

<b>Delegated Report</b>		<b>Analysis sheet</b>		<b>Expiry Date:</b>		(i) 30/08/2012 (ii) 16/08/2012	
		N/A / attached		<b>Consultation Expiry Date:</b>		(i) 09/08/2012 (ii) 09/08/2012	
<b>Officer</b>				<b>Application Number(s)</b>			
Rob Tulloch				(i) 2012/3229/P (ii) 2012/3312/L			
<b>Application Address</b>				<b>Drawing Numbers</b>			
31-32 ARGYLE SQUARE LONDON WC1H 8AP				See 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>							
Planning – Erection of two 3-storey rear extensions following the demolition of existing part 2/part 3-storey rear extensions and laundry outbuilding of hotel (Class C1).							
Listed Building - Erection of two 3-storey rear extensions following the demolition of existing part 2/part 3-storey rear extensions and laundry outbuilding of hotel (Class C1).							
<b>Recommendation(s):</b>		Refuse Planning Permission Refuse Listed Building Consent					
<b>Application Type:</b>		Full Planning Permission Listed Building Consent					
<b>Conditions:</b>		Refer to Draft Decision Notice					
<b>Informatives:</b>							
<b>Consultations</b>							
<b>Adjoining Occupiers:</b>		No. notified	<b>21</b>	No. of responses	<b>08</b>	No. of objections	<b>00</b>
<b>Summary of consultation responses:</b>		<p>Site notice 13/07/2012-03/08/2012 Press advert 19/07/2012-09/08/2012</p> <p>8 letters of support were received from, the Megaro Hotel, Euston Road, the Montana and Howard Winchester Hotels, Argyle Square; the Wardonia Hotel, Argyle Street; the Crestfield Hotel, Crestfield Street; and residents of 329-331 Grays Inn Road, 82 Rumfields Road, and 16 Arnold Grove.</p> <p>Their support was on the grounds that the current state of the building detracts from the appearance of the square and the refurbishment would be an improvement to the building and conservation area, the proposals are modest and cannot be seen from the square, and that the proposals would create jobs and other economic benefits.</p> <p>Officer comment: No alterations are proposed to the front of the buildings, the previously approved scheme included improvements to the front and an increase in the number of hotel rooms. Although the proposals would not been seen from the square they would still affect the special interest of the listed buildings.</p>					

<p><b>CAAC/Local group comments:</b></p>	<p><b>Bloomsbury CAAC object:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Gross over-development</li> <li>• Permission has already been granted for intensive use of the site</li> <li>• The proposal would leave no outdoor space</li> <li>• The proposal would be harmful to the original plan form of the listed buildings</li> </ul> <p><b>The Friends of Argyle Square object:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The proposal is contrary to the local and to English Heritage's design guidance</li> <li>• Gross overdevelopment</li> <li>• Provides poor quality accommodation</li> <li>• No long term benefits and damage is not justified by economic viability contrary to National Planning Policy Framework</li> </ul>
--	--

### Site Description

The application buildings are two Grade II listed Georgian townhouses which, like many buildings in the square, have been converted to a hotel use with a lateral link at ground floor level. The site lies within Bloomsbury Conservation Area and the Central London Area. It is located within a terrace of similarly listed buildings.

### Relevant History

2012/3184/P & 2012/3290/L Erection of two part2/part 3-storey rear extensions following the demolition of existing part 2/part 3-storey rear extensions and laundry outbuilding of hotel (Class C1). Yet to be determined.

2012/0930/P Alterations to rear extension of no. 31 Argyle Square including first floor rear extension, replacement of doors to front elevation and windows to front and rear elevations and associated alterations in connection with creation of 2 additional rooms to hotel following demolition of an existing two storey rear extension at basement and ground floor level (Class C1). Granted 30/04/2012

2012/0922/L Alterations to rear extension of no. 31 Argyle Square including first floor rear extension, replacement of doors to front elevation and windows to front and rear elevation, and internal alterations including removal and installation of partition walls at all levels in association with creation of 2 additional rooms and refurbishment of hotel (Class C1), following demolition of an existing two storey rear extension at basement and ground level. Granted 30/04/2012

2010/6026/L External additions and alterations to include the removal of sign from metal balustrade and the installation of new balustrade to match existing to front elevation of existing hotel (Class C1). Granted 23/12/2010

### 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

CS13 Tackling climate change through promoting higher environmental standards

CS14 Promoting high quality places and conserving our heritage

CS15 Protecting and improving our parks and open spaces & encouraging biodiversity

DP14 Tourism development and visitor accommodation

DP16 The transport implications of development

DP22 Promoting sustainable design and construction

DP23 Water

DP24 Securing high quality design  
DP25 Conserving Camden's heritage  
DP26 Managing the impact of development on occupiers and neighbours  
DP32 Air quality and Camden's clear zone

**Camden Planning Guidance 2011**

**National Planning Policy Framework 2012**

**Bloomsbury Conservation Area Appraisal and Management Strategy 2011**

**English Heritage "London terrace houses 1660-1860 – A guide to alterations and extensions"**

**Other Guidance**

**Argyle Square – A guide to its conservation and enhancement 2011**

This guidance does not comprise new policy or represent a new approach, but brings together advice on good conservation practice

**Assessment**

**1 Proposal**

- 1.1 Permission is sought for the erection of two 3-storey rear extensions following the demolition of existing part 2/part 3-storey rear extensions and laundry outbuilding of hotel (Class C1). The proposal would result in an additional 26sqm of floorspace and two additional rooms being created. All the rooms in the extensions would benefit from en-suite suite showers and w.c's.
- 1.2 Planning permission and listed building consent were granted earlier this year for refurbishment of the hotel and a modest extension to the rear (refs: 2012/0930/P and 2012/0922/L). The extent of the rear extensions was scaled back following discussions during the application process. This application now seeks to increase the volume of the rear extensions, but does not include any of the other internal works or alterations to the front elevation included in the previous application. The main issues are:
- Design and heritage
  - Neighbour amenity
  - Sustainability
  - Transport

