

Delegated Report		Analysis sheet		Expiry Date:		20/07/2012	
Members' Briefing		N/A / attached		Consultation Expiry Date:		20/6/2012	
Officer				Application Number(s)			
Tania Skelli-Yaoz				2011/4028/P 2011/4041/L			
Application Address				Drawing Numbers			
46/48 Maple Street London W1T 6HQ				See decision notices			
PO 3/4	Area Team Signature	C&UD	Authorised Officer Signature				
		AP					
Proposal(s)							
(1) Replacement of windows and doors and general works of refurbishment all in connection with existing residential flats (Class C3) (Retrospective).							
(2) Replacement of windows and doors, general works of refurbishment and internal alterations including modification of partitioning, doors openings, and internal decorations all in connection with existing residential flats (Class C3) (Retrospective).							
Recommendation(s):		Grant planning permission Grant listed building consent					
Application Type:		Full Planning Permission					
Conditions or Reasons for Refusal:		Refer to Draft Decision Notices					
Informatives:							
Consultations							
Adjoining Occupiers:		No. notified	18	No. of responses	00	No. of objections	00
				No. electronic	00		
Summary of consultation responses:		n/a					
CAAC comments:		Bloomsbury CAAC: Object. Basement window enlargement at unit (46?) objectionable; new window should re establish historic condition, which we would have thought was for two smaller windows that replicate window arrangement at ground floor and first floor level.					
Site Description							
The application site is 2x four-storey with basement and mansard grade II listed terraced houses on the corner of maple Street and Conway Street. The site lies within the Bloomsbury/Fitzrovia Conservation Area. The houses are in residential use as 12 self-contained flats.							

Relevant History

01/01/1971 **GRANTED** The conversion of Nos. 46 and 48 Maple Street into ten self-contained flats.

13/05/1971 **GRNATED** The addition of two self contained flats at roof level at Nos 46 and 48 Maple Street.

Relevant policies

LDF Core Strategy and Development Policies

DP 6, 18, 24, 25, 26

CPG 1, 2

Bloomsbury CA Statement

Assessment

The proposal is for the retention of the existing residential use as 12 self-contained units. On site these seem to have been refurbished recently and mostly still unoccupied. It is unclear whether the building was recently vacant or otherwise. Currently all works to occupy the building as residential have been completed and the main issues to consider are housing and conservation/listed buildings related;

Background-

The Housing/Private Sector Team have confirmed they have been enforcing the Improvement Notice served under the Housing Act 2004 to this property since December 2010. Most work has been completed and has been carried out in accordance with guidance issued by Camden Conservation Officers. It further confirms that 12 self-contained flats remain as existing and that this application is mainly for refurbishment and conservation-related works.

No comments have been received from the Enforcement Team.

Conservation-

These buildings have been in a very dilapidated state for many years and have, as a result, been on the English Heritage Buildings at Risk Register. The current work has been carried out to the buildings prior to formal Planning Consent and Listed Building Consent. The applications are retrospective applications for the refurbishment works to date.

An LBCamden Conservation officer carried out a site visit and wrote on 19/10/2011 to the applicants giving detailed advice on the appropriate approach and methods of repair. At that time it was noted that the interior of the buildings had lost much of their historic significance. Still in situ were the timber vertically sliding sash windows of the front elevation, although not necessarily the original sashes, one of the internal staircases and evidence of the historic floor plan.

The Bloomsbury CAAC has commented that it is unclear if the chimney breasts survive through the two houses. On site it is clear there are no remaining chimney breasts. The Bloomsbury CAAC objection also refers to the enlarged window in the basement of No. 48. A new timber window which replaces a metal Crittall type casement, has been installed without alteration to the existing opening.

It remains unclear if the unauthorised removal of the historic internal elements was carried out under the current ownership.

Comments on the current application are as follows:

Some modest realignment of the 20th century stud walls has been carried out but this is not considered to harm the buildings special interest.

The upgrading and replacement of the windows to the flank wall of No. 46 and to the front basement of No. 48 along with those to the rear elevations have been carried out within the openings that currently exist and it is disappointing that the opportunity to improve the proportions has not been taken, contrary to the Conservation Officers advice. The proportions of the window openings on Conway Street are noticeably and inappropriately squat.

Overall it is considered however that the introduction of painted vertically sliding timber sashes is an improvement on the ugly 20th century casements.

All other refurbishment appears to have been carried out in line with the Conservation Officer's pre application

advice and as such there are no further concerns. It is therefore considered that the proposal complies with policies DP 24 and 25.

Housing and residential standards-

The drawings suggest that all 12 flats are either just meeting the criteria for a 1-bed flat or exceed it. Given the constraints of the site and its listed building status the refurbishment works are welcomed and the unit dimensions are acceptable. The proposal is therefore in line with policy DP2 and CPG2.

Lifetime Home standards-

A lifetime homes statement has not been submitted and it is clear that most criteria cannot be met. However, this is considered acceptable given the historic background of the house and its listed status and therefore acceptable.

Amenity-

No new issues introduced.

Car-Parking/Cycle-

Cycle storage has not been proposed; again, this is considered acceptable given the constraints of the site and the nature of the building.

Car-free: Since the residential units are established and no new units are proposed no car-free requirement is attached to this proposal.

Accordingly, it is recommended to grant planning permission and listed building consent.

DISCLAIMER

Decision route to be decided by nominated members on Monday 16th July 2012. For further information please click [here](#).