

Planning Solutions Team Planning and Regeneration Culture & Environment Directorate London Borough of Camden 2<sup>nd</sup> Floor 5 Pancras Square London N1C 4AG

www.camden.gov.uk/planning

Dear Mr Osgerby

Date: 07/07/2020

Our ref: 2020/0918/PRE

Contact: Sofie Fieldsend

Direct line: 020 7974 4607

## Re: 4 Cambridge Gate, NW1 4JX

Email: sofie.fieldsend@camden.gov.uk

Thank you for submitting a pre-planning application enquiry for the above property which was received on 20/02/2020, with payment of £1,693.68 received on 20/4/2020. This advice is based on the information provided as a site visit was not possible during the covid-19 pandemic.

## 1. Proposal

The proposal includes:

- Erection of single storey side extension at lower ground floor to infill existing sunken terrace with associated terrace at ground floor.
- Internal alterations including a new lift.

#### 2. Site description

The site is a Grade II listed four storey mid terrace four storey property with a linked two storey rear mews house that leads onto Cambridge Gate Mews. It is located within the Regent's Park Conservation Area.

The terrace was built in 1875 in the French Renaissance style.

# 3. Relevant planning history

# <u>Site</u>

**M11/3/13/3029-** The execution of alterations to 4, Cambridge Gate, St. Pancras, subject to the work being commenced within six months and completed within eighteen months from the first day of October, 1946, failing which this consent shall become null and void.. – **Granted 12/09/1946** 

**LSX0104310** – Minor alterations at lower ground floor level to internal courtyard including replacement of 2 No. sash windows with French doors, and 2 No. adjacent French doors with enlarged opening. Internal alterations to layout at lower ground floor. – Granted 05/06/2001

**PSX0104309** - Minor alterations at lower ground floor level to internal courtyard including replacement of 2 No. sash windows with French doors, and 2 No. adjacent French doors with enlarged opening. Internal alterations to layout at lower ground floor. – Granted 05/06/2001

1

4. Relevant policies and guidance

National Planning Policy Framework (2019)

The London Plan March 2016

### Intend to publish London Plan 2019

#### Camden Local Plan (2017)

G1 - Delivery and location of growthA1 - Managing the impact of developmentD1 - DesignD2 - Heritage

## **Camden Planning Guidance**

CPG Altering and extending your home (March 2019) CPG Amenity (March 2018) CPG Design (March 2019)

## Regent's Park Conservation Area appraisal and management strategy (2011)

## 5. Assessment

The planning considerations relevant to the current proposal are:

- Design and Heritage
- Amenity impacts

#### **Design and heritage**

#### Policy background

The Council's design policies are aimed at achieving the highest standard of design in all developments. Policy D1 requires extensions to consider the character, setting, context and the form and scale of neighbouring buildings; the quality of materials to be used; and the character and proportions of the existing building. Policy D2 additionally states that the Council will only permit development within conservation areas that preserves or enhances the character and appearance of the area. It adds that the Council will resist proposals for a change of use or alterations and extensions to a listed building where this would cause harm to the special architectural and historic interest of the building.

#### Proposal:

Erection of single storey side extension at lower ground floor to infill existing sunken terrace with associated terrace at ground floor. Internal alterations including a new lift.

#### **Assessment**

### Extension and terrace:

The development will completely infill the lower ground floor courtyard to create an enlarged bedroom and dressing space. At upper ground floor level the existing conservatory structure overlooking the courtyard will be demolished and extended towards the bay window with new patio doors inserted to access a proposed terrace.

It is noted at upper ground floor that this conservatory feature which appears to be a later addition is present in the majority of the adjoining properties and is a characteristic of the terrace.

Only proposed longitudinal sectional elevation A and B have been provided, existing versions are required for further assessment. It is assumed that the proposed extensions do not extend above the existing courtyard walls but clarity is required.

It is considered that the raising of the courtyard's ground level would be uncharacteristic and harmful to its historic character. The yard demonstrates the traditional arrangement of the house, separating it from the mews house behind. It is noted that the yard has already been reduced by the link building, as much as is conducive to retaining the legibility of the original layout and leaving the bay window expressed.

While it is not contended that uPVC is an appropriate material for this site, the conservatory part of the link structure contrary to the heritage statement has clearly been carefully designed to respect the bay window, leaving it fully expressed on all three sides. The proposal is less sympathetic and crashes into the side of the bay, removing historic fabric, harming the plan form and requiring the top of the window to be bricked up. The existing conservatory is subordinate to the bay window, having a pitched roof that makes it lower than the windows.

The form of the conservatory also appears to be repeated along the terrace. While some replacement of the conservatory and its deck might be envisaged, the wholesale enclosure of the yard below, and the partial enclosure of the bay window would not be acceptable. It is considered that it would cause harm to the legibility and historic plan form and layout of the listed building and therefore could not be supported.

Overall the Council would be unlikely to support the infill of the lower ground floor, the fenestration alterations required to facilitate it and loss of historic fabric. The proposal would be at odds with, and harm, the prevailing pattern of development along the rear of the listed terrace.

#### Internal alterations:

#### Lower ground floor:

The demolition relating to fitted cupboards and bathrooms are likely to be acceptable if they do not involve the loss of historic fabric and if the heritage has correctly assessed that the interiors and linings being of no historic interest. A site visit would be required to verify this. However, the demolition of historic walls would likely to be unacceptable in particular the stair compartment and the light well elevation.

