows with timber glazed doors at rear first floor and rear second floor level within rear wing extensions. The proposals include the installation of 1.1metre high black metal railings with willow screens (also referred to as 'willow style railings') at first and second floor level in order to create two roof terraces around the full extent of the flat roof areas at these levels. The roof terraces would measure 2.8m x 3m at first floor level and 2.2m x 3m at second floor level. Also proposed is a hand rail at rear basement floor level in order to provide assistance for people climbing the stairs from the basement level up to the rear yard area.

Relevant History

CTP/L14/9/A/21609 Construction of a vehicular access to garage at the rear. Approved 05/11/1975

2005/3924/P Change of use from hotel use (Class C1) to a mixed use comprising non self contained residential accommodation (Sui Generis), training/meeting rooms (Class D1), offices (Class B1) and associated functions for a charity, new external door at ground floor level to the rear elevation and lean-to smokers shelter and platform goods lift in the rear yard. Granted on 12/04/2006 subject to a S106.

2013/0677/P Application under Section 106A (3) to modify a legal agreement and remove clause 4.1 (car cap) of the S106 associated with planning permission ref: 2005/3924/P dated 12/04/2006 (for change of use from hotel to a mixed use comprising non-self-contained residential accommodation, training rooms and offices). Refused on 21/03/2013

Relevant policies

LDF Core Strategy and Development Policies

- CS5 - Managing the impact of growth and development
- CS9 - Achieving a successful Central London Borough of Camden
- CS14 - Promoting high Quality Places and Conserving Our Heritage
- DP24 - Securing High Quality Design
- DP25 - Conserving Camden's Heritage
- DP26 - Managing the impact of development on occupiers and neighbours
- DP28 - Noise and vibration

Bloomsbury Conservation Area Appraisal and Management Strategy 2011 pages 116, 118-9

Camden Planning Guidance 2011
CPG1 Design – chapters 1-3 and 5
CPG6 Amenity – chapters 1 and 7

London Plan 2011

NPPF 2012

Assessment

The main issues to assess in this application are:

- The design and the impact on the listed building and conservation area
- The impact on the amenity of surrounding occupiers

Design and impact on the listed building and conservation area

It is considered that the design of the railings would be overly stylised for the age and style of the building and would result in undue prominence of the new roof terraces. The finials and circular motifs would not complement the listed buildings. Paragraph 5.4 of the Bloomsbury Conservation Area Appraisal and Management Strategy mentions inappropriate materials within the Conservation Area that have a detrimental impact on the character and appearance of the area. Little detail is provided as to the form or solidity of the proposed willow screens/railings to be attached to the proposed railings. It is probable that any additional screen structure, to serve the intended purpose, would be overly solid and would appear more obtrusive and out of character for the host building and surrounding area. It is considered that the railings and screens would fail to preserve or enhance the character and appearance of the Conservation Area.

There are no objections in design terms to the handrail at basement level nor the appearance of the proposed timber glazed doors at rear first floor and second floor level.

Impact on the amenity of surrounding occupiers

Camden's policies and guidance seek to ensure that development does not adversely impact the amenities of existing and future neighbouring occupiers. Design guidance CPG1 state that proposed terraces should not provide views into habitable rooms or the garden area closest to the dwelling-house. CPG6 says that development should be designed to protect the privacy of existing dwellings to a reasonable degree.

There is a hotel immediately adjacent to the north of the site at 56 Birkenhead Street. At numbers 2-4 Crestfield Street, there is the Crestfield Hotel and at number 1 Crestfield Street is a residential property. There would be approximately 10metres between the edge of the closest proposed roof terrace at first floor level and a bedroom window for number 1 Crestfield Street. Whilst there is an existing element of overlooking between the rear windows of Birkenhead Street and Crestfield Street it is considered that the proposed terraces would significantly worsen the situation and increase the loss of privacy for residential occupiers at 1 Crestfield Street contrary to guidance within CPG1 and CPG6 and policies CS5 and DP26. The low level of the screen proposed would not mitigate this impact to any significant degree, and were the height of the screen to be raised, it would only become more prominent and the harm to the host building and CA more apparent.

Conclusion

The proposed railings and screens would not serve to preserve or enhance this part of the conservation area and thus cause harm to the character and appearance of the existing listed building and rear of this terraced group which was considered worth protecting. The terrace would cause an unacceptable level of overlooking to habitable rooms at 1 Crestfield Street. For the reasons above the proposal is considered unacceptable in relation to policies: CS14; DP24; DP25 and DP26 and planning guidance CPG1. It is recommended that planning permission and listed building consent are refused.