

| | | | | |
|---|-------------------------------|---|---|--------------------------|
| Delegated Report (Members Briefing) | | Analysis sheet N/A / attached | Expiry Date: Consultation Expiry Date: | 16/07/2014 26/06/2014 |
| Officer | | Application Number(s) | | |
| Hannah Walker | | 1. 2014/3381/P 2. 2014/2311/L | | |
| Application Address | | Drawing Numbers | | |
| Flat 1, 4 St. Georges Terrace London NW1 8XH | | Refer to decision notice | | |
| PO 3/4 | Area Team Signature | C&UD | Authorised Officer Signature | |
| | | | | |
| Proposal(s) | | | | |
| 1. External alterations including installation of a replacement steel staircase to the rear and replacement French doors and window (retrospective) | | | | |
| 2. Internal and external alterations with associated refurbishment works (retrospective) | | | | |
| Recommendation(s): | Grant Listed Building Consent | | | |
| Application Type: | Listed Building Consent | | | |

| | | | | | | |
|------------------------------------|---|--|------------------|-----------|-------------------|----|
| Conditions or Reasons for Refusal: | Refer to Draft Decision Notice | | | | | |
| Informatives: | | | | | | |
| Consultations | | | | | | |
| Adjoining Occupiers: | 10 | | No. of responses | 04 | No. of objections | 02 |
| Summary of consultation responses: | <p>Site Notice Posted 30/05/14, expired 20/06/2014 Ham & High Press Notice issued 05/06/2014, expired 26/06/2014</p> <p>A resident at Flat 4, 4 St George's Terrace has objected:</p> <p><i>"Myself and my flat Ruth Wilson wish to comment on the closure of the entrance door to flat 1, included on the plan 2014/2311/L as "storeroom G3". As this work has already been carried out, it is plain to see that the work does not correspond to the plan .The plan indicates a concave closure, when in fact the work shows a convex arrangement. We would like the wall put back as it was and the banister rail reinstated as it is a safety issue.(see attached photograph). They have taken part of the wall which has encroached on the common part of the hallway. This means that we now have to negotiate a number of steps before being able to hold on to the safety rail(banister rail). Ruth Wilson and myself are now in our mid seventies. We both have arthritis which affects our balance, and I am very unsteady on my feet."</i></p> <p>This objection has been addressed at paragraph 2.5 within the assessment section of the report. Revised plans have been received which reflect the correct layout of the partition that has been inserted within the ground floor hallway.</p> <p>A comment was received on behalf of the same resident:</p> <p><i>"I am emailing you about the planning application Application reference: 2014/3381/P. My mother who is in her seventies and her friend who is has a heart condition live at the address 4, St Georges Terrace, Primrose Hill, N.W.1 8xh. I have no objection to a new steel staircase being erected. It needs to be made very clear that Flat 1 are responsible for removing the original FIRE ESCAPE staircase. This needs to be put back immediately as it is the only means of escape for the other 3 flats in the building. I have attached photographs to show where Flat 1 have removed the fire escape. It has been left in a dangerous state."</i></p> <p>This comment has been addressed at paragraph 2.8 within the assessment section of the report.</p> <p>A resident at Flat 2, 4 St George's Terrace supported the application:</p> <p><i>"We support this application. This stairway is the only exit alternative to the front door entrance to a six-storey, 4-apartment, shared house. It replaces a simple stairway that was removed by the garden flat holder. We remaining residents view this stairway and its adjacent balcony as a fire escape. It is</i></p> | | | | | |

vitally important, especially for elderly residents, that the stairway be safe and easy to use.”

Primrose Hill CAAC – object.

“Strong objection.

The application drawings submitted are not adequate for the assessment of work to a Listed Building. There is no first floor plan to show the roof terrace, to assess any impact it might have on the house and the terrace. Nor is there a rear elevation showing the adjoining houses, again to assess the impact of the work on the Listed Building in its group.

Proposed WB1 is seriously inappropriate in scale and detailed design to the Listed Building, harming its surviving forms.

The proposed widening at WB2 is seriously inappropriate in scale to the Listed Building, harming its surviving forms.

Bedroom B6, the destruction of original plan form and proportions is harmful to the Listed Building.

We would object to any changes to the stair, sufficient details of which are not provided.”

The objections raised are discussed at paragraphs 2.1-2.4 within the assessment section of the report below. Additional rear elevation drawings and details of the proposed steel staircase have been sought and received from the applicant.

CAAC/Local groups*

comments:

*Please Specify

Site Description

This Grade II listed building forms part of a terrace of 11 houses dating from c1852. The house is of 3 storeys with a basement and is constructed of pale yellow stock brick with stucco embellishment. The site is located in the Primrose Hill Conservation Area.

Relevant History

None relevant.

Relevant policies

LDF Core Strategy and Development Policies

National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) 2012
London Plan 2011

Camden LDF Core Strategy and Development Policies
CS14 Promoting high quality places and conserving our heritage
DP24: Securing high quality design
DP25: Conserving Camden's Heritage

Camden Planning Guidance 2011
CPG1 – Design & Heritage

Assessment

1.0 Proposal

1.1 This Grade II listed building is divided into flats. The applications relate to Flat 1 which is located at basement and ground floor levels. The interior of Flat 1 is very plain with few historic features surviving. Following a site visit it was discovered that work to the property had already commenced. An enforcement case was opened and work ceased on site whilst negotiations were undertaken with the Council. Additional information and justification in the form of photographs, drawings and written evidence has been submitted to the Council.

