

Delegated Report		Analysis sheet	Expiry Date:	26/03/2014
		N/A / attached	Consultation Expiry Date:	25/02/2014
Officer			Application Number(s)	
Mandeep Chagger			2013/8263/P 2014/0171/L	
Application Address			Drawing Numbers	
23 Macklin Street London WC2B 5NN			See decision notice	
PO 3/4	Area Team Signature	C&UD	Authorised Officer Signature	
Proposal(s)				
<p>(i) Erection of rear first floor balcony, introduction of new windows and alterations to the front facade of dwelling.</p> <p>(ii) Erection of rear first floor balcony, introduction of new windows and replacement of door to entrance, also; internal alteration to include new stairs and re-instatement of fireplaces</p>				
Recommendation(s):	Granted			
Application Type:	Full Planning Permission			

Conditions or Reasons for Refusal:	Refer to Draft Decision Notice					
Informatives:						
Consultations						
Adjoining Occupiers:	No. notified	18	No. of responses	02	No. of objections	01
			No. electronic	00		
Summary of consultation responses:	<p>Site notice 07/02/2014 – 28/02/2014 Press advert 13/02/2014 – 06/03/2014</p> <p>One objection received from the occupiers of Flat A, 19 Macklin Street, summarised below:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Object to large first floor balcony as this will overlook patio courtyard and the rooflight of living room. 2. The creation of a large outdoor entertaining space is intrusive and will increase extra noise at a raised level in the area which is tightly-packed with residential property. 3. Not in keeping with original property and use of the space. 4. Internal renovations will bring the living areas closer to the large windows at a raised level that will overlook my property. <p>Officer comment:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The balcony has been revised to include screening to ensure no overlooking of neighbouring residential properties. 2. There is an existing courtyard which extends the depth of the balcony, therefore the noise levels would not be any worse than existing. 3. The Conservation and Urban Design Officer has been consulted and has no objections to the proposal following revisions. 4. See point No.2. <p>The Theatres Trust The Trust supports the application in principle because the proposal seeks to restore the façade and remove later internal alterations as well as rationalising the interior space to better reflect the significance of the former scene painting workshop.</p> <p>Conservation and Urban Design comments:</p> <p>These obs follow pre-app obs given on 11/9/13 (2013/4563/PRE). The concerns raised in the pre-app have been addressed in the application. However, additional concerns arising from this application were:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) There are still five windows on the eastern elevation, contrary to the pre-app. We would accept the two windows to the south, but the northern three represent an unacceptable loss of fabric and of original layout and are still unacceptable. <p>The number of windows has been reduced from five to three, which we believe to be acceptable.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 2) We are not convinced that the case has been made for removing the 					

render from the façade. No photo or painting can be found that shows the building without render. At one point, you state that the building may have been rendered to conceal 1868 damage to the brickwork, and yet the proposal gives no explanation of how it will deal with this possibility. Secondly, the 1989 proposal to reveal the brickwork that you mention appears to require the demolition of this elevation. This would not be acceptable. We will need firmer proposals about what will happen to this brickwork and for that there needs to be more investigation and exploration of what is there.

The proposal has been revised to “refurbish” the render subject to condition.

- 3) Similarly, it is not clear whether you are planning to terminate the front bays as arches or with the square-topped design shown in some of the drawings (D&A section 7.9.2). Again, we would want to know what is actually present underneath the render before we grant consent for this work which at the moment appears to be speculative. Can you scan or x-ray the area to find out what is going on under the render? Otherwise our approach would be that you should leave it alone.

The front bays are to remain unaltered.

In discussion about retaining the original render and form of the bays and reintroducing the three central pairs of doors, it was not noted that the façade windows were changing in size. **Consequently, additional drawings (172_P_40_20_a-closed_P9-140321, 172_P_40_20_b-open_P9-140321 and 172_P_40_21- Comparison_P9-140321) were requested. These show the proposed windows apertures at their existing size and position and supersede previous drawings ~~172_P_40_20_a, 172_P_40_20_b and 172_P_40_21.~~**

- 4) We would want to see external front doors retained at each level, to retain the reference to the building’s original use.

