

| | | | | |
|---|----------------------------|--|-------------------------------------|-------------------|
| Delegated Report | | Analysis sheet | Expiry Date: | 02/11/2022 |
| | | N/A / attached | Consultation Expiry Date: | 11/12/2022 |
| Officer | | Application Number(s) | | |
| Sofie Fieldsend | | i) 2022/3835/P ii) 2022/4853/L | | |
| Application Address | | Drawing Numbers | | |
| 4 Cambridge Gate London NW1 4JX | | See decision notice | | |
| PO 3/4 | Area Team Signature | C&UD | Authorised Officer Signature | |
| | | | | |
| Proposal(s) | | | | |
| i) Erection of a side extension at ground floor following demolition of existing one and fenestration alterations, all within internal courtyard at lower ground floor. ii) Erection of side extension at ground floor following demolition of existing one and fenestration alterations, all within internal courtyard at lower ground floor plus internal alterations. | | | | |
| Recommendation(s): | | i.) Grant Full Planning Permission ii.) Grant listed building consent | | |
| Application Type: | | i.) Full planning permission ii.) Listed building consent | | |

| | | | | | | |
|---|---|--|------------------|-----------|-------------------|-----------|
| Conditions or Reasons for Refusal: | Refer to Decision Notice | | | | | |
| Informatives: | | | | | | |
| Consultations | | | | | | |
| Adjoining Occupiers: | | | No. of responses | 00 | No. of objections | 00 |
| Summary of consultation responses: | <p>A site notice was displayed on the 09/11/2022 and the consultation period expired on the 03/12/2022. A press notice was advertised on 17/11/2022 and expired on 11/12/2022.</p> <p>No objections were received during public consultation</p> | | | | | |
| Regents Park CAAC | <p>Regent's Park CAAC objected to the original scheme as follows:</p> <p>"We object within the same grounds to the 2022 application, which we advise is out of scale to the courtyard, and inappropriate in forms to the essentially domestic nineteenth-century forms conveyed by the existing details of the Listed Building. These include the canted bay and the mews details."</p> <p><i>Officer response:</i> Following revisions in line with the Council's Conservation team's comments, the CAAC withdrew their objection.</p> | | | | | |

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 townhouse was built in 1877 by Archer and Green, one of a terrace of 10.

Relevant History

Application site

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**

2020/4957/P - Erection of single storey infill extension at lower ground floor to infill existing sunken courtyard and side extension at ground floor with associated terrace. Fenestration alterations within internal courtyard at ground floor. Internal alterations. – **Refused 16/2/21**

Reason for refusal:

The proposed development would, by reason of its scale, siting, detailed design and materials, represent an unsympathetic addition that would diminish the size and quality of the courtyard space and harm the architectural and historic interest of the Grade II listed building, the prevailing pattern of rear development along the listed terrace and the character and appearance of the Regent's Park Conservation Area contrary to policies D1 (Design) and D2 (Heritage) of the Camden Local Plan (2017).

2020/4990/L- Erection of single storey infill extension at lower ground floor to infill existing sunken courtyard and side extension at ground floor with associated terrace. Fenestration alterations within internal courtyard at ground floor. Internal alterations. – **Refused 16/2/21**

Reason for refusal:

The proposed development would, by reason of its footprint, scale, siting, detailed design and materials, represent an unsympathetic addition that would diminish the size and quality of the courtyard space and result in the loss of historic fabric and plan form hence harming the architectural and historic interest of this Grade II listed building contrary to policy D2 (Heritage) of the Camden Local Plan (2017).

Relevant policies

National Planning Policy Framework (2021)

The London Plan (2021)

Camden's Local Plan (2017)

- A1 - Managing the impact of development
- D1 - Design
- D2 – Heritage
- T1 - Prioritising walking, cycling and public transport
- T3 - Transport infrastructure
- T4 – Sustainable movement of goods and materials

Supplementary Guidance

- CPG Design (2021)
- CPG Home improvements (2021)
- CPG Amenity (2021)
- CPG Transport (2021)

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

Assessment

1. Proposal

1.1 The proposal is for the following works:

- Erection of a side extension at ground floor with associated terrace in courtyard following demolition of existing one.
- Fenestration alterations within internal courtyard at lower ground floor.
- Internal alterations including the insertion of a spiral staircase between lower and upper ground floor within the link structure, removal of a partition walls and minor relocation of internal doors at lower and upper ground.

1.2 During the lifetime of the application, the following revisions were received:

- Change in detailed design of the extension from stone with aluminium frames to a more glazed and lightweight structure of brass finished steel framing with a lead roof.
- Reduction in width of the extension and it now retains the same separation distance to the rear bay as the existing.

1.3 From the refused 2020 scheme, this scheme differs in the following ways:

- There is no infill extension at lower ground floor with associated terrace above proposed
- Upper ground floor side extension is smaller in scale, pulled away from the rear bay window and a different detailed design of the extension has been pursued.

2.0 Assessment

2.1 The main considerations in relation to this proposal are:

- Design and heritage Impacts
- Amenity
- Transport

3.0 Design and heritage

3.1 The Council's design policies are aimed at achieving the highest standard of design in all developments, including where alterations and extensions are proposed. Policy D1 of Camden's Local Plan outlines that the Council will require all developments to be of the highest standard of design and will expect developments to consider character, setting, context and the form and scale of neighbouring buildings and the character and proportion of the existing building. In addition it should integrate well with the surrounding streets and contribute positively to the street frontage. Policy D2 states that Council will only permit development within conservation areas that preserves and 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.

