

<b>Delegated Report</b>		<b>Analysis sheet</b>		<b>Expiry Date:</b>		<b>08/05/2014</b>	
		N/A / attached		<b>Consultation Expiry Date:</b>		19/06/2014	
<b>Officer</b>				<b>Application Number(s)</b>			
Obote Hope				2014/2420/P			
<b>Application Address</b>				<b>Drawing Numbers</b>			
Flat E Guilford Court 51 Guilford Street WC1N 1ES				Please refer to 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>							
Replacement of existing windows with 1 x fixed double glazing and 1 x double glazed sliding window both fitted within the existing hardwood frame, located to the front elevation at second floor level.							
<b>Recommendation(s):</b>		Grant planning permission					
<b>Application Type:</b>		Full Planning Permission					
<b>Conditions or Reasons for Refusal:</b>		Refer to Draft Decision Notice					
<b>Informatives:</b>							
<b>Consultations</b>							
<b>Adjoining Occupiers:</b>		No. notified	<b>15</b>	No. of responses	<b>05</b>	No. of objections	<b>03</b>
				No. electronic	<b>04</b>		
<b>Summary of consultation responses:</b>		<p><b>The owner/occupier of flat F commented as follows:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The windows of the block have already been changed and would be inappropriate and unnecessary to have the windows re-changed. <i>(Please see paragraph 4 for officers comments)</i></li> </ul> <p><b>Flat D objects to the proposed change are as follows:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>In 2009 LB Camden agreed a proposal to replace the existing sliding windows in Guilford Court with a mix of fixed units and hinged ventilation quarter lights. <i>(Please see paragraph 4 for officers comments)</i></li> <li>It would be very unfortunate if this proposal were to be agreed by the council since it could open up the possibility of other leaseholders deciding to renovate their windows in a differing fashions. <i>(Please see paragraph 4 and para 6 for officers comments)</i></li> <li>We therefore argue that the proposal should be rejected because it represents a significant variation from the approved design. <i>(Please see paragraph 4 and 6.3 for officers comments)</i></li> <li>Our objections therefore are that the change would seriously affect the</li> </ul>					

	<p>external appearance of the building (<i>Please see paragraph 4 and para 6.3 for officers comments</i>)</p> <p><b>Defries and Associates Ltd objects to the proposed change are as follows:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Permission was granted at the end of the year, and the leaseholder (Guilford Court Freehold Limited and Guilford Court Management Ltd) held extensive discussion with other leaseholders and it was decided to adopt those plans for the building as a whole. It would be very unfortunate if this proposal were to be agreed by the council since it could open up the possibility of other leaseholders deciding to renovate their windows in a differing fashions. (<i>Please see paragraph 6.2 for officers comments</i>)</li> </ul>
<p><b>CAAC/Local groups comments:</b></p>	<p><b>Bloomsbury CAAC</b> commented – no objection was raised</p> <p><b>Marchmonth Street Resident Association</b> objection are as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• It would be very unfortunate if this proposal were to be agreed by the Council since it could open up the possibility of other leaseholders deciding to renovate their windows in a differing fashions (<i>Please see paragraph 6.2 for officers comments</i>)</li> <li>• There would then be two (or more) differing approved ways of renovating the windows in existence and the exterior appearance of the block could be detrimentally affected proposal should be rejected (<i>Please see paragraph 4 and 6.2 for officers comments</i>)</li> <li>• The window represents a significant variation from the approved design and would seriously affect the external appearance of the building (<i>Please see paragraph 4 and 6.3 for officers comments</i>)</li> </ul>

## Site Description

The site is located on the south of Guildford Street with Queen Square to the rear. The site comprises a 4 storey residential block with mansard roof in an area that is characterised of a combination of office and residential accommodation. The block is not listed but is located within the Bloomsbury Conservation Area. The application relates to a flat located on the second floor of the building.

## Relevant History

24/11/2004 – **p.p granted (2004/4016/P)** for replacement of existing sliding glass (frameless) windows with aluminium (colour brown) sliding framed windows.

05/01/2010 – **p.p. granted (2009/5343/P)** for replacement of existing sliding glass windows with fixed double glazing windows and alterations to top lights from fixed to outward opening, to second floor flat (Class C3) on the front and side elevation.