2.0 Design

2.1 Replacement French doors within the rear lightwell at basement level (WB1 and WB2). The previous doors were inserted in the 1980s and were constructed of softwood with double glazed sealed units. The apertures themselves are clearly not original and have a flat rendered surround in the case of WB1 and a rendered flat concrete lintel to WB2. Opening WB1 consisted of a pair of doors set into a wide opening, flanked by panels of glass blocks. These have been replaced by a pair of doors in the same location but with fixed glazed panels with openable toplights flanking them. The size of the aperture has not increased. The doors are painted softwood to a simple design, with 24mm double glazed units. The replacement of the unsympathetic glass blocks is a significant enhancement. Opening WB2 previously consisted of a pair of French doors. These have been replaced with simple French doors with openable toplights. Once again the aperture has not been increased in size.

The proposed replacement French doors are considered acceptable. The openings themselves have not been increased in size. Given the discrete position and simple design of the doors within the rear basement lightwell, the design and configuration of the previous 1980s doors, and the enhancement achieved through the replacement of the panels of glass blocks, the works are considered to preserve the special interest of the listed building.

2.2 Replacement French doors in the rear elevation at ground floor level (WG3). This opening is located in the rear elevation of the large rear addition. The window formerly consisted of a pair of softwood double glazed French doors with a fixed door panel to one side. These have been replaced with a pair of painted softwood French doors within the same opening. The aperture has clearly been modified and is not to its original scale or proportions, and has a flat concrete lintel. The proposed doors are considered acceptable given their simple design and the altered opening into which they are inserted.

2.3 Replacement window in the rear elevation at ground floor level (WG2). This formerly consisted of a pair of softwood double glazed casements. These have been replaced with a traditional timber double glazed sash window. The design of this is considered to be an enhancement and more appropriate for a listed building of this age and character. The proposed double glazed units are considered acceptable given that the previous units were also double glazed and that they have been inserted into a modified opening rather than an opening that retains its original character (it has had a flat concrete lintel installed).

2.4 Insertion of a small ensuite bathroom into the rear room at basement level (room B6). A partition is to be inserted parallel to the spine wall so as to create an ensuite. This will change the plan form and proportions of the room. However the rear part of the building has been significantly altered through the creation of a wide opening in the original rear wall of the building and the construction of a small extension. This has fundamentally altered the plan form and spatial quality of the rear room and as such, the proposed partitioning is considered to be a very minor intervention

which will not harm the special interest of the listed building.

2.5 Alterations to the entrance door into Flat 1 from the communal hallway. The communal hallway has already been altered, with a partition inserted within the centre of the staircase, associated with the conversion of the building to flats. The entrance door to Flat 1 at ground floor level has been removed and a new curved section of wall which follows the line of the partition above the doorway has been installed. This will divide the communal staircase from the private hallway of Flat 1. A door is to be reinstated in the traditional position from the hallway to the front room and this will serve as the main entrance into the flat. This is a very minor alteration to non-original fabric and will enhance the listed building through the reinstatement of a currently blocked up traditional opening.

An objection has been received from another resident within the building regarding the handrail to the main communal staircase. This is the original handrail which is likely to terminate on an original newel post which is currently encased within the modern partition that rises through the centre of the staircase. The position and layout of the handrail has not been altered. The objection requests that the handrail is “reinstated” however this is not possible as it has not been altered. The partition wall has simply been extended in a curve to infill the modern doorway that previously formed the entrance to Flat 1. This is not considered to harm the special interest of the listed building, particularly given that a more appropriate doorway is to be reinstated. The applicant has agreed to discuss the possibility of a secondary handrail to this wall so as to improve safety on the stairs and has confirmed that this will be raised with the freeholder’s agent.

2.6 Minor plan form changes. Within the private hallway of Flat 1 a doorway is to be installed which will create a store room now that this area no longer forms the main circulation route through the flat. This is a very minor alteration and is considered acceptable within the context of the existing conversion and the arrangement of partition walls.

2.7 Internal doors. New timber doors are proposed. These are of 4 panels, with a moulding detail to the panels for ground floor level and simple recessed panels at basement level. This reflects the expected hierarchy of features within the building and is considered acceptable.

2.8 Replacement external staircase. A steel staircase was previously in situ to the rear of the property, connecting the garden and the 1st floor roof terrace. This has been removed. It is proposed to replace this with a simple steel flight in the same location. Residents of the building have highlighted that a staircase in this location serves as a fire escape for the building and that it is critical that this is reinstated. The proposed replacement steel staircase is considered acceptable in listed building terms and there is considered to be no impediment in planning terms to its reinstatement.

3.0 Conclusion

3.1 The existing conversion of the building and the works that had already taken place prior to its listing in 1997 has altered its internal and external character. Given this context, and the design and detailing of the works that have been undertaken, these proposals are considered to preserve the special architectural and historic interest of the listed building. The external alterations will also preserve the special interest of the listed building and will preserve and enhance the character and appearance of the Primrose Hill Conservation Area. Recommend granting of planning permission and listed building consent.



