

Item No. 6.1	Classification: Open	Date: 26 January 2012	Meeting Name: Borough and Bankside Community Council
Report title:	Development Management planning application: Application 11-AP-2398 for: Listed Building Consent Address: 8 COLNBROOK STREET, LONDON, SE1 6EZ Proposal: Listed Building Consent Demolition of existing rear addition. Reducing part of garden level to lower ground floor level & construction of a new single storey rear extension comprising a new kitchen. New external steps from lower ground floor up to retained garden level. Complete refurbishment of the listed property including a new bathroom & cloakroom. Blocking up some existing openings & forming new openings to internal walls. Repair of existing sash windows where viable, & replacement windows to match existing elsewhere. Construction of a mansard roof extension.		
Ward(s) or groups affected:	Cathedrals		
From:	Head of Development Management		
Application Start Date 22 July 2011		Application Expiry Date 16 September 2011	

RECOMMENDATION

- 1 Grant listed building consent subject to conditions.

BACKGROUND INFORMATION

Site location and description

- 2 The site refers to a mid terrace three storey including basement level, single family dwelling on the eastern side of Colnbrook Street. The property is part of a Grade II group listing of the terrace of 17 houses, listed in 1989. The property is also situated within the West Square Conservation Area.

Details of proposal

- 3 The erection of a single storey ground floor rear extension measuring 5000mm in length, 2475mm in width and 2840mm in height, consisting of a main part constructed in brick with a slate roof, and a timber framed glazed 'link' between the rear of the property and the new extension.
- 4 The insertion of a door at basement level in replacement of existing window. Following objections from Design and Conservation this has now been restricted to the drop down of the existing window opening and no widening. The excavation of a terrace area with new external steps up to garden level. Opening up of two basement rooms with 1.35m opening, blocking up of hall opening and opening between basement and first floor to the existing rear extension.

- 5 Blocking up of opening between two rooms on the ground floor. The restoration/refurbishment of timber sliding sash windows to the front and rear elevations, where they are found to be beyond repair these will be replaced to match the existing, conditions proposed to ensure this.
- 6 The construction of a mansard roof extension, set back from both the front and rear parapet walls with terrace area to the front, constructed with natural slates to the sloping walls; and the replacement of the detailing cornicing to this parapet.
- 7 A planning application for the works which require such, is also included within this agenda (11-AP-2397)

Planning history

- 8 Applications for planning permission and listed building consent were granted on 23/11/07 for the erection of a mansard roof extension and a rear extension including conservatory (Ref: 07-AP-1416 and 07-AP-1417). These applications expired on 23/11/10. The proposed roof extension included in this scheme is the same previously approved.
- 9 Applications for planning permission and listed building consent were submitted on 26/11/2010 for a similar scheme but with a full width rear extension (Ref: 10-AP-3440 and 10-AP-3439). These applications were withdrawn following advice that they were likely to be refused on design grounds. It was considered that the loss of the original butterfly roof would be an unacceptable loss of historic form and fabric and the rear extension at full width was considered excessive in scale and completely incongruous in its contemporary design.
- 10 Applications for planning permission and listed building consent were submitted on 25/03/11 for the erection of a full width ground floor single storey extension (Ref: 11-AP-0961 and 11-AP-0962). These applications were again withdrawn following advise it was likely they would be refused as the size of the rear extension was excessive and likely to harm the integrity of the listed building.
- 11 This application was submitted originally just for the rear extension, stating the mansard roof extension permission from 2007 had commenced implementation within the 3 year time frame. However, as conditions precedent had not been discharged on the 2007 permission the applicant was advised that the application had expired, and therefore the mansard roof extension was also included in the current applications for planning permission and listed building consent. The proposed extension is largely the same as the 2007 permitted scheme. Extensive internal alterations have been undertaken with little fabric of historical interest being retained. An application for planning permission for the works have also been submitted (11-AP-2397) and is to be considered at this meeting also.

Planning history of adjoining sites

- 12 Many of the properties in the immediate surrounding area (Colnbrook Street and Gladstone Street) have mansard roof extensions of varying designs. To note are No.5 Colnbrook Street, where planning permission was granted and listed building consent granted on appeal in 2010 for a mansard roof extension at the property including a terrace area at roof level on the front elevation. 6 Colnbrook Street also has a mansard roof extension with terrace to the front, whilst no.10 Colnbrook Street has a mansard roof extension with a terrace above although this does not appear to have been granted planning permission or listed building consent it is likely the work is historic.