## Relevant policies

### LDF Core Strategy and Development Policies

#### Core Strategies

CS1 (Distribution of growth)

CS5 (Managing the impact of growth and development)

CS14 (Promoting high quality places and conserving our heritage)

#### Development Policies

DP24 (Securing high quality design)

DP25 (Conserving Camden's heritage)

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

## **Assessment**

### **1.0 Proposal** - Permission is sought for the following:

- To replace the existing 2 x glazing panels with 1 x fixed double glazed and 1 x double framed sliding windows to the front elevation of second floor flat. No alterations are proposed to the existing frame.

### **2.0 Background**

2.1 Permission (2009/5343/P) was approved in 2009 for the same proposal for one of the flats located on the second floor. Permission is now sought for the installation of new windows within the existing frame associated with flat E of a similar design with some of the neighbouring flats.

### **3.0 Main issues**

3.1 The impact of the proposal on the character and appearance of the conservation area and residential amenity are the main considerations.

### **4.0 Design**

4.1 The original fenestration of the host building comprises overlapping sliding glazed panels with fixed top panels in brown timber frames. The fenestration across the front and side elevation of the building is not entirely original, a window on the side elevation at ground floor level has been replaced with entirely fixed windows and at third floor with fixed panels. Permission was approved in 2004 for the replacement of the frameless glass panels with aluminium framed windows with a central glazing bar. However this scheme was only partially implemented.

4.2 The proposed alterations follow the same design as the recently approved scheme (2009/5343/P). The design comprises the retention of the existing frame and inserting double glazing bar. The top panel/ fanlights would be retained as part of the proposed scheme.

4.3 The original overlapping sliding glazed panels can be distinguished from the street however it is not considered to be such a prominent architectural feature of the building as to insist on its retention. The main feature of the fenestration pattern is considered to be the large expanse of glass with no central glazing bar.

4.4 The proposed changes would have limited visual impact with the current design of the proposed window as the material would be similar to what already exists in terms of retaining the fan lights and using the same timber panels. The proposed window would match the neighbouring flat in terms of having a central sliding frame of a similar design to three other flats within the same block. The proposed single window pane glass to the west the proposed glazing is fixed therefore, would match the design of the existing windows in keeping with the neighbouring flats.

4.5 The proposed replacement design is considered to be in line with the overall pattern, character, materials and dimensions of the fenestration on the host building. It is considered that the thickness of the top panel windows, being top openable, would not have a detrimental impact on the overall appearance of the building in the wider context in terms of its design. Therefore, it is considered that the proposed works would be in accordance with DP24 and DP25 of the LDF.

4.6 I am of the opinion that the proposed replacement of the windows on the front elevation, would not have a detrimental impact on the character and appearance of the host building or the wider conservation area.

### **5.0 Amenity**

5.1 It is considered the proposals would not have a detrimental impact on the amenity of the any neighbouring occupiers or residents in comparison to the existing situation.

## **6.0 Officers Comments**

6.1 The proposed windows design are already established with approximately 3 other flats within the block of approximately 9 units. The proposed window through having a central located double glazing bar would not have a detrimental impact on the host building due to its design.

6.2 The prior agreement between the residence in regards to the proposed up keep and design of the windows can only be accessed by the planner on design terms. The contractual arrangement in regards to any privately discussed agreement between the leaseholder does not bear any material considerations. Therefore, the plans and elevation drawings submitted with this application are purely assist against planning policies together with any design implication of the proposed scheme. Furthermore, any leaseholder discussions are civil matters and are not a material planning consideration in this instance.

6.3 It is considered in this instance that the proposed windows are not of a significant variation in terms of the design to the existing or neighbouring properties. The proposed materials used would be the same as existing.

6.4 Understandably it is important to retain the the look and feel of the building. Whilst, making sure that future development do not compromise the host building or fail to preserve and enhance the conservation area. I am of the opinion that these minor changes to the windows would not be contrary to planning policies, and as such, it would be extremely difficult to recommend refusal for this application.

## **7.0 Recommendation**

7.1 Grant planning permission