Delegated Report (Members' Briefing)		Analysis sheet		Expiry Date:	(i) 16/10/2012 (ii) 30/10/2012		
		N/A / attached		Consultation	(i) 04/10/2012		
				Expiry Date:	(ii) 04/10/2012		
Officer			<b>Application</b>	Number(s)			
Rob Tulloch			(i) 2012/4207/P				
			(ii) 2012/4261/L				
Application Address			Drawing Numbers				
Jenkins Hotel							
45 Cartwright Gardens			See decision notice				
London							
WC1H 9EH							
PO 3/4	Area Team Signatur	e C&UD	Authorised	Officer Signatu	re		

# Proposal(s)

- (i) The erection of a 2 storey extension within the rear lightwell to replace existing single storey extension, installation of gate and stair to front lightwell, and installation of air conditioning unit to rear 1st floor flat roof to hotel (Class C1).
- (ii) The erection of a 2 storey extension within the rear lightwell to replace existing single storey extension, installation of gate and stair to front lightwell, installation of air conditioning unit to rear 1st floor flat roof, and alterations to bedroom layouts on each floor level of hotel.

Recommendation(s):	(i) Grant Planning Permission (ii) Grant Listed Building Consent									
Application Type:	(i) Full Planning Permission (ii) Listed Building Consent									
Conditions:	Refer to Draft Decision Notice									
Informatives:										
Consultations										
Adjoining Occupiers:	No. notified	17	No. of responses	00	No. of objections	00				
Summary of consultation responses:	Site notice 11/09/2012-02/10/2012 Press advert 13/09/2012-04/10/2012 No responses were received									
CAAC/Local group comments:	Bloomsbury CAAC object to the infilling of the lightwell as it will reduce amenity for users of the building in terms of light and ventilation. The proposal will also increase dependence on artificial light and ventilation.  Officer comment: The proposal would not completely infill the lightwell, but would reduce it in size. No windows would be lost, and all hotel bedrooms would continue to have windows facing the lightwell providing access to natural light and ventilation.									

## Site Description

The building dates from circa 1809-11 and was designed and built by James Burton. It forms part of a terrace of 19 houses and at some stage has been converted to a hotel (along with many other buildings in Cartwright Gardens). The hotel is listed Grade II and lies within sub-area 13 of the Bloomsbury Conservation Area and the Central London Area.

# **Relevant History**

2012/2553/P & 2012/2302/L The erection of a rear infill extension located within existing rear yard creating 2 additional bedrooms between lower ground & first floor level, following the erection of a new rear mansard roof extension, relocation of air conditioning units to existing vault enclosures at lower ground floor level, installation of new staircase enclosure and new entry/access point at south-east elevation all associated with existing hotel (Class C1). Withdrawn due to officers' concerns about excessive subdivision and the mansard roof extension.

# **Relevant policies**

## **LDF Core Strategy and Development Policies**

- CS1 Distribution of growth
- CS3 Other highly accessible areas
- CS5 Managing the impact of growth and development
- CS8 Promoting a successful and inclusive Camden economy
- CS9 Achieving a successful Central London
- CS11 Promoting sustainable and efficient travel
- CS14 Promoting high quality places and conserving our heritage
- DP14 Tourism development and visitor accommodation
- DP16 The transport implications of development
- DP24 Securing high quality design
- DP25 Conserving Camden's heritage
- DP26 Managing the impact of development on occupiers and neighbours
- DP28 Noise and vibration

## **Camden Planning Guidance 2011**

Bloomsbury Conservation Area Appraisal and Management Strategy 2011 NPPF 2012

### **Assessment**

## 1 Proposal

- 1.1 The proposal is for the extension and refurbishment of the existing hotel including the erection of a two storey extension to rear lightwell extension replacing a single storey extension of a smaller footprint, the installation of external plant and internal alterations.
- 1.2 The scheme follows a previously withdrawn scheme that sought an extension with a mansard roof which was considered harmful to the special interest of the building. The main issues are:
  - Principle of development
  - Design and heritage
  - Neighbour amenity
  - Sustainability
  - Transport

### 2 Principle of development

2.1 Policies CS8 and DP14 recognise the contribution that tourism makes to the character of Camden and its economic benefits. DP14 identifies Euston and King's Cross (which the site is close to) and Central London (which the site is within) as being the preferred locations for new tourism development. The proposal would result in the loss of a dining room and kitchens with visitors using the sister hotel across the road, and two staff rooms would be converted to hotel rooms resulting in an increase in the number of rooms from 13 to 19. This is not considered to have a harmful impact on the local environment. The proposal would improve the standard of accommodation by making most of the rooms en-suite. As such the extension and alterations are considered acceptable in principle.

## 3 Design

- 3.1 The building dates from circa 1809-11 and was designed and built by James Burton. It forms part of a terrace of 19 houses and at some stage has been converted to a hotel (along with many other buildings in Cartwright Gardens). As this property is on the corner the entrance is on the flank elevation with a single storey stuccoed extension beyond.
- 3.2 The application retains the building in hotel use but links it to the hotel at 46-47 Cartwright Gardens, hence why there is no reception or dining area proposed. The architect is the same for the scheme at

46-47 and has used many of the details approved there. Internal alterations are proposed as well as a number of extensions to the rear.