KEY ISSUES FOR CONSIDERATION

Summary of main issues

13 The main issues to be considered in respect of this application are:

a) The impact of the proposal on the appearance and setting of the listed building in its context with the group.

Planning policy

Core Strategy 2011

14 Strategic Policy 12 – Design and conservation

Southwark Plan 2007 (July) - saved policies

15 3.17 Listed Buildings

London Plan 2011

16 Policy 7.4 Local Character
Policy 7.6 Architecture

Planning Policy Guidance (PPG) and Planning Policy Statements (PPS)

17 PPS5 Planning for the Historic Environment.

Principle of development

18 The principle of alterations to a listed building acceptable providing the works present sensitive upgrading to the building.

Design issues and Impact on character and setting of a listed building and/or conservation area

19 Design and Conservation raised some concerns over elements of the proposed scheme firstly, the width of the opening proposed at basement level to give access to the rear terrace area, which officers considered should be no wider than the existing window opening, and this has been amended. Secondly, the decision not to reinstate the cornicing to the parapet on the front elevation of the building, which has also been reconsidered by the applicant and included as part of the application. Thirdly, Officers have considered the objection in relation to the terrace at roof level however it is considered that given the set back of the dormers, and as it is now intended to replace the cornice to the parapet which will greatly improve the front elevation of the property, and as the terrace will not be visible from street level the character of the property will not be adversely affected by the introduction of the terrace area. It is unlikely the terrace will be overly used given it serves a bedroom and is relatively small in size, and the placement of any additional material such as trellising which would detract from the character of the front elevation of the building can be restricted by condition.

20 The proposed development preserves the features of the property of historic or architectural significance, and returns this historic building back to its optimal use.

21 The rear extension is considered to compliment the historic character of the building with the use of glass where the extension abuts the host building to minimise impact and to separate the old and the new. The extension is modest in scale contained

within the footprint of the original 'outrigger' and is considered to preserve the historic character of the building.

- 22 The mansard roof extension is set back from the parapet, and therefore not largely visible from street level on the front elevation. The extension is modest in size creating an additional bedroom, and retaining the appearance of the butterfly roof to the rear elevation.
- 23 The internal alterations to the property, the blocking up and creation of openings, are considered acceptable. The property has been poorly maintained, with much of the internal historic fabric lost. However the plan form of the modest property comprising two rooms on each floor is preserved, on the upper floors some significant features remain including original cornices, windows and surrounds, and an original fireplace. The applications seek to conserve the listed building, the opening at basement level to the rear terrace area has been amended to maintain the original width and allow the retention of the window reveals and head and simply to allow access through.
- 24 Many of the windows appear original and retain their original surrounds, the presumption should be in favour of repairing and restoring these. However, where they are beyond repair these are proposed to be replaced with windows to match. It is considered appropriate to require prior to commencement of the proposed works a condition survey of the windows is prepared and a schedule of proposed restoration works prepared to ensure the windows are restored where appropriate.
- 25 Saved Southwark Plan Policy 3.17 Listed Buildings states in point iv that Planning permission for proposals which involve an alteration or extension to a listed building will only be permitted where existing detailing and important later additional features of the building are preserved, repaired or, if missing, replaced. This application seeks to replace the previously removed detailed cornicing to the parapet on the front elevation. This will enhance the property and the appearance of the terrace and wider conservation area.

Impact on trees

- 26 Not relevant to listed building application but considered in accompanying report for planning application.

Planning obligations (S.106 undertaking or agreement)

- 27 Not required with an application of this nature.

Sustainable development implications

- 28 None.

Other matters

- 29 Objections from local residents have been made to the proposals being contrary to guidance set out in the '*House Extension in the Albert Triangle*' Design Guide which was published in 1986 following consultation between the Council and the Albert Association. However this document was produced before the properties were listed, and with no review or update to take the listing into account it is considered the document is no longer considered a material consideration. This was also accepted by the Planning Inspectorate in deciding the recent appeal at 5 Colnbrook Street. The inspected in his decision dated 12 July 2011 stated in paragraphs 10 that although the document promoted good practice in terms of some aspects of extension in the Albert Triangle it was now significantly out of date and therefore he could not give the guide

weight in deciding the appeal.

