

Delegated Report		Analysis sheet		Expiry Date:	14/03/2012
		N/A / attached		Consultation Expiry Date:	23/2/2012
Officer			Application Number(s)		
Hugh Miller			A: 2011/6371/P B: 2012/0188/L		
Application Address			Drawing Numbers		
3 Leigh Street London WC1H 9EW			Refer to draft decision notice		
PO 3/4	Area Team Signature	C&UD	Authorised Officer Signature		
Proposal(s)					
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ A: 2011/6371/P - The replacement of existing roof extension staircase enclosure and installation of new enclosure with glazed balustrade associated with the use as a roof terrace to residential maisonette (Class C3). ➤ B: 2012/0188/L - Works in association with the replacement of existing roof extension staircase enclosure and installation of new enclosure with glazed balustrade associated with the use as a roof terrace ancillary to residential maisonette (Class C3). 					
Recommendation(s):		A: Refuse planning permission reference - 2011/6371/P B: Refuse Listed building consent reference - 2011/0188/L.			
Application Type:		Full Planning Permission			

Conditions or Reasons for Refusal:	Refer to Draft Decision Notice					
Informatives:						
Consultations						
Adjoining Occupiers:	No. notified	12	No. of responses	01	No. of objections	01
			No. Electronic	00		
Summary of consultation responses:	<p>The application was advertised in Ham & High on 2/2/2012, expires 23/2/2012. Site Notice displayed 26/1/2012, expires 16/2/2012.</p> <p><u>First Floor Flat, 96 Marchmont St – Objection</u></p> <p>There is a terrace to the rear of this property which overlooks the rear of 3 Leigh Street. There are also windows in the bedroom and bathroom which look out onto the backs of the properties on Leigh Street.</p> <p>The application documents the one of Jan 19 Revised Drawing 3LS Section, East Elevation Rev A. This document draws specific attention to the fact that there is no sightline from eyelevel from the street below to the proposed edifice on the roof of no. 3. However there is no mention in this document or the one with the North, South and West elevations of any sightline questions relating to the rear of the property.</p> <p>I am concerned that from the first floor level of 96 Marchmont Street it will be possible to see the top of the new construction and thus interrupt the present building roofline with an ugly modern intrusion. The height of the new edifice needs to be sufficiently reduced, if necessary, to ensure that there is no difficulty at the rear, just as it is suggested there is no difficulty from the street side.</p>					
CAAC/Local groups* comments: *Please Specify	<p><u>Bloomsbury CAAC: Objection</u></p> <p>The increased stair enclosure is unacceptable in listed building terms as it would further detract from the roofscape of the terrace by reason of its bulk height location and design. This should be refused.</p>					

Site Description

A basement 4-storey terraced property situated on the south side of Leigh Street near the junction with Marchmont Street and north of Tavistock Place and Compton Place. The building has been sub-divided into self-contained flats. The property's original roof has been removed and the flat roof contains a rooftop access enclosure accessed from the upper floor by a spiral staircase. The existing roof enclosure is seen in glimpsed views from Cartwright Gardens and at the rear from Compton Place and through a passage between buildings on Tavistock Place. The remainder of the terrace has original 'V' shaped roof forms plus small dormer windows.

Relevant History

13/4/1988 – PP Granted - Change of use including works of conversion to form a self-contained flat and an upper maisonette with the erection of a conservatory at the rear front railings and a roof extension; ref. 8701915.

Associated (April 1998) – LBC - Works of conversion and alteration with the erection of a roof extension front railings and the formation of a rear extension; ref. 8770262

June 1986 – PP Granted - Change of use and works of conversion to form bedsitters at basement and 1st floor levels four person maisonette at second and third floor with retention of ground floor shop unit; ref. 8600200

Associated LBC - Alterations to form bedsitters at basement and first floor levels four person maisonette at second and third floor with retention of ground floor shop unit; ref. 8670053.