3.2 CPG Home Improvements states that extensions should:

- Be subordinate to the building being extended, in relation to its location, form, footprint, scale, proportions, dimensions and detailing;
- Be built from materials that are sympathetic to the existing building wherever possible;
- Respect and preserve the original design and proportions of the building, including its architectural period and style;

- Respect and preserve existing architectural features, such as projecting bays, decorative balconies, cornices and chimney stacks;
- Be carefully scaled in terms of its height, width and depth;
- Allow for the retention of a reasonably sized garden;

3.3 It further adds that extensions should 'Respect and preserve the historic pattern and established townscape of the surrounding area, including the ratio of built to unbuilt space'

Assessment

3.4 Special regard has been attached to the desirability of preserving the listed building and its features of special architectural or historic interest, under s.16 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 as amended by the Enterprise and Regulatory Reform Act 2013

3.5 Special regard has been attached to the desirability of preserving the listed building or its setting or any features of special architectural or historic interest which it possesses under s.66 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 as amended by the Enterprise and Regulatory Reform Act 2013.

3.6 Special regard has been given to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character and appearance of the conservation area, under s.72 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 as amended by the Enterprise and Regulatory Reform Act 2013.

3.7 The house is unusually deep in plan with a central lightwell that was partially infilled historically to create a link structure. To the rear, it has retained its lower ground floor yard. Like all the others in the terrace, it has a specially designed, tapered, light-weight, two-storey link structure connecting it to its associated mews house that fronts Cambridge Gate Mews. The tapered ends mean that the relationship between the house and its mews, and the non-originality of the link structure, can be clearly identified. Although the rear wall of the mews house appears to have been moved a few feet into the yard, the general plan-form relationship appears largely unaltered.

3.8 At upper ground floor level the existing conservatory structure overlooking the courtyard will be demolished and marginally extended towards the rear; it will retain the separation distance to the rear bay window facing the internal courtyard as the existing structure. On this side elevation across lower and upper ground floors, the fenestration will be replaced with full height glazing, finished in brass finished steel. Sliding doors will provide access to the existing lower ground floor courtyard. This layout allows the true historic arrangement to be retained. Also, at ground floor level, unlike the refused scheme the rear bay window will be retained and unaltered which is welcomed.

3.9 It is observed that every house in the terrace appears to be furnished with a similar link building. All were clearly done simultaneously and are evidently designed to allow the rear of the house and the rear of the mews house to be read and their relationship to be understood. The yard demonstrates the traditional arrangement of the house, separating it from the mews house behind.

3.10 The existing conservatory is subordinate to the bay window, having a pitched roof that makes it lower than the windows. The link structure is canted to allow the bay window enough space to be experienced. It is considered that the proposal to remove this existing link structure and slightly extend the building towards the rear, while retaining its separation distance with the historic bay, would be acceptable and it would not result in the loss of appreciation of the bay. Its sensitive design

and scale would allow it to retain its relationship with the main house as this and the mews house are currently still read as two separate elements.

3.11 The revised elevation treatment provides the extension with a lighter and more highly glazed appearance by removing the heavy stone fins and introducing metal framing (brass finish steel framing). It is considered that the material palette including a lead roof is more in keeping with the host property and would be acceptable.

3.12 The extension would appear as a subordinate addition to the host property and, although the small side balcony at upper ground floor will be removed, the space available within the courtyard at the lower ground floor will remain unaltered. Views of the development would be limited from the street and, given that there is only a modest increase of the link extension within the central courtyard towards the rear and that it retains the existing separation distance between the rear bay, it is not considered that it would result in an increased enclosure, or have a negative impact on the setting of the listed building unlike the previously refused scheme. Therefore, the ability to appreciate the exterior appearance of the historic building would be maintained and it would not result in the loss of the relationship between the main house, mews house and their central courtyard.

3.13 The revised detailed design and footprint of the proposed link piece ensures a lightweight and more sympathetic connection. It occupies a similar footprint to the existing, retains the lead roof and mimics the canted glazed roof detail to recognise the link piece's value across the terrace. It is considered that this proposal addresses the previous refusal that would have resulted in the further reduction/erosion of the open courtyard and constituted 'less-than-substantial' harm to the designated heritage asset and the character and appearance of the Regents Park Conservation Area.

3.14 A green wall is proposed at lower ground floor to the Southern boundary within the courtyard which is welcomed. Details of its installation and maintenance will be secured by condition.

3.15 In regards to the proposed internal alterations involving alterations to the floorplan, the Council's Conservation Team raise no objection and consider the changes to have a neutral impact on the special interest of the listed building. The restoration of areas of the building of higher significance, such as the stone communal staircase, is welcomed.

3.16 Overall it is considered that replacement of the link structure at upper ground and fenestration alterations at lower ground below along with the internal alterations would not harm the character and appearance of the listed building, listed terrace and wider conservation area. It would retain the prevailing pattern of development along the rear of the listed terrace. The development would preserve the heritage asset and would not cause harm to its special architectural and historic interest.

4.0 Amenity

4.1 Local Plan Policy A1 and Camden CPG Amenity seeks to ensure that the amenity of neighbours is protected including visual privacy, outlook, sunlight, daylight and overshadowing.

4.2 The development is contained within the central lightwell and internally. As it does not extend above the existing courtyard walls there would not be a material impact on the amenity of neighbouring residential properties in terms of loss of light, privacy or outlook.

4.3 The replacement conservatory will have a similar amount of glazing to the existing structure and revisions were received so it had a solid lead roof, therefore it is not considered that the development would have a negative impact in terms of light spill.

5.0 Transport

5.1 Cambridge Gate is a private road which is managed and maintained by the Crown Estate Paving Commission. The Council's Highways Team have assessed the development and consider that a Construction Management Plan would not be required in this instance regardless.

6.0 Recommendation

6.1 Grant full planning permission and listed building consent.