Conclusion on listed building issues

- 30 The alterations and extensions are acceptable and would preserve and enhance the fabric and setting of the listed building.
- 31 Policy HE9.1 of PPS5 states: "*There should be a presumption in favour of the conservation of designated heritage assets and the more significant the designated heritage asset, the greater the presumption in favour of its conservation should be. Once lost, heritage assets cannot be replaced and their loss has a cultural, environmental, economic and social impact. Significance can be harmed or lost through alteration or destruction of the heritage asset or development within its setting. Loss affecting any designated heritage asset should require clear and convincing justification.*"
- 32 This proposal conserves the building and its features of historic and architectural significance. It involves a modest and subservient extension and alteration to this designated heritage asset and compliments it by enabling the reinstatement of its historic use. It is therefore recommended that planning permission be granted.

Community impact statement

- 33 In line with the Council's Community Impact Statement the impact of this application has been assessed as part of the application process with regard to local people in respect of their age, disability, faith/religion, gender, race and ethnicity and sexual orientation. Consultation with the community has been undertaken as part of the application process.
- 34 a) The impact on local people is set out above.

Consultations

- 35 Details of consultation and any re-consultation undertaken in respect of this application are set out in Appendix 1.

Consultation replies

- 36 Details of consultation responses received are set out in Appendix 2.

Summary of consultation responses

- 37 Design and Conservation Team - response has been incorporated in the main body of the report.
- 38 Objections received from 5 local residents for both the original proposals and the revised scheme including the roof extension.

Objections to original proposal (ground floor single storey rear extension)

- 39 Resident of 7 Colnbrook Street considers the rear extension constitutes an over development of the property and its historic footprint, and detrimental to the neighbouring properties amenity. The extension fails is wider than half the width of the house and it is not a glazed 'link' it is fundamental to the design as the proposed layout does not work without this extra floorspace. Concerns also raised regarding the excavation work entailed in the proposal which will cause disturbance to the foundations of the adjoining buildings.

- 40 Resident of 28 Gladstone Street objects on the basis of unnecessary partial demolition and removal of existing historic fabric. Objects to the blocking up of openings, all original doors should be retained and in the case of the entrance to the lobby the door should be reinstated. Objects to widening of the window opening to create a doorway at basement level on the rear elevation. Considers the rear glazed extension is inappropriate to a listed building of this age, objects to the size of the extension almost across the full width of the house contrary to Southwark's Residential Design Policy 3.4 Objections raised to the inclusion of the 'existing' second floor extension which is not existing and planning permission lapsed on 23rd November 2010.
- 41 Resident of 42 Gladstone Street objects to the proposals on the basis they harm the character of the conservation area and the listed building by way of loss of historic fabric. The existing drawings submitted are incorrect and show a non-existent roof extension. The creation of a three quarter width increased plot width; single storey extension with glazed roof lights has no precedent. Considers the proposals are contrary to a number of Southwark Policies including saved policy 3.16 Conservation areas and 3.17 Listed Buildings of the Southwark Plan 2007. Also reports that works were undertaken to the property without the necessary planning permission or listed building consent which the Planning Enforcement Team opened an investigation into following complaints. The immediate neighbours refute that any works were undertaken to implement the previous 2007 planning and listed building consent for the mansard roof extension prior to there expiry in 2010.
- 42 Resident of 5 Colnbrook Street objects to the proposals on basis of loss of historic fabric and as the extension does not ensure the continuity of the terrace and involves the use of a large area of glazing which is out of character with the materials used in the original construction and extension elsewhere. Albert Triangle residents have sought to protect the integrity of these listed buildings and the conservation area, which was largely achieved through a set of guidelines agreed with the Council (considered reference to 1986 '*House extension in the Albert Triangle*' outlined above). The principles set out in the guidelines were aimed at maintaining uniformity of approach to roof and rear extensions, however the Council's views on roof terraces are now at odds with those of the Albert Association. Considers the application should include the reinstatement of the cornicing on the front elevation.
- Objections to the revised scheme which included the erection of a roof extension.
- 43 Resident of 18 Colnbrook Street objects to the roof extension as the rear elevation is inappropriate, viewed with others in the street and spoils rather than enhances the character of the terrace. States that there is no physical evidence or indication of work being undertaken in connection with the roof extension for which the planning permission and listed building expired in November 2010.
- 44 Resident of 28 Gladstone Street objects to the proposed works on the basis of loss of historic fabric and the anomalous rear elevation of the second floor extension and the glazing to the ground floor rear extension. Additions to previous letter refer to the proposed second floor roof extension and revisions to objections in relation to rear basement extension. Considers that due to the number of roof extensions which extend vertically from the rear elevation, the retention of the butterfly roof to the rear elevation is out of character with the rest of the terrace.
- 45 Further objections received from resident of 42 Gladstone Street, objects on the basis the rear "mansard" will harm the group listing of the terrace and considered the rear extension will neither preserve nor enhance the listing building or its setting. The continuity of the rear elevation of Gladstone Street and Colnbrook Street is essential to the continuity of the street pattern, and the special architectural norms for extension