**2 Design and heritage**

- 2.1 The rears of the buildings have undergone various alterations and extensions in the past. No. 31 currently has a half-width two storey rear extension which extends the entire length of the rear garden. The section of the extension abutting the main building has a sloped roof, and permission has been granted (refs: 2012/0930/P and 2012/0922/L) for the sloping roof to be "squared off" to create a part two, part three storey extension. The approved scheme was revised to remove a single storey extension at the rear of the garden.
- 2.2 No. 32 has a part two, part three storey full-width rear extension, which extends to half the length of the garden. At the rear of the garden is a small single storey laundry room. Permission was granted to demolish the two storey section of the extension and the laundry room. The scheme also included a part one part two storey extension to the rear, which was considered unacceptable and removed from the scheme.
- 2.3 As such the only extension approved at the rear was the squaring of the rear wing of no. 31 to convert a two storey extension to a part two part three storey extension.
- 2.4 The current scheme is similar to the approved scheme in that the extent of demolition is the

same, i.e. the laundry room and two storey extension to no. 32 would be removed, and the first floor rear wing to 31 would be “squared off”. However, compared with the approved scheme the proposal now seeks to extend to the rear wing of no. 31 at first floor level (which was not on the previous application) and extend the rear wing of 32 from basement to first floor (which on the previous application was proposed at basement to ground floor but then removed). As such, both rear wings would extend to the full length of the garden to create 2x three storey extensions with a narrow, elongated courtyard area to each side.

2.5 English Heritage’s document “London terrace houses 1660-1860 – A guide to alterations and extensions” states on page 3 that: *“Although London terrace houses are varied, certain aspects of their special interest are common to nearly all:*

- *The layout of the houses in streets and squares, or less frequently crescents and circuses, with small rear yards, private gardens or large communal gardens surrounded by terraces, and consistent boundary treatments using railings or walls.*
- *The architectural composition of the terrace facades themselves, in which the single houses form a unit in a larger entity, but are subordinate to it.*

It also states on page 13 that: *A proposed extension should be subordinate to the main building. In general, rear extensions should not extend rearward beyond the line of any neighbouring extensions, or intrude on any garden space of amenity value or above the general height of neighbouring extensions.*

2.6 Bloomsbury Conservation Area Appraisal and Management Strategy advises on page 116 that extensions of excessive scale, massing or height can have a detrimental impact on the character and appearance of the area.

2.7 The proposed full length rear extensions would infill over half of the original garden space of both nos. 31 and 32 and would result in two rear wings which would extend further and higher (at the rear of the garden) than any other extension on the terrace. Whilst it is acknowledged that there are large extensions to the east (26 & 27 are an overly large two storey 1960’s addition) the remainder are small in number and shallower in depth as the rear gardens to the east are half the depth of the application site. To the west, the terrace exhibits a consistent rear building line and open gardens (any additional structures tend to be lightweight outbuildings which have a transient appearance). Few extensions extend the entire length of the garden, and none of them do so for three storeys. Therefore, not only would they occupy the full length of the gardens, which are an important feature of the buildings’ setting, but they would also be dominant in the wider terrace where consistency of the rear building line and the largely uniform arrangement of rear wings contributes to the special interest of the listed building and the character and appearance of the conservation area.

2.8 As such, the proposed rear extensions due to their height, depth and bulk are unacceptable in terms of the impact on the listed buildings, the terrace they form a part of, and Bloomsbury Conservation Area.

### **3 Amenity**

3.1 The permitted scheme only proposed the squaring off of the sloping part of the roof to no. 31 which would have created a part two part three storey extension, which was not considered to affect daylight or sunlight to neighbouring properties. The proposed extension to no. 31 would be three storeys for its full length. Not only would this have more of an impact on no. 30 Argyle Square in terms of daylight and loss of outlook, but it would also affect no. 14 Argyle Walk which has been converted into flats. This property has a rear lightwell and terrace at second floor level. The proposed extension would increase the height of the eastern wall of the lightwell by 1.3m affecting light to ground and first floor windows as well as abutting the side glazed screen of the terrace. The three storey extension to no. 32 would also extend into the garden by an additional 4m and impact on light to the lower floors of the adjoining property at no. 33 Argyle Square which

is in use as residential flats.

3.2 The existing extension to no. 31 has various window and doors to its side. The remodelled extension would increase windows and doors to its side, but views from the windows would be blocked by the extension to no. 32. The removal of the infill to no. 32 would create six new windows to the side of the enlarged three storey extension which would directly overlook the rear garden and obliquely overlook a rear ground floor window.

3.3 As such the proposal is considered to harm the amenity of adjoining occupiers and would not comply with policies CS5 and DP26 of the LDF and Camden Planning Guidance.

#### **4 Sustainability**

4.1 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 applicants have proposed green roofs to both rear extensions which is welcomed.

#### **5 Transport**

5.1 Given the minor nature of the extension and alterations a Construction Management Plan is considered unnecessary. Two additional hotel rooms are not considered to have an impact on local transport conditions.

#### **6 Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL)**

6.1 The proposal would not be liable for a CIL contribution as the increase in floorspace would be less than 100sqm.

#### **7 Recommendation: Refuse Planning Permission/ Refuse Listed Building Consent**

#### **Disclaimer**

***This is an internet copy for information purposes. If you require a copy of the signed original please telephone Contact Camden on (020) 7974 4444***