

<b>Delegated Report (Members Briefing)</b>		<b>Expiry Date:</b>	<b>10/10/2016</b>	<b>Officer:</b>	<b>David Peres Da Costa</b>
<b>Application Address</b>		<b>Application Number(s)</b>	<b>1<sup>st</sup> Signature</b>	<b>2<sup>nd</sup> Signature</b>	
12 Gloucester Gate, 12 & 13 Gloucester Gate Mews London NW1 4AD		i) 2016/4549/P ii) 2016/4554/L			
<b>Proposal(s)</b>					
Erection of single storey extension connecting 12 Gloucester Gate to mews building; insertion of rooflight; excavation of basement to extend below rear courtyard and mews properties; remodelling of mews properties with sash windows at upper ground floor (facing courtyard), parapet height raised, and erection of hipped, pitched roof to 12 Gloucester Gate Mews following demolition of 12 and 13 Gloucester Gate Mews behind retained elevation facing Gloucester Gate Mews and internal alterations to 12 Gloucester Gate including installation of lift and alterations at 1st and 2nd floor level.					
<b>Recommendation(s):</b>		i) Grant conditional planning permission ii) Grant Listed building consent			
<b>Application Type:</b>		i) Full planning permission ii) Listed building consent			
<b>Consultations</b>	<b>Date advertised</b>	<b>21 days elapsed</b>	<b>Date posted</b>	<b>21 days elapsed</b>	
<b>Press notice</b>	25/8/16	15/9/16	<b>Site notice</b>	24/8/16	14/9/16
	<b>Date sent</b>	<b>21 days elapsed</b>	<b># Notified</b>	<b># Responses</b>	<b># Objections</b>
<b>Adjoining Occupier letters</b>	18/8/16	8/9/16	6		2
<b>Consultation responses (including CAACs):</b>	<p>Two objections were received including one from an occupier of Albany Street and one from British American Drama Academy (14-15 Gloucester Gate)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Demolition work will entail an enormous amount of builders' vehicle traffic in and out of Gloucester Gate Mews over many months. The entrance to these Mews is narrow and difficult to negotiate. My house, 219 Albany Street, and its neighbour 217 Albany Street, both back onto the Mews and are both vulnerable to being scraped by large vehicles.</li> <li>The extent of the proposed works would cause a complete inability of our business to operate during the period of construction. We are a Drama Academy with full time classes taking place Monday to Friday 9am -6pm. The training and education we provide would cease to be possible if there was constant construction noise bleeding through into our teaching rooms which adjoin the building next door.</li> <li>Nursery School, Bright Horizons, located within our curtilage - noise disruption which would make the children's naptime impossible</li> <li>If planning permission was to be granted we request that a condition be placed on the approval requiring the contractors to work to agreed construction arrangements to include hours of working, timing and means of access for deliveries, location of scaffolding and cranes and car parking</li> <li>Busy area and development would result in further disturbance with site traffic and parking; This would make the road and pavement area extremely</li> </ul>				

dangerous for our students and the nursery school children and parents who require space to carry out their drop offs and pickups.

- The proposed works at the rear of the properties would also result in the erection of scaffolding which would cause significant security and privacy issues for the nursery and render the playground unsafe for use during the period of the works requiring the scaffolding. Need to ensure contractors show respect for nursery school children.

*Officer's comment: The above six points relating to noise, transport issues and construction would all be covered by a construction management plan which would be secured via legal agreement.*

- Inappropriate development within the area. The proposed extreme demolition and rebuilding of these listed buildings should not be allowed.