#### Ground floor:

It is considered that the demolition of the light well wall is likely to be harmful to plan form and to historic fabric which would not be supported. As would the demolition of the side wall of the closet wing to form a glass-fronted wine room. In addition the absorption of the rear bay window into a new link structure is unacceptable, as is the conversion of its central window into a French window.

#### Mews house:

The acceptability of the alterations within the mews house will depend upon the degree to which historic fabric and plan form are present. More detail would be required.

#### <u>Lift</u>

While it is acknowledged that a lift could improve accessibility for the property it has to be considered on balance with the potential harm caused to the listed building. It is assumed that the lift location is likely in the former light well which may possibly have been filled in but the original floor plans would be required to confirm this. To install the lift it would result in the demolition of the walls and loss of historic fabric and plan form which would not be supported.

#### Lighting/Other:

The Council's Conservation Team has advised that mini spotlights or mounted AV equipment are not acceptable in historic rooms. Such lighting may be acceptable in bathrooms where not visible from outside, and in modern spaces. The inclusion of non-fitted furniture makes the drawings difficult to interpret the level of intervention of the lighting.

The lighting proposal states at ground floor level that the ceiling rose is to be moved. This is likely to be harmful and is not shown or addressed in the heritage statement.

#### General advice for detail of future listed building applications:

It is noted that the proposed plans detail the furniture, non-fitted furniture should not be shown on the floor plans. On the plans the existing walls are shown as white, the demolition as grey and the proposed as blue. It would be easier for officers if the colours were distinctly different. The Conservation Team has advised that plans showing the original layout of the house should be submitted to understand the original form of the property and how it has been altered. In addition the heritage statement could be broken down to individual rooms to improve interpretation of it.

#### Impact on neighbouring amenity

Policy A1 seeks to protect the quality of life of occupiers and neighbours by only granting permission to development that would not harm the amenity of residents. This includes factors such as privacy, outlook, implications to natural light and artificial light spill.

It is assumed that the proposed extensions do not extend above the existing courtyard walls but clarity is required. If they do not project above these walls it is unlikely that the development would cause any loss of outlook, privacy or light to any adjoining occupiers.

Whilst noise from construction would cause some disturbance to neighbouring properties the hours of operation at the site would be restricted by environmental health legislation to 08.00 and 18.00 hours Monday to Friday and 08.00 to 13.00 on Saturday and not at all on Sundays and Public Holidays.

#### 6. Planning application information

The following documents should be included with the submission of a full planning application:

- Completed application form
- An ordnance survey based location plan at 1:1250 scale denoting the application site in red
- Floor plans at a scale of 1:50 labelled 'existing' and 'proposed'
- Roof plans at a scale of 1:50 labelled 'existing' and 'proposed'
- Elevation drawings at a scale of 1:50 labelled 'existing' and 'proposed'
- Section drawings at a scale of 1:50 labelled 'existing' and 'proposed'
- Design and Access statement
- Heritage Statement
- The appropriate fee
- Please see the following link to supporting information for planning applications

https://www.camden.gov.uk/ccm/navigation/environment/planning-and-builtenvironment/planning-applications/making-an-application/supportingdocumentation--requirements-/

All pdfs submitted via the Portal should be labelled so it is clear what the drawing or document relates to e.g. 'existing front elevation'. We are legally required to consult on applications with individuals who may be affected by the proposals. We would notify neighbours by displaying a notice on or near the site and placing an advert in the local press. The Council must allow 21 days from the consultation start date for responses to be received. The applicant is encouraged to engage with the Regents Park CAAC and the residents of adjoining properties prior to any formal submission.

Non-major applications are typically determined under delegated powers, however, if more than 3 objections from neighbours or an objection from a local amenity group is received the application will be referred to the Members Briefing Panel should it be recommended for approval by officers. For more details click <u>here</u>.

## 7. Conclusion

Overall it is considered that officers would be unable to support this development at application stage in terms of the infill extension, creation of raised terrace and fenestration alterations as the proposals are considered to cause less than substantial harm without public benefits which would be required by statute to balance that harm. The internal works proposed result in a significant amount of historic fabric being removed and results in further loss of the historic plan form.

The external works/extensions further erode the original form, by enclosing the yard, bringing the principal storey to garden level, weakening the house's relationship with its mews house and obscuring original components of the rear elevation.

In seeking to justify the harm in the evidential value section of the heritage statement, it states that the interior has already been heavily altered and that "historic reconfiguration" has devalued the original form of the terrace and the mews building. It could however be argued that, despite what has been lost, the original plan form is still more or less legible, historic fabric is still present, and that, while alterations have been made, the original sequence of house-yard-mews is still present.

The Council Conservation Team would encourage you to reinstate the historic plan form by reinstating the wall between the front and back rooms of the main house or by re-enclosing the stair compartment.

This document represents an initial informal officer view of your proposals based on the information available to us at this stage and would not be binding upon the Council, nor prejudice any future planning application decisions made by the Council.

If you have any queries about the above letter or the attached document please do not hesitate to contact Sofie Fieldsend on 020 7974 4607.

Thank you for using Camden's pre-application advice service.

Yours sincerely,

Sofie Fieldsend Planning Officer Planning Solutions Team