have been ignored.

Human rights implications

- 46 This planning application engages certain human rights under the Human Rights Act 2008 (the HRA). The HRA prohibits unlawful interference by public bodies with conventions rights. The term 'engage' simply means that human rights may be affected or relevant.
- 47 This application has the legitimate aim of providing additional residential accommodation to the dwelling house. The rights potentially engaged by this application, including the right to a fair trial and the right to respect for private and family life are not considered to be unlawfully interfered with by this proposal.

SUPPLEMENTARY ADVICE FROM OTHER OFFICERS

Strategic Director of Communities, Law & Governance

- 48 None.

BACKGROUND DOCUMENTS

Background Papers	Held At	Contact
Site history file: TP/1029-8 Application file: 11-AP-2398 Southwark Local Development Framework and Development Plan Documents	Regeneration and Neighbourhoods Department 160 Tooley Street London SE1 2TZ	Planning enquiries telephone: 020 7525 5403 Planning enquiries email: planning.enquiries@southwark.gov.uk Case officer telephone: 020 7525 5560 Council website: www.southwark.gov.uk

APPENDICES

No.	Title
Appendix 1	Consultation undertaken
Appendix 2	Consultation responses received

AUDIT TRAIL

Lead Officer	Gary Rice, Head of Development Management	
Report Author	Anna Clare, Senior Planning Enforcement Officer	
Version	Final	
Dated	01 December 2011	
Key Decision	No	
CONSULTATION WITH OTHER OFFICERS / DIRECTORATES / CABINET MEMBER		
Officer Title	Comments Sought	Comments included
Strategic Director of Communities, Law & Governance	No	No
Strategic Director of Regeneration and Neighbourhoods	No	No
Strategic Director of Environment and Housing	No	No
Date final report sent to Constitutional Team		16 January 2012

Consultation undertaken

Site notice date: 18/08/11 and 17/10/11

Press notice date: 11/08/11

Case officer site visit date: 08/09/11

Neighbour consultation letters sent: 10/08/11 and wide consultation of 04/10/11

Internal services consulted: Michael Tsoukaris - Design and Conservation Team

Statutory and non-statutory organisations consulted: None.

Neighbours and local groups consulted:

1st Consultation

10/08/2011 9 COLNBROOK STREET LONDON SE1 6EZ
10/08/2011 7 COLNBROOK STREET LONDON SE1 6EZ

Re-consultation

04/10/2011 FLAT 18 ST GEORGES COURT GARDEN ROW LONDON SE1 6HD
04/10/2011 FLAT 29 ST GEORGES COURT GARDEN ROW LONDON SE1 6HD
04/10/2011 FLAT 39 ST GEORGES COURT GARDEN ROW LONDON SE1 6HD
04/10/2011 FLAT 16 ST GEORGES COURT GARDEN ROW LONDON SE1 6HD
04/10/2011 8 COLNBROOK STREET LONDON SE1 6EZ
04/10/2011 9 COLNBROOK STREET LONDON SE1 6EZ
04/10/2011 FLAT 15 ST GEORGES COURT GARDEN ROW LONDON SE1 6HD
04/10/2011 FLAT 40 ST GEORGES COURT GARDEN ROW LONDON SE1 6HD
04/10/2011 FLAT 30 ST GEORGES COURT GARDEN ROW LONDON SE1 6HD
04/10/2011 FLAT 41 ST GEORGES COURT GARDEN ROW LONDON SE1 6HD
04/10/2011 FLAT 42 ST GEORGES COURT GARDEN ROW LONDON SE1 6HD
04/10/2011 FLAT 28 ST GEORGES COURT GARDEN ROW LONDON SE1 6HD
04/10/2011 BASEMENT FLAT 16 COLNBROOK STREET LONDON SE1 6EZ
04/10/2011 FLAT 17 ST GEORGES COURT GARDEN ROW LONDON SE1 6HD
04/10/2011 FLAT 27 ST GEORGES COURT GARDEN ROW LONDON SE1 6HD
04/10/2011 7 COLNBROOK STREET LONDON SE1 6EZ
04/10/2011 10 COLNBROOK STREET LONDON SE1 6EZ
04/10/2011 11 COLNBROOK STREET LONDON SE1 6EZ
04/10/2011 12 COLNBROOK STREET LONDON SE1 6EZ
04/10/2011 42 GLADSTONE STREET LONDON SE1 6EY
04/10/2011 GROUND FLOOR AND FIRST FLOOR FLAT 16 COLNBROOK STREET LONDON SE1 6EZ
04/10/2011 28 GLADSTONE STREET LONDON SE1 6EY
04/10/2011 13 COLNBROOK STREET LONDON SE1 6EZ
04/10/2011 4 COLNBROOK STREET LONDON SE1 6EZ
04/10/2011 5 COLNBROOK STREET LONDON SE1 6EZ
04/10/2011 6 COLNBROOK STREET LONDON SE1 6EZ
04/10/2011 18 COLNBROOK STREET LONDON SE1 6EZ
04/10/2011 14 COLNBROOK STREET LONDON SE1 6EZ
04/10/2011 15 COLNBROOK STREET LONDON SE1 6EZ
04/10/2011 17 COLNBROOK STREET LONDON SE1 6EZ

Re-consultation: Carried out following amendments to include the mansard roof extension, with wider consultation.

Consultation responses received

Internal services

Michael Tsoukaris Group Manager - Design and Conservation Team.

Design Surgery Comments

The proposal is for a modest single storey rear extension and a mansard extension set back from the front and rear for the property as well as minor internal modifications to turn this previously squatted property into a single family residence.

Core Strategy policy SP12 Design and conservation requires "*development to conserve or enhance the significance of Southwark's heritage assets, their settings and wider historic environment, including conservation areas, archaeological priority zones and sites, listed and locally listed buildings, registered parks and gardens, world heritage sites and scheduled monuments.*"

Saved Southwark Plan Policy 3.17 Listed Buildings - states:

Planning permission for proposals which involve an alteration or extension to a listed building will only be permitted where:

- i. There is no loss of important historic fabric; and
- ii. The development is not detrimental to the special architectural or historic interest of the building; and
- iii. The development relates sensitively and respects the period, style, detailing and context of the listed building or later alterations of architectural or historic interest; and
- iv. Existing detailing and important later additional features of the building are preserved, repaired or, if missing, replaced.

Taking each of these in turn

- i. The property has been occupied by squatters and has been damaged internally however, particularly on the upper ground floor some significant features remain including original cornices, windows and window surrounds. Further, on the first floor an original fire place has survived and the staircase appears to be original.

The proposal seeks to conserve the listed building and its historic fabric. The Plan form of a modest historic property comprising two rooms on each floor, is preserved and with it its important historic features. The areas noted above, where the main historic fabric is located, are preserved and restored as necessary.

- ii. The main impact of this development is in the creation of a new rear extension and a mansard extension that is set back from the front and rear face of the building.

The proposed extension is modest and occupies the footprint of the original 'outrigger'. Where it abuts the listed building it is made of glass to limit the impact of the new extension on the original building and to clearly demarcate the separation between the old and the new. **The glazed structure should be constructed of traditional materials to compliment its historic setting and can be reserved by condition.** This extension is constructed of traditional materials, subservient in its scale and bulk and will preserve and enhance the appreciation and enjoyment of this historic property.