*Officer's comment: The street elevation of the mews is being retained. No. 13 Gloucester Gate Mews has no original interior floorpan/layout/joinery etc remaining. The interior of No.12 retains its modest residential first floor with the layout and joinery of historic interest. While this type of interior is increasingly rare, it is clearly not of the grade I calibre of the main house and subsequently is of much less significance. The main house would be left, to a large extent, in its existing form. Some demolition is involved however this is in areas which appear to date from the late 20<sup>th</sup> century modifications carried out by Donald Insall Associates.*

- The Crown buildings are a key feature of the Regent's Park area and the proposed works would result in the landscape of Gloucester Gate being completely altered

*Officer's comment: The development would all be limited to the internal courtyard and mews buildings to the rear. The forecourt plan for the grade I villa would include the re-establishing of two trees to replace those which have died. The reduction in the area of soft landscaping in the central courtyard (reduced by 16sqm from 69sqm to 53sqm) would be modest.*

- Impact on adjoining building's fabric, safety and business and concern over substantial disruption

*Officer's comment: A basement impact assessment has been provided and the audit accepts ground movements would be minimal and that Damage Impact in accordance with the Burland Scale will be Category 1 (Very Slight)*

- Concern over effect that subterranean developments can have on the water table and natural water flow causing possible damage and harm to surrounding buildings. The basement area in No.14 Gloucester Gate has experienced extensive flooding during periods of heavy rain and with the extent of the proposed excavation we fear it may disturb water currently held in place by the land and generally upset the natural water flow in the area.

*Officer's comment: accepts there is a very low risk of groundwater flooding at the site or impact to the wider hydrogeological environment.*

- There is no benefit to the conservation area with this development. The character of the Conservation Area is an attractive balance of historic buildings and their settings. A key ingredient in this balance is the amount of open space which is available to the properties. In this area the open areas are already very limited and further development will destroy the balance and be detrimental to its character.

*Officer's comment: The extension would reduce the area of the courtyard by approximately 24%. The majority of the courtyard would therefore remain open.*

- Will also affect the skyline and have a direct negative impact on the open space of Bright Horizons Nursery. The proposed extension will overcrowd the

children's playground at No.14

*Officer's comments: The glazed extension would be within the courtyard between 12 Gloucester Gate and the mews buildings. There is an existing high boundary wall between No 12 and No 14 which would be retained. The boundary between the two properties also has tall dense planting and hornbeam trees which would be replaced by trellis and planting. Given the high boundary wall and planting, the impact on the playground would be limited and the proposed extension would not have a prominent appearance from the playground of No.14*

- The privacy and security of the nursery school could be compromised by a property with a direct view into their only outdoor space

*Officer's comment: There is an existing high boundary wall between No. 12 and No.14 which would be retained. A new boundary wall would be built against the existing boundary wall with trellis and planting to allow a similar level of privacy as currently enjoyed. The northernmost of the first floor windows in the mews house would allow limited oblique views into the playground of No. 14 Gloucester Gate. However the playground is already overlooked by windows at first and second floor level in the rear elevation of 12 Gloucester Gate and directly overlooked from a first floor window in the north elevation of 13 Gloucester Gate Mews. Given these existing windows, there would be no harmful loss of privacy to the courtyard / playground.*

### **Regent's Park CAAC – Object**

The Committee's main objections to this application are to the extent of demolition of listed fabric, the extent of the double basements in terms of both sustainability and the harm

to the Listed Buildings, the relation of the new work to the spaces in the Listed Buildings, energy use, light pollution, and landscape sustainability.

The Committee objects to the scale of the new work in the proposed basements and spaces in the mews houses. These spaces appear, like the catering kitchen, to be on a commercial rather than a domestic scale. They are wholly inappropriate in association with the spaces in the Listed Building. These proposals are substantially harmful to the special significance of the group.

*Officer's comment: The creation of the house's underground gym under the rear courtyard has been skilfully considered. The entrance to the gym is through a separate link which creates a clear buffer between the historic interior and the new development below ground. Distancing the old and the new in this way allows clear appreciation of the historic buildings. Whilst the internal plant room and gym would have relatively high ceiling heights, the gym and the contemporary development is well hidden so as not to impact on the historic appearance or character of the listed building. For further details, please refer to paragraph 2.5 of the assessment below.*

The extent of demolition in the mews houses is not appropriate in Grade I Listed Buildings: much more of the fabric can and should be retained.