Relevant policies

LDF Core Strategy and Development Policies

CS5 (Managing the impact of growth and development)

CS14 (Promoting high quality places and conserving heritage / conservation areas)

Development Policies

DP24 (Securing high quality design)

DP25 (Conserving Camden's heritage / conservation areas)

DP26 (Managing the impact of development on occupiers and neighbours)

CPG 2011

Bloomsbury Conservation Area Statement

Assessment

1.0 Overview

1.1 In April 1988, the Council granted planning permission for change of use including works of conversion to form a self-contained flat and an upper maisonette with the erection of a conservatory at the rear front railings and a roof extension.

1.2 The basic structure of the roof extension / stair enclosure has not altered since it was first erected. It is also subjected to rain water ingress and makes for uncomfortable accommodation during the extreme weather conditions. The remainder of the roof comprises a roof terrace used by the occupiers.

2.0 Proposal

- **A:** 2011/6371/P - The replacement of existing roof extension staircase enclosure and installation of new glazed enclosure with balustrade associated with the use as a roof terrace to residential maisonette (Class C3).
- **B:** 2012/0188/L - Works in association with the replacement of existing roof extension staircase enclosure and installation of new enclosure with glazed balustrade associated with the use as a roof terrace ancillary to residential maisonette (Class C3).

2.1 The main issues are **a]** design, **b]** impact on the appearance of the building and on the character and appearance of the C.A; **c]** neighbour amenity.

2.2 The applicant amended the proposal during the course of the assessment of the scheme by **a]** removal of sun louvre/ canopy **b]** change timber cladding and reduce glazing for slate / zinc/ lead cladding finish and **c]** increase the glazing to the east elevation.

3.0 Design and appearance/ Listed buildings

3.1 The Council's Local Development Framework Development Policies (LDP) Policy DP24 (*Securing high quality design*) states "The Council will require all developments, including alterations and extensions to existing buildings, to be of the highest standard of design and will expect developments to consider:

- a)** character, setting, context and the form and scale of neighbouring buildings;
- b)** the character and proportions of the existing building, where alterations and extensions are proposed;
- c)** the quality of materials to be used.

Respecting local character

3.2 Paragraph 24.12 states "In order to best preserve and enhance the positive elements of local character within the borough, we need to recognise and understand the factors that create it. Designs for new buildings, and alterations and extensions, should respect the character and appearance of the local area and neighbouring buildings. Within areas of distinctive character, development should reinforce those elements which create the character. Where townscape is particularly uniform attention should be paid to responding closely to the prevailing scale, form and proportions and materials. In areas of low quality or where no pattern prevails, development should improve the quality of an area and give a stronger identity.

3.3 Paragraph 24.13 states "... Overly large extensions can disfigure a building and upset its proportions. Extensions should therefore be subordinate to the original building in terms of scale and situation unless, exceptionally, it is demonstrated that this is not appropriate given the specific circumstances of the building. Past alterations or extensions to surrounding properties should not necessarily be regarded as a precedent for subsequent proposals for alterations and extensions".

3.4 Policy DP25 (Conserving Camden's heritage) state "To preserve or enhance the borough's listed buildings, the Council will: **f)** only grant consent for alterations and extensions to listed building

where it considers this would not cause harm to the special interest of the building”;

Paragraph 25.13 states “In order to protect listed buildings, the Council will control external and internal works that affect their special architectural or historic interest. Consent is required for any alterations, including some repairs, which would affect the special interest of a listed building. The matters which will be taken into consideration in an application for alterations and extensions to a listed building are those set out in Policy HE7 of PPS5”.

3.5 Planning Policy Statement (PPS) 5, Para. HE7.4 states “Local planning authorities should take into account:

- the desirability of sustaining and enhancing the significance of heritage assets, and of utilising their positive role in place-shaping; and
- the positive contribution that conservation of heritage assets and the historic environment generally can make to the establishment and maintenance of sustainable communities and economic vitality by virtue of the factors set out in HE3.1”.

3.6 Paragraph HE7.5 states “Local planning authorities should take into account the desirability of new development making a positive contribution to the character and local distinctiveness of the historic environment. The consideration of design should include scale, height, massing, alignment, materials and use”.