The mansard extension is well set-back from the front of the building and provides one additional room at the top. The stair case is extended to reach this floor. Due to the

set-back it will appear between the two groups of chimneys in the roofscape and will not appear overly dominant in the street. With traditional slate finishes and modest dormer windows it will appear as a natural roof construction typical of these properties. Officers retain concerns over the inclusion of a roof terrace to the front of the property. This introduces a discordant and inappropriate feature and introduces activity to this prominent face of the property. **Notwithstanding what is illustrated on the drawings, this part of the roof should not be used as a terrace and its access should be changed to a window - the changes should be note on the approved drawings. The restriction on the use provision should be reserved by condition.** To the rear, the set-back from the face ensures that the butterfly roof, a distinguishing feature of this terrace of properties, is preserved.

iii. The proposed development preserves all the features of historic or architectural significance. **The only exception is the exit the extension at the lower ground floor where the opening should preserve the existing window reveals and head and simply cut down the flanks to allow access through to the extension at the rear and the drawings amended to suit.** Further, **the extended staircase should be carefully designed to reflect the features of the existing stair, its handrail and spindles and can be reserved by condition.**

An important aspect of the historic significance of this building is its windows, many of which appear to be original and retain their original window surrounds. these features are proposed to be preserved and restored by this development. officers would recommend that, prior to commencement of the proposed works a condition survey of the windows is prepared and a schedule of proposed restoration works prepared. This should be reserved by condition.

iv. The proposed development is generally appropriate and returns this nationally important historic building to its optimal use. This aspect of the policy seeks to repair or reinstate features that may have been lost by previous unsympathetic amendments. In this case, the projecting dentil cornice - a prominent feature of the front elevation, appears to have been removed by an previous owner. This is a future that can be seen on many of the adjacent properties and is prominent by its absence on this property and the immediately adjacent one.

The detailed cornice at the front should be reinstated by this application and the drawings amended to suit.

Policy HE7.5 of PPS5 - Planning for the historic Environment states: *Local planning authorities should take into account the desirability of new development making a positive contribution to the character and local distinctiveness of the historic environment. The consideration of design should include scale, height, massing, alignment, materials and use.*

This proposal compliments this historic building. Its scale, height, mass, materials and use are entirely appropriate and the proposed extensions modest and sympathetic in character and subservient in nature.

Policy HE9.1 of PPS5 states: *"There should be a presumption in favour of the conservation of designated heritage assets and the more significant the designated heritage asset, the greater the presumption in favour of its conservation should be. Once lost, heritage assets cannot be replaced and their loss has a cultural, environmental, economic and social impact. Significance can be harmed or lost through alteration or destruction of the heritage asset or development within its setting. Loss affecting any designated heritage asset should require clear and convincing justification."*

This proposal conserves the building and its features of historic and architectural significance. It involves a modest and subservient extension and alteration to this designated heritage asset and compliments it by re-enabling the reinstatement of its historic use.

Further, in the government objectives for PPS5 the national policy framework is charged with conserving England's heritage assets in a manner appropriate to their significance by ensuring that, among other things : "*wherever possible, heritage assets are put to an appropriate and viable use that is consistent with their conservation*"

This proposal seeks to restore this property to a single family residence giving this property a new lease on life and ensuring that this historic building is put to an appropriate and viable use that is consistent with its conservation.

Recommendation

Officers are broadly supportive of this application however, changes are required to the approved drawings to include a revision to the width of the door from the lower ground floor to the extension, change the door to a dormer window and to remove the terrace at the top floor.

If these changes cannot be secured officers are unable to support a recommendation to approve this application.

Provided the above are addressed appropriately, and if the council is minded to grant permission the following conditions should be included:

1. Section detail-drawings at a scale of (1:1, 1:2, 1:5) through:

- the new staircase to the mansard extension
- The front and rear parapets of the mansard including the reinstated cornice
- the cut-down existing opening at the lower ground floor
- the timber-framed glazed roof to the rear extension;

to be used in the carrying out of this permission shall be submitted to and approved by the Local Planning Authority in writing before any work in connection with this permission is commenced; the development shall not be carried out otherwise than in accordance with any such approval given.

Reason:

In order that the Local Planning Authority may be satisfied as to the quality of the design and details in accordance with Core Strategy (April 2011) Policy SP12 Design and conservation, saved Policies: 3.12 Quality in Design; 3.13 Urban Design; and 3.17 Listed buildings of The Southwark Plan (UDP) July 2007 and PPS5 Planning for the Historic Environment.

2. Before any work in connection with this permission is commenced the applicant shall submit a Schedule of Condition of existing windows/ doors and Schedule of Works for their repair to the Local Planning Authority for approval in writing, prior to the commencement of works. All existing doors, windows, shutter boxes and window cases, are to be retained, repaired and refurbished. The development shall not be carried out otherwise than in accordance with any such approval given.