*Officer's comment: The existing interior of No.12 retains its modest residential first floor with the layout and joinery of historic interest. While this type of interior is increasingly rare, it is clearly not of the grade I calibre of the main house and subsequently is of much less significance. The loss of the interior of No.12 at first floor level is considered modest. It would not be appropriate to refuse the application on this basis as it would be difficult to defend at appeal. For further details, please refer to paragraph 2.3 of the assessment below.*

The extensive basements appear to require substantial plant. We question this

proposal on sustainability grounds.  
*Officer's comment: An internal plant room would be provided at basement level for air handling equipment. The size of the proposed basement plant room is considered acceptable and it would not be appropriate to refuse the application on this basis. For further details, please refer to paragraph 2.24 of the assessment below.*

We are concerned with light pollution from the proposed conservatory: what methods will be used to limit light pollution?

*Officer's comment: Whilst officers consider there would be no material harm to amenity from light pollution, the impact on the character of the listed building needs to be considered. A condition would secure details of measures to mitigate light spill from the link structure and basement rooflights to ensure any the night time visual impact on the neighbouring grade I buildings would be acceptable. For further details, please refer to paragraph 2.7 of the assessment below.*

We question the sustainability of the landscape proposals: there needs to be an agreed, legally enforceable, maintenance plan for the landscape, which is an integral part of the design of the Park and its buildings.

*Officer's comment: Details of the landscaping would be secured by condition to ensure these were acceptable. For further details, please refer to paragraph 2.6 of the assessment below.*

#### **Historic England:**

We are pleased to see that the nature of our advice has been substantially incorporated within the proposals and are grateful to your council and to the applicants for the spirit of cooperation which has enabled, we feel, significant improvements to have been made to the scheme.

As the development site is Grade I listed, adjoins the Grade I registered Park and Garden of Regent's Park, and is within the Regent's Park Conservation Area we suggest that your council applies rigorous conditions to ensure that a high standard of quality and detailing is carried out. In addition our attached draft letter of authorisation applies one further condition regarding the structural security of the listed structures during the course of works.

*Before any work is undertaken in pursuance of this consent to demolish or to alter by way of partial demolition any part of the building, structural engineers' drawings a method statement, indicating the proposed method of ensuring the safety and stability of the building fabric to be retained throughout the period of demolition and reconstruction, shall be submitted to and approved by the Council as local planning authority. The relevant work shall be carried out in accordance with such structural engineers' drawings method statement thus approved.*

We recommend that this application is determined in accordance with national legislation and policy, and on the basis of your own specialist conservation advice.

#### **Site Description**

The site comprises three buildings: No. 12 Gloucester Gate (Gloucester Lodge), No. 12 and No. 13 Gloucester Gate Mews. No.12 Gloucester Gate is one half of a pair of semi-detached houses which are Grade I listed These properties face towards Regent's Park with 2 and 3 storeys and semi-basement. 12 and 13 Gloucester Gate Mews is a 2 storey mews building to the rear of 12 Gloucester Gate.

No. 12 Gloucester Gate is an existing single family dwelling house with a large forecourt and a walled

garden at the rear. Despite having its own address, No. 12 Gloucester Gate Mews has historically been an ancillary building to No. 12 Gloucester Gate. The site falls within the Regent's Park Conservation Area and adjoins the Grade I registered 'Historic Park and Garden' of Regent's Park.

### **Relevant History**

**9370129:** Demolition of single storey service annexe in rear garden together with internal and external alterations including the reinstatement of period details. Granted 15/10/1993

**2015/5961/T:** 1x pendulous ash, FELL - dead, centre of front garden of 12 Gloucester Gate, London NW1 - No objection to emergency works 09/12/2015

**2015/6092/P & 2015/6389/L:** Conversion of two residential units into a single dwellinghouse. Erection of a single storey rear extension, part raising of the courtyard including the creation of a single storey subterranean level. Erection of a single storey infill extension to the side of the dwelling. Demolition and rebuild of mews buildings No. 12 and No. 13. internal alterations, and landscaping alterations. Withdrawn 26/02/2016

**2015/6095/P & 2015/6391/L:** Conversion of two residential units into a single dwellinghouse. Excavation of basement level underneath mews buildings and installation of 2 lightwells to the front of the dwelling. Erection of a single storey rear extension, part raising of the courtyard including the creation of a single storey subterranean level. Erection of a single storey infill extension to the side of the dwelling. Demolition and rebuild of mews buildings No. 12 and No. 13. internal alterations, and landscaping alterations. Withdrawn 26/02/2016