3.3 An application lodged earlier in the year for similar works was withdrawn by the applicant following concerns raised regarding the volume of extensions proposed to the rear and the impact of the some of the internal works, especially to the ground floor front room.

#### Internal alterations

3.4 The conversion to a hotel appears to be historic (there is no record of any planning permission for it) judging by the condition of the interior. Internally the amount of historic fabric which survives varies from room to room. However the original layout is still evident with most of the later dividing partitions being inserted within the original room layout.

#### Basement

- 3.5 The proposals involve the insertion of new partitions dividing up the existing floor plan to provide bedrooms. These rooms are very plain with no decorative features and it is considered that these insertions are acceptable in areas of limited interest as they could be easily reversed.
- 3.6 Ground floor

It was not possible to see the front bedroom on this level as it was occupied (Room 4). However the adjacent room 3 was inspected and had a fire place and cornice. Originally these two rooms combined to create one of the principal rooms of the property. It is now proposed to reopen this space to form one room with a bathroom "pod" in the corner. This is a significant improvement to the layout of this level of the building and better reveals the significance of the asset.

#### First floor

3.7 The main front room has been somewhat eroded by the insertion of the corridor and shower room and toilet. The only alterations at this level are the insertion (or relocation) of bathroom "pods" to provide en suite facilities. These are better positioned than the existing in relation to their impact on the existing chimney breasts.

### Second floor

3.8 No objection is raised to the works on the second floor which maintains the three room arrangement but simply re-works the positioning of the bathrooms.

## Third floor

3.9 An inspection of this floor revealed little surviving historic fabric other than the original square section skirting. Given its modest appearance no objection is raised to the proposed works which retain the cellular arrangement and original walls with the bathrooms reading as insertions.

## Services

3.10 The arrangement for this largely replicates the arrangement approved in 46-47. The condensers for the air conditioning would be located in the rear yard. Services would be run in the floor void or within suspended ceilings which would only be located within non original corridors. Vertically the pipes would run in a riser located in bathrooms or the linen closet.

### **External alterations**

Extensions in the rear yard

- 3.11 The existing basement structure in the rear yard is non original and of poor quality. There would be no objection with its replacement to provide extra accommodation. The ground floor extension does infill part of the lightwell area and creates a more enclosed lightwell facing onto the rear room, however it has been pulled further away from the main building than the last application and the rear yard of this property is enclosed on high walls on each side. The extension is therefore screened from public views and the site context is unique and this would not form a precedent for other buildings in the terrace.
- 3.13 The applicant has agreed to reinstate the ground floor front room which has meant the loss of one bedroom. As is mentioned above this is a significant improvement to the building whose benefits offset the harm of the ground floor rear extension. On balance this element of the proposal is considered acceptable.

3.14 The proposed scheme is now considered to preserve the special interest of the listed building in line with policies CS14, DP24 and DP25 of the LDF, and it is recommended that consent is granted with the following conditions

## 4 Amenity

- 4.1 The existing building has a single storey extension at basement level currently in use as a staff bedroom, creating a small internal lightwell measuring 3m x 3.5m. The proposed two storey extension would replace the single storey structure and have a slightly larger footprint leaving a lightwell measuring 3m x 2m. The lightwell is bordered by nos. 7 Burton Place to the south east and 44 Cartwright Gardens to the north. The neighbouring flank walls rise to first floor level, above the height of the proposed extension, and neither neighbouring building has windows facing the lightwell. As such there would be no impact on these properties in terms of loss of light or privacy.
- 4.2 An external condenser unit is proposed on top of the new extension. The applicants have submitted an acoustic report which recorded the minimum background noise levels as 44dB(A) during daytime (07:00-23:00) and 40dB(A) at night (23:00-07:00). The report indicates that the proposed plant would be designed and attenuated not to exceed 30dB(A) in line with Camden's noise standards which requires noise at 1m from the closest sensitive location to be at least 10dB(A) below background noise. A condition will ensure the attenuation measured cited in the report are adhered to.
- 4.3 Cartwright Gardens comprises mainly hotels and the small increase in rooms at this site is not considered to harm the amenity of any adjoining residential occupiers.
- 4.4 As such the proposal is not considered to harm the amenity of adjoining occupiers and would comply with policies CS5 and DP26 of the LDF and Camden Planning Guidance.

# 5 Sustainability

5.1 Policies CS13 and DP22 require development to incorporate sustainable design and construction measures. As part of this DP22b denotes that green or brown roofs and green walls should be incorporated wherever suitable. The extension would have a roof area of approximately 12sqm and a green roof of this size is not considered to be practical.

### 6 Transport

6.1 The site has a PTAL rating of 6b (excellent) and is close to numerous bus routes, tube stations and overland/international rail. The modest increase in the number of four additional hotel rooms (two of which were previously staff rooms) is not considered to have an impact on local transport conditions, particularly given the site's good transport links. Given the minor nature of the extension and alterations a Construction Management Plan is considered unnecessary.

## 7 Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL)

- 7.1 The proposal will be not be liable for the Mayor of London's CIL as the proposed extension would only add 16.5sqm of floorspace.
- **8** Recommendation: Grant Planning Permission & Grant Listed Building Consent

### **DISCLAIMER**

Decision route to be decided by nominated members on Monday 15<sup>th</sup> October 2012. For further information please click <u>here.</u>