

Delegated Report		Analysis sheet		Expiry Date:		09/07/2010	
				Consultation Expiry Date:		14/06/2010	
Officer				Application Number(s)			
Jenny Fisher				1. 2010/2296/P 2. 2010/2308/L			
Application Address				Drawing Numbers			
50 & 51 Gordon Square London WC1H 0PQ							
PO 3/4	Area Team Signature	C&UD	Authorised Officer Signature				
Proposal(s)							
1. Demolition of existing single storey rear extension and erection of a single storey rear extension to an existing university building (Class D1). 2. Works associated with Demolition of existing single storey rear extension and erection of a single storey rear extension to an existing university building (Class D1).							
Recommendation(s):		1. Refuse Planning Permission 2. Refuse Listed Building Consent					
Application Type:		Full Planning Permission Listed Building Consent					
Conditions or Reasons for Refusal:		Refer to Draft Decision Notice					
Informatives:							
Consultations							
Adjoining Occupiers:		No. notified	16	No. of responses	00	No. of objections	00
				No. electronic	00		
Summary of consultation responses:							
CAAC/Local groups* comments: <small>*Please Specify</small>		No comment received from Bloomsbury CAAC					

Site Description

These buildings form part of a terrace of 7 early 19th century houses. They comprise 5 storeys with a basement. The terrace is on the east side of Gordon Square. The application premises back onto Connaught Hall fronting Tavistock Square. Both the application site and Connaught Hall are part of the UCL campus. The buildings accommodate a mix of office and seminar uses with a children's day care centre in the basement.

The buildings are grade 1 listed and within the Bloomsbury Conservation Area.

Relevant History

23/03/2006 (2006/0417/L) listed building consent for:

Alterations to existing walls to create new/altered openings, and the removal of partitions and doors at basement level.

Application for internal alterations to the basements of nos. 50 and 51 in order to provide a nursery. The basement contains no features or joinery of any interest and the principle of a lateral opening between nos. 50 and 51 had already been accepted.

Relevant policies

Replacement Unitary Development Plan 2006

SD6 (amenity for occupiers and neighbours); B1 (general design principles); B3 (alterations and extensions); B6 (listed buildings); B7 (conservation areas)

LDF Core Strategy and Development Policies

As the draft LDF Core Strategy and Development Policies documents have now been published, they are material planning considerations. However, as a matter of law, limited weight should be attached to them at this stage.

DP26 (managing the impact of development on occupiers and neighbours); DP24 (securing high quality design); DP25 (Conserving Camden's heritage); CS14 (promoting high quality places)

Camden Planning Guidance 2006

Bloomsbury C.A. Statement

Assessment

Proposed

Demolition of the existing single storey rear extension and its replacement with a single storey extension in the same location. The existing structure is of no architectural or historic merit and its removal is considered acceptable.

A basement extension to the rear to create an office for the Day Care Centre and to be used for meetings with Ofsted and Council representatives.

The building has a typical two room deep plan form with the stair compartment adjacent to the party wall and a modest projecting extension that rises over 3 storeys. The proposed new structure would be situated adjacent to the existing brickwork rear addition, effectively infilling the 'L' shaped plan form.

The proposed extension would be set back 300mm from the rear building line of the existing projecting extension.

The rear elevation would be brick built with a timber framed double glazed sliding sash window and concrete coping along the roof edge.

Applicant declares extension has been designed to achieve a Good BREEAM rating.

No amenity issues only matter for consideration is visual impact on the special historic character of the listed building.

The applicant was been advised (28/06/2010) that the Council has no objection to the principle of a single storey extension in this location. However, in order to preserve sense of the original plan form and shape of the building, the new infill structure should be significantly more glazed – thus retaining the solid to void pattern that is evident along the terrace. Furthermore, in order for the extension to read as a subordinate addition, it should be setback behind the line of the existing solid rear addition (500mm should be adequate).

Applicant requested a site visit however this was considered unnecessary. The drawings submitted are very clear and the applicant also submitted several clear photographs. The Council's Conservation and Design Officer worked on a previous application for the building and is therefore completely familiar with the appearance and layout of the site.

Applicant proposed a revision with a 300mm set back; a 500mm set back as required would not have provided an adequate internal layout.

Applicant was advised 06/07/2010 that the proposed revision was unacceptable. Proposed fenestration was totally out of character. This has been revised and a timber framed sliding sash window is now proposed. The applicant was again advise that what is required is something more lightweight (e.g. a conservatory) and that the proposed extension still appears too solid.

The application has been considered in the light of policy B1 that requires consideration of building lines and B3 that requires consideration of the form, proportions and character of the building and its setting and the preservation of the architectural integrity of the existing building. Policy B6 states that the Council will only grant listed building consent for alterations and extensions to a listed building where it considers this would not cause harm to the special interest of the building. Policy B7 declares that the Council will only grant planning permission for development in a conservation area that preserves or enhances the special character or appearance of the area.

Conclusion The applicant has explained that a mainly glazed extension would not be appropriate for the proposed use of the space that would be created by the extension. Unfortunately it is considered that the solid extension proposed would fail to preserve the solid to void pattern evident along the terrace and as such is contrary to UDP policies B1 (general design), B3 (extensions), B6 (listed buildings) and B7 (Conservation areas) and Camden Planning Guidance.

Recommend Refuse

Disclaimer

This is an internet copy for information purposes. If you require a copy of the signed original please contact the Culture and Environment Department on (020) 7974 5613