### **Relevant policies**

#### **NPPF 2012**

#### **London Plan 2011**

#### **LDF Core Strategy and Development Policies**

CS1 (Distribution of Growth)

CS5 (Managing the Impact of Growth and Development)

CS11 (Promoting sustainable and efficient travel)

CS14 (Promoting High Quality Places and Conserving Our Heritage)

CS15 (Protecting and improving our parks and open spaces and encouraging biodiversity)

CS19 (Delivering and monitoring the Core Strategy)

DP20 (Movement of goods and materials)

DP24 (Securing High Quality Design)

DP25 (Conserving Camden's heritage)

DP26 (Managing the Impact of Development on Occupiers and Neighbours)

DP27 (Basements and lightwells)

DP28 (Noise and vibration)

#### **Camden Planning Guidance**

#### **Regent's Park Conservation Area Statement**

## Assessment

### 1. Proposal

- 1.1. The following development is proposed:
- single storey glazed extension (within the courtyard) to connect 12 Gloucester Gate to mews building;
  - insertion of rooflight;
  - excavation of single storey basement (approx. 194sqm) to extend below rear courtyard and mews properties;
  - remodelling of mews properties with sash windows at upper ground floor (facing courtyard), parapet height raised, and erection of hipped, pitched roof to 12 Gloucester Gate Mews following demolition of 12 and 13 Gloucester Gate Mews behind retained elevation facing Gloucester Gate Mews
  - internal alterations to 12 Gloucester Gate including installation of lift and alterations at 1st and 2nd floor level including replacement of dining room window.
  - Alterations to landscaping at front of property including the replacement of a small dead cherry tree at the edge of the site and replacement of the dead weeping ash located in the centre of the forecourt with the same species.
- 1.2. Revision: Following officer's conservation concerns the lightwell in the courtyard was replaced with rooflights. In addition the nibs in the lower ground floor between the front and rear rooms (12 Gloucester Gate) would be retained. Details of replacement trees for the courtyard have been provided.

### 2. Assessment

#### 2.1. Design and Heritage

- 2.2. In terms of the impact on the Listed Grade I villa, this scheme is hugely improved from the previous proposal (withdrawn). The design now reflects much of the advice from the Council's conservation officers and from Historic England.
- 2.3. No. 13 Gloucester Gate Mews has no interior floorpan/layout/joinery etc remaining. From the demolition that has already taken place it is evident that the interior was of low significance. The mews facing elevation is important and this would be retained. However the interior of No.12 retains its modest residential first floor with the layout and joinery of historic interest. While this type of interior is increasingly rare, it is clearly not of the grade I calibre of the main house and subsequently is of much less significance. The loss of the interior of No.12 at first floor level is considered modest. It would not be appropriate to refuse the application on this basis as it would be difficult to defend at appeal. A photographic record of the interior and an agreement for the salvage of the joinery would be secured by condition for the listed building consent.
- 2.4. The main house would be left, to a large extent, in its existing form. Some demolition is involved however this is in areas which appear to date from the late 20<sup>th</sup> century modifications carried out by Donald Insall Associates. The change in floor level as a result of the previous introduction of the Papworth wing would be retained. The early timber stair from the 1<sup>st</sup> to 2<sup>nd</sup> floor would be retained and repaired. The reconfiguration of the 2<sup>nd</sup> floor allows the early chimney piece in the rear bedroom to be greater appreciated. The forecourt plan for the grade I villa would include the re-establishing of two trees. This is welcomed. A traditional roof form would be reintroduced to No. 12 Gloucester Gate Mews.
- 2.5. The creation of the ancillary underground gym under the rear courtyard has been skilfully

considered. The entrance to the gym is through a separate link which creates a clear buffer between the historic interior and the new development below ground. Distancing the old and the new in this way allows clear appreciation of the historic buildings. Whilst the plant and gym would have relatively high ceiling heights, the proposed basement development is well hidden so as not to impact on the historic appearance or character of the listed building. The proposed rooflights within the landscaped area (rather than lightwell) would help to conceal the underground development.

