

Bm

de dated 10.11.98



Development Control
Planning Services
London Borough of Camden
Town Hall
Argyle Street
London WC1H 8ND
Tel 0171 278 4444
Fax 0171 314 1975

OBS FROM CONSERVATION AND DESIGN/FLEXIBLE AUTHORITY

To: HARR/PARJ/LEOS/MARD/METB/JACN/BLUR/MACK/
BRAC/VOLM
From: Jay Turner Ref: PS9804997

Case File :N15/13/A

Date: 4th November 1998

50c Red Lion Street, WC1

Conversion and extension of existing office studio/dwelling
(Plans submitted)

BLO Bloomsbury Conservation Area

I attach a copy of application form and plan/s (if available) and will be contacting you shortly to discuss the application. Comments to be returned within 14 days from the date of this request.

Observations:

Site inspection made 17/11/98. The front of the building can be seen by entering the alley between 50 & 51 Red Lion St. It is attractively picturesque in timber construction with large multipane windows at first floor with a loading opening in centre. There is a long dormer to the slated (appears slate) roof plus some patent glazing to the front slope. The wall in front of the building is in granite sets adding to the attractive appearance which makes a positive contribution to the conservation area. The rear elevation faces banks Conduit Passage across quality space to Tresham House.

C and D Summary: Recommendation

Unsatisfactory

Relevant policies:

EN 33 EN 27 EN 26 EN 57

Signed: Bruce Mettew

Dated: 18/11/98

pacis/cdobs/IC&D

Relevant SPG paras:

across quality space to Tresham House.

The application site seems to have ~~exactly~~ a door onto this amenity space - the back of which is at a higher level. The application drawings are marked with a boundary which indicates that none of this amenity space is owned by the applicant. The wall of the application site visible from
(continued over) →

Lambert Conduit passage^② is brick of 3 distinct colours with, in addition to the door already referred to, 2 semi-circular windows at first floor which do not appear to have window frames and 2 square windows at ground floor - which are quite close to ground. These latter are the back windows to the office. Immediately to the south of the site & abutting the site is 20/22 Princeton St, a block of flats, called Ossington Court. The main part of the premises is 2 storey plus a roof with dormers/rooflights whilst the wall facing Lambert Conduit Passage is a full 3 storey. The existing pitched roof is not visible because this wall provides a storey high parapet above it.

The proposal.

The rear taller area with a stone slab floor at 1st floor but no roof is to be partially demolished & brought into use as part of the house/studio. The rear roof slope is removed and a flat roof taken across from the ridge to this rear wall creating another floor.

It is proposed that this roof be used as a terrace. Further windows are proposed through the party wall onto the open space.

Comments.

Although theoretically the roof terrace would not raise the height a parapet would be necessary ^{possibly} which would increase the height - above the ridge and alter the appearance from the front.

This terrace would be overlooked by surrounding premises. I do not ~~consider~~ ^{consider} this ^{terrace} satisfactory. With regard to the new openings in the wall at 2nd floor ~~there~~ the window W7 is a projection over land not owned by the applicant and also a balcony is proposed. These are new projections and are not normally acceptable.

Additionally ⁽³⁾
~~Similarly~~ The additional window ~~is~~ W7
would allow overlooking of windows
in Oannon Court.

The additional windows at 1st floor are
in party walls. Unless the applicant can
demonstrate an interest in the land I
don't think we should agree these.

I think the space at second floor created
by altering the roof and the use of the
space within the ^{height of the} existing rear brick wall
perhaps lit by rooflights is the only
thing we could regard as satisfactory.

I have taken very quickly to building control
and they say additional windows/openings in party
wall are not acceptable. They also said that internally
the layout was not satisfactory in the way the staircases
are arranged. This being an unlisted building it
would not be a concern for us.