3.7 Paragraph HE8.1 states “The effect of an application on the significance of such a heritage asset or its setting is a material consideration in determining the application. When identifying such heritage assets during the planning process, a local planning authority should be clear that the asset meets the heritage asset criteria set out in Annex 2...”

3.8 Paragraph HE9.1 states “There should be a presumption in favour of the conservation of designated heritage assets and the more significant the designated heritage asset, the greater the presumption in favour of its conservation should be....”

3.9 Paragraph 6.5 of The Bloomsbury Conservation Area Appraisal and Management Strategy state “Inevitably there are buildings that detract from the character and appearance of the Conservation Area. This may be due to a building's scale, materials, relationship to the street or due to the impact of alterations and extensions. There are also structures and elements of streetscape that impinge on the character and quality of the Conservation Area”.

3.10 Paragraph HE9.2 states “Where the application will lead to substantial harm to or total loss of significance local planning authorities should refuse consent unless it can be demonstrated that:

- (i) the substantial harm to or loss of significance is necessary in order to deliver substantial public benefits that outweigh that harm or loss;

Roof extension / External alterations

3.11 The roof alteration and the missing (valley/ butterfly) roof form to this building is the exception to the terrace of buildings with small single dormer windows to the front roofslope. Roof extensions of this type and in particularly for a listed building of historic interest are normally contrary to policy and guidance.

3.12 The proposed roof extension has dimension of 2.6m depth x 3.5m width x 2.5 m height (front) 2.1m (rear). It would replace a much smaller extension 1.6m depth x 2.125m width x 2.28m height. The revised proposal retains the proportions as original submitted with alternative materials and the amount of glazed walls reduced to ensure conformity with existing roof appearance. The proposed extension would be marginally taller than the existing although the proposed floorspace measure 9.41sqm against the existing 3.4sqm. At the front, the footprint of the extension would not extend closer to Leigh Street than the existing addition which is largely hidden from view. The extension would be partially visible through mature trees in long views from Cartwright Gardens and from Tavistock Place & Compton Place. In this context, the proposed extension is assessed against the

related policy justifications and guidelines referred to above. Notwithstanding, the replacement standing seam zinc / lead together with reduced glazed walls is considered unacceptable. The increase in height together with increased footprint would make it more visually prominent when compared with the existing. The enlarge extension would be obtrusive from long views from the public realm in Cartwright Gardens, Tavistock Place and Compton Place and it would not complement the appearance of the roofscape of the host building and the terrace of which it forms part.

Glazed balustrades

3.13 New glazed balustrades at 1150mm high and set back 800mm from the front and rear elevations would be erected to the roof terrace. Due to their location these glazed balustrades would be largely discernible in long and short views and is not considered to cause undue harm to the appearance of the host building and roofscape. The proposed balustrades are acceptable.

3.14 Although the proposed roof extension was amended and is considered to be an improvement on the original, it is considered that the increase in footprint and height is unacceptable in this instance and that a precedent has not been set.

Internal alteration

3.15 It is proposed to install a new more conventional internal staircase as replacement for the metal spiral staircase. The new staircase would not harm the existing form or proportions of the landing or the existing main staircase. In fact, it is considered that the more conventional design would better suit the traditional interior of the host building, moreover, it would enhance rather than cause harm to the buildings' historic interest and is acceptable.

4.0 Neighbour amenity

4.1 A neighbour noted that the extension would be visible from rear windows at Marchmont St. 1st floor level and concerns have been raised about the visual impact of the proposal and the sightlines excluded from the submitted drawings which would demonstrate its visual impact.

4.2 The revised scheme with lead and zinc cladding plus reduced glazed walls has improved the extension appearance. As noted above the extension being closer to the rear parapet would be visually prominent from private and the public realm and is considered to be harmful.

4.3 The setting of the extension, the 1150mm high balustrade plus the distance between the extension and windows of properties that lies due south would ensure that no overlooking or loss of privacy would occur. It is considered that the proposed roof extension would not result in an unreasonable amount of additional overlooking of the neighbouring occupiers and the proposal is acceptable in this regards.

Recommendation: Refuse planning and listed building consent.