- 2.6. The applicant has provided a heritage statement which confirms that a single-storey structure was built during the 1950s to connected 12 Gloucester Gate to the rear of 12 Gloucester Gate Mews. Listed building consent was granted to demolish this extension in 15/10/1993. The proposed extension would be in the same location as this previous extension. The single storey glazed extension would have a lightweight appearance and would have a sympathetic relationship with the rear elevation of 12 Gloucester Gate. The extension would reduce the area of the courtyard by approximately 24%. The majority of the courtyard would therefore remain open. The extension would retain an appropriate sized amenity space and the reduction in the area of soft landscaping in the courtyard (reduced by 16sqm from 69sqm to 53sqm) would be modest. Details of the courtyard landscaping would be secured by condition to ensure an appropriate landscaping scheme.
- 2.7. A condition would secure details of measures to mitigate light spill from the link structure and basement rooflights to ensure the night time visual impact on the neighbouring grade I buildings would be acceptable in conservation terms.
- 2.8. Whilst the proposed development would lead to less than substantial harm to the significance of the listed building, this harm is outweighed by the public benefits. The NPPG states the *public benefits may follow from many developments and could be anything that delivers economic, social or environmental progress as described in the National Planning Policy Framework. Benefits do not always have to be visible or accessible to the public in order to be genuine public benefits.* In this case there are a number of benefits to the scheme which would outweigh the less than substantial harm. These benefits include:
- The forecourt plan for the grade I villa includes the re-establishing of the two trees.
  - The change in floor level, as a result of the introduction of the Papworth wing, is retained.
  - The early timber stair from the 1<sup>st</sup> to 2<sup>nd</sup> floor is now retained and repaired
  - The reconfiguration of the 2<sup>nd</sup> floor allows the early chimney piece in the rear bedroom to be greater appreciated.
  - The mews houses retain their street frontages.
  - No. 12 Gloucester Gate Mews has a traditional roof form reintroduced
- 2.9. **Basement**
- 2.10. The development includes a single storey basement (with a 4.43m floor to ceiling height) which would extend below rear courtyard and mews properties. The basement would provide approximately 194sqm floorspace. The applicant has submitted a basement impact assessment which has been independently audited by Campbell Reith.
- 2.11. The BIA states that the site lies directly on a designated non-aquifer, the London Clay, and is within an area at very low risk of surface water flooding. The audit accepts that there is a very low risk of groundwater flooding at the site or impact to the wider hydrogeological environment. However, the neighbouring property reports historical basement flooding. The updated BIA submissions do not identify the potential causes of flooding to the adjacent property but have provided details of mitigation incorporated into the design of the proposed development, in

accordance with best practice.