The revised proposal incorporates operable doors at each level.

- 5) How do you propose to remove the varnish from the internal brickwork?

The method is to be conditioned, subject to test panels.

- 6) The top-floor balcony is too big. It should be set back to be in line with the rest of the new internal elevation.

The drawings have been revised with the terrace pulled back to the line of the floors below.

- 7) What is going to be underneath the periphery gratings? Will you maintain a trough?

The detailed design of the trough below the grating should be subject to condition.

	<p>8) It is not clear how the ceiling of the main roof will be finished. The perspectives appear to show it plastered, while it currently has a dark, industrial tone.</p> <p>The ceiling will now be left unchanged.</p> <p>It is therefore considered that the proposal is now acceptable in C&UD terms.</p> <p>Conditions: Final treatment of façade render to be agreed. Technique of removing varnish from internal brickwork to be agreed. Detailed design of the trough below the peripheral grating to be agreed.</p>
<p>CAAC/Local groups* comments: *Please Specify</p>	<p>Covent Garden CAAC- No comment.</p>

Site Description

The structure is grade-II listed and is a positive contributor to the Seven Dials Conservation Area, at the heart of London's theatre district. It and its interior are of national importance; the Theatre Trust describes the building type as "extremely rare and significant". Built in 1850–51, the building was *Britain's first ever purpose-built scenery painting workshop* but is now a house. Around a third of the interior has already been given up to a full-height slab of residential accommodation to the south. The remaining set-up takes the form of a subservient modern box sitting respectfully within a grander historic box.

No.23 Macklin Street is located between three buildings (and fronts onto Macklin Street, a narrow side street). The west boundary 21 Macklin Street is currently occupied as a residence. The east boundary 25 Macklin Street, a converted mortuary is currently occupied with offices. To the north it shares a rear boundary with 22 Stukeley Street, that is occupied as a commercial office space.

Relevant History

2013/4563/P – Pre-application Advice for re-configuration & re-furbishment.

Relevant policies

LDF Core Strategy and Development Policies

CS5 Managing the impact of growth and development
CS6 Providing quality Homes
CS8 Promoting a successful and inclusive Camden economy
CS9 Achieving a successful Central London
CS14 Promoting high quality places and conserving our heritage

DP2 Making full use of Camden's capacity for housing

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

Camden Planning Guidance 2013
Seven Dials Estate Conservation Area Statement 1999
NPPF 2012

Assessment

1 Proposal

1.1 Consent is sought for the erection of a rear first floor balcony, introduction of new windows, alterations to the front façade of dwelling and associated internal alterations. Revised plans have been submitted throughout the course of the application reducing the size of the balcony and adding privacy screening and amendments to windows. The main issues are:

- Heritage Impact
- Amenity

2 Heritage impact

Exterior

2.1 The applicant proposes three new windows on the eastern elevation, refurbish the render on the façade and propose operable doors at each level. The balcony would be extended by 2.80m deep and 2.80m wide with a hardwood timber screen 1.45m above the terrace. The supplied drawings appear satisfactory.

Interior

2.2 Internal alterations to repositioning of the modern box dwelling within the building, new staircase to roof terrace and re-instatement of fireplaces.

3 Amenity

3.1 The surrounding buildings to the rear of the property are largely in commercial use and No.21 Macklin Street in residential use. No.21 has a single storey extension with rooflights used as a living room. The rooflights are not the only windows serving this room and as such, it is considered the proposed balcony and screening would not result in a loss of light to this room. The privacy screen is slightly wider than the balcony which would ensure there would be no overlooking to No.21. As such the proposal is considered to comply with policies CS5 and DP26 of the LDF and Camden Planning Guidance.

4 Recommendation: Grant Planning Permission and Listed Building Consent.