Reason:

In order that the Local Planning Authority may be satisfied as to the design and details in the interest of the special architectural or historic qualities of the listed building in accordance with Core Strategy (April 2011) Policy SP12 Design and conservation, saved Policies: 3.15 Conservation of the Historic Environment; 3.16 Conservation

Areas; 3.17 Listed Buildings; of The Southwark Plan (UDP) July 2007 and PPS5 Planning for the Historic Environment.

A further condition restricting the use of the flat roof area at the front of the property as a terrace should also be included.

Statutory and non-statutory organisations

N/A

Neighbours and local groups

Objections received from 5 local residents.

Objections to original proposal (ground floor single storey rear extension)

Resident of 7 Colnbrook Street considers the rear extension constitutes an over development of the property and its historic footprint, and detrimental to the neighbouring properties amenity. The extension fails is wider than half the width of the house and it is not a glazed 'link' it is fundamental to the design as the proposed layout does not work without this extra floorspace. Concerns also raised regarding the excavation work entailed in the proposal which will cause disturbance to the foundations of the adjoining buildings.

Resident of 28 Gladstone Street objects on the basis of unnecessary partial demolition and removal of existing historic fabric. Objects to the blocking up of openings, all original doors should be retained and in the case of the entrance to the lobby the door should be reinstated. Objects to widening of the window opening to create a doorway at basement level on the rear elevation. Considers the rear glazed extension is inappropriate to a listed building of this age, objects to the size of the extension almost across the full width of the house contrary to Southwark's Residential Design Policy 3.4 Objections raised to the inclusion of the 'existing' second floor extension which is not existing and planning permission lapsed on 23rd November 2010.

Resident of 42 Gladstone Street objects to the proposals on the basis they harm the character of the conservation area and the listed building by way of loss of historic fabric. The existing drawings submitted are incorrect and show a non-existent roof extension. The creation of a three quarter width increased plot width; single storey extension with glazed roof lights has no precedent. Considers the proposals are contrary to a number of Southwark Policies including saved policy 3.16 Conservation areas and 3.17 Listed Buildings of the Southwark Plan 2007. Also reports that works were undertaken to the property without the necessary planning permission or listed building consent which the Planning Enforcement Team opened an investigation into following complaints. The immediate neighbours refute that any works were undertaken to implement the previous 2007 planning and listed building consent for the mansard roof extension prior to there expiry in 2010.

Resident of 5 Colnbrook Street objects to the proposals on basis of loss of historic fabric and as the extension does not ensure the continuity of the terrace and involves the use of a large area of glazing which is out of character with the materials used in the original construction and extension elsewhere. Albert Triangle residents have sought to protect the integrity of these listed buildings and the conservation area, which was largely achieved through a set of guidelines agreed with the Council (considered reference to 1986 '*House extension in the Albert Triangle*' outlined above). The principles set out in the guidelines were aimed at maintaining uniformity of approach to roof and rear extensions, however the Council's views on roof terraces are now at odds with those of the Albert Association. Considers the application should

include the reinstatement of the corning on the front elevation.

Objections to the revised scheme which included the erection of a roof extension.

Resident of 18 Colnbrook Street objects to the roof extension as the rear elevation is inappropriate, viewed with others in the street and spoils rather than enhances the character of the terrace. States that there is no physical evidence or indication of work being undertaken in connection with the roof extension for which the planning permission and listed building expired in November 2010.

Resident of 28 Gladstone Street objects to the proposed works on the basis of loss of historic fabric and the anomalous rear elevation of the second floor extension and the glazing to the ground floor rear extension. Additions to previous letter refer to the proposed second floor roof extension and revisions to objections in relation to rear basement extension. Considers that due to the number of roof extensions which extend vertically from the rear elevation, the retention of the butterfly roof to the rear elevation is out of character with the rest of the terrace.

Further objections received from resident of 42 Gladstone Street, objects on the basis the rear "mansard" will harm the group listing of the terrace and considered the rear extension will neither preserve nor enhance the listing building or its setting. The continuity of the rear elevation of Gladstone Street and Colnbrook Street is essential to the continuity of the street pattern, and the special architectural norms for extension have been ignored.