- 2.12. The updated BIA submission confirms that the impermeable area of the site will slightly decrease due to the proposed development's basement roof slab being covered by 1.0m of topsoil, within the courtyard, and that discharge flow will remain at or slightly below existing levels.
- 2.13. The BIA includes a GMA which assesses that ground movements will be minimal and that Damage Impact in accordance with the Burland Scale will be Category 1 (Very Slight). Control of construction activities to mitigate ground movements, including an outline monitoring proposal, is presented in the BIA. This would be secured by condition requiring the scheme to be implemented in accordance with the submitted BIA.
- 2.14. **Amenity**
- 2.15. The glazed extension would be within the courtyard between 12 Gloucester Gate and the mews buildings. The northern boundary of the courtyard has an existing high boundary wall which would be retained. A new boundary wall would be built against this existing boundary wall with trellis and planting to allow a similar level of privacy as currently enjoyed. A condition would be included to ensure the details of the planted wall were acceptable. The planted screen above the wall would help to ensure that light spill to the neighbouring property would be minimised.
- 2.16. The development includes the replacement of the courtyard elevation of the mews house. The replacement elevation would include 6 sash windows (at first floor level). The existing elevation has 2 small windows and a single sash window at first floor level. The introduction of additional windows into this elevation would not harm neighbouring amenity as they would face directly towards the rear elevation of 12 Gloucester Gate which is part of the same dwelling. The neighbouring property, 14 Gloucester Gate, is occupied by a Drama School and nursery. The relatively small distance (approx. 10.5m) between these windows and the rear elevation of No.14 would not harm the amenity of neighbouring occupiers as this building is not in residential use. The northernmost of the first floor windows in the mews house would allow limited oblique views into the courtyard (playground) of No. 14 Gloucester Gate. However the courtyard / playground is already overlooked by windows at first and second floor level in the rear elevation of 12 Gloucester Gate and from a first floor window in the north elevation of 13 Gloucester Gate Mews. Given these existing windows, there would be no harmful loss of privacy to the courtyard / playground.
- 2.17. **Trees**
- 2.18. The proposal includes the removal of two dead trees (a weeping ash and a cherry tree). Permission has already been given for their removal (09/12/2015) by virtue of an earlier tree notification (2015/5961/T). A "dead or dangerous" emergency tree works notification (ref. 2015/5961/T) was received to remove both the pendulous ash in the centre of the front garden and a small, insignificant cherry tree in the corner of the front garden adjacent to the pavement. The Council did not object to the proposed works as the ash tree is dead and the cherry tree was in an advanced state of decay. A replacement tree for the pendulous ash was conditioned, a Liquidambar Styraciflua (sweet gum). A replacement for the cherry was not condition due to the insignificance of the tree (it was a small tree of poor form planted to close to other shrubs/trees).
- 2.19. A "like for like" replacement would have been conditioned with the ash but it is very difficult to source pendulous ash specimens at present due to the import restrictions on most ash species as a result of the ash dieback fungus. The species of the replacement tree can be changed, if



the applicant can source a pendulous ash that would be preferable but it is unlikely it will be possible. A Liquidambar was considered to be a similarly ornate species as they ash and suitable for the site.

- 2.20. As the removal of the trees is included in this application, a condition would be included requiring a replacement tree 'Liquidambar Styraciflua' to be planted.
- 2.21. The proposal would remove the smaller trees in the courtyard. Three of the trees to be removed are category C (trees of low quality and value). The development also requires the removal of the group of hornbeams which are used for screening at the boundary with 14 Gloucester Gate. The hornbeam hedge is a recently planted feature, with little visual amenity (as it can only be viewed from the rear of a small number of properties). Its removal would have no impact upon the streetscene, and would be unnoticed by the majority of people. The loss of this group would be mitigated by a replacement Hornbeam hedge adjacent to the mews house. Drainage details for the trees have been provided and would be acceptable. The soil volume is sufficient at this location to establish and sustain the hedge during its life-expectancy.
- 2.22. A 1m soil depth would be provided above the basement to allow a wide range of planting suitable for the area. The reduction in the area of soft landscaping in the courtyard (reduced by 16sqm from 69sqm to 53sqm) would be modest. Details of the landscaping would be secured by condition to ensure these were acceptable.
- 2.23. **Plant**
- 2.24. An internal plant room would be provided at basement level for air handling equipment. The plant room would have a ventilation grill in the first floor flat roof. A noise condition would be included to ensure noise levels did not harm neighbouring amenity.
- 2.25. **Transport**
- 2.26. Given the proposed basement excavation a construction management plan would be secured via legal agreement. The footway and vehicular crossover directly adjacent to the site could be damaged as a direct result of the proposed works. To allow the proposal to comply with Development Policy DP21, a financial contribution for highway works (£5000) would be secured via legal agreement. This would allow the Council to repave the access to the private road from the public highway (Albany Street) if necessary. This would be refunded if the Council were to decide that repairs were not necessary on completion of the development (i.e. if the development does not cause damage worthy of repair).
- 2.27. **Recommendation**
- 2.28. Grant conditional planning permission subject to a s106 legal agreement and listed building consent.

***The decision to refer an application to Planning Committee lies with the Director of Regeneration and Planning. Following the Members Briefing panel on Monday 21<sup>st</sup> of November 2016, nominated members will advise whether they consider this application should be reported to the Planning Committee. For further information, please go to [www.camden.gov.uk](http://www.camden.gov.uk) and search for 'Members Briefing'.***