

Application ref: 2023/2811/PRE  
Contact: Ewan Campbell  
Tel: +44 20 7974 5458  
Email: Ewan.Campbell@camden.gov.uk  
Date: 26/10/2022

**Development Management**  
Regeneration and Planning  
London Borough of Camden  
old address

Phone: 020 7974 4444

[planning@camden.gov.uk](mailto:planning@camden.gov.uk)

[www.planning@camden.gov.uk](http://www.planning@camden.gov.uk)

Tom Pemberton  
Montagu Evans  
tom.pemberton@montagu-evans.co.uk

Dear Sir/Madam

### **Pre-application Medium Development Pre-application Advice Issued**

Address:

**Former Hampstead Police Station**  
**26 Rossllyn Hill**  
**London**  
**NW3 1PD**

Proposal: Change of use from police station (Sui Generis) to offices on lower ground, ground and part first floor (Class E) and residential on part first and second floors (Class C3) with private amenity space to provide 5 units; two four storey rear extensions of the east wing, full width roof extension, infill extension to the courtyard and alterations to elevations including steps to the front, lifts and wheelchair access.

#### **Site constraints**

- Article 4 Basements
- Hampstead Conservation Area
- Hampstead Neighbourhood Plan
- Grade II Listed Building
- Central London Area
- Underground development constraint – Claygate Beds
- Underground development constraint – 50m buffer to Claygate Beds
- Underground development constraint - Slope Stability
- Underground development constraint – Subterranean (groundwater) flow

#### **Relevant planning history**

2019/2375/P and 2019/2491/L - Change of use of the site from a police station (sui generis) to a one-form entry school (Use Class D1) for 210 pupils and business/enterprise space (Class B1) including alterations and extensions to the rear and associated works. **Refused 15 May 2019 (Appeals dismissed)** *Reasons for refusal:*

*The proposed development by virtue of its use, location and catchment area is likely to result in an increase in trips by private motor vehicles, increased traffic congestion and exacerbating air pollution and would fail to sufficiently prioritise sustainable modes of transport, contrary to policies T1 (Prioritising, walking, cycling and public transport) and C2 (Community facilities) of the Camden Local Plan 2017 and policies TT1 (Traffic volumes and vehicle size) and TT2 (Pedestrian environment) of the Hampstead Neighbourhood Plan*

*The proposed development, by virtue of the proximity of its outdoor amenity space to 2 neighbouring residential properties would result in an unacceptable increase in noise disturbance to the detriment of the amenity of neighbouring residents contrary to policy A1 (Managing the impact of development) of the Camden Local Plan 2017*

*The proposed development by virtue of its location on a main road with poor air quality, which could harm the health of pupils, would not be an appropriate location for a school, contrary to policies A1 (Managing the impact of development) and CC4 (Air quality) of the Camden Local Plan 2017 and policy S3 of the emerging London Plan December 2017.*

2016/6045/P (1 Telephone kiosk outside Hampstead Police Station, 26 Rossllyn Hill, London NW3 1PD) - Change of use from telephone box to office pod (sui generis). **Granted 9 March 2017**

2016/1590/P and 2016/2042/L Change of use from police station (sui generis) to school (Use Class D1) including the partial demolition and extension to the rear of the Grade II Listed Building and associated works. **Refused 9 April 2016** *Reasons for Refusal:*

*The proposed rear extension, by reason of its scale, bulk, height and detailed design would fail to preserve the special architectural and historic interest of the host building and its setting and less than substantially harm its significance (there being an absence of substantial public benefits that outweigh such harm) and fail to preserve or enhance the character or appearance of the Hampstead Conservation Area and harm its significance contrary to policy CS14 (Promoting high quality places and conserving heritage) of the London Borough of Camden Local Development Framework Core Strategy and policies DP24 (Securing high quality design) and DP25 (Conserving Camden's heritage) of the London Borough of Camden Local Development Framework Development Policies*

*The proposed development due to its scale and intensity of use would by reason of the additional trip generation and traffic congestion have a detrimental impact on the local transport network contrary to CS11 (Promoting sustainable and efficient travel) of the London Borough of Camden Local Development Framework Core Strategy and policies DP16 (The transport implications of development) DP17 (Walking, cycling and public transport) and DP21 (Development connecting to the highway network) of the London Borough of Camden Local Development Framework Development Policies.*

*The proposed development, by reason of the scale and intensity of use in close proximity of residential accommodation would harm the amenity of neighbouring residents contrary to policies CS5 (Managing the impact of growth and development) and CS14 (Promoting high quality places and conserving our heritage) of the London Borough of Camden Local Development Framework Core Strategy and policies DP26 (Managing the impact of development on occupiers and neighbours) and Policy DP28 (Noise and vibration).*

*In the absence of sufficient information, the applicant has failed to demonstrate that the proposed development would not have a detrimental impact on air quality as a result of the proposal, contrary to policies CS13 (Tackling climate change through promoting higher environmental standards) and CS16 (Improving Camden's health and wellbeing) of the London Borough of Camden Local Development Framework Core Strategy; and policy DP32 (Air quality and Camden's Clear Zone) of the London Borough of Camden Local Development Framework Development.*

*In the absence of sufficient information the applicant has failed to demonstrate that the proposed development would not have a harmful impact on neighbouring trees, contrary to policies CS14 (Promoting high quality places and conserving our heritage) and CS15 (Protecting and improving our parks and open spaces and encouraging biodiversity) of the London Borough of Camden Local Development Framework Core Strategy; and policy DP24 (securing high quality design) of the London Borough of Camden Local Development Framework Development.*

*In the absence of sufficient information the applicant has failed to demonstrate that the proposed development would not have a detrimental impact on neighbouring amenity in terms of noise as a result of the proposal, contrary to policies CS6 (Managing the impact of growth and development) CS14 (Promoting high quality places and conserving our heritage) of the London Borough of Camden Local Development Framework Core Strategy; and policy DP26 (Managing the impact of development on occupiers and neighbours) of the London Borough of Camden Local Development Framework Development.*

*The proposed development, in the absence of a legal agreement securing a school travel plan and associated monitoring and administrative costs for a period of 5 years, would fail to promote the use of sustainable means of travel, contrary to policies CS11 (sustainable travel) and CS19 (Delivering and monitoring the Core Strategy) of the London Borough of Camden Local Development Framework Core Strategy and policy DP16 (transport implications of development) of the London Borough of Camden Local Development Framework Development Policies.*

*The proposed development, in the absence of a legal agreement securing it as car free, would be likely to contribute unacceptably to parking stress and congestion in the surrounding area, contrary to policies CS11 (Promoting sustainable and efficient travel) and CS19 (Delivering and monitoring the Core Strategy) of the London Borough of Camden Local Development Framework Core Strategy and policies DP18 (Parking standards and the availability of car parking) and DP19 (Managing the impact of parking) of the London Borough of Camden Local Development Framework Development Policies.*

*The proposed development, in the absence of a legal agreement securing a construction management plan and the establishment and operation of a Construction Working Group, would be likely to give rise to conflicts with other road users and would fail to mitigate the impact on the amenities of the area generally, contrary to policies CS5 (Managing the impact of growth and development), CS11 (Promoting sustainable and efficient travel) and CS19 (Delivering and monitoring the Core Strategy) of the London Borough of Camden Local Development Framework Core Strategy and policies DP20 (Movement of goods and materials), DP21 (Development connecting to highway network) and DP26 (Managing the impact of development on occupiers and neighbours) of the London Borough of Camden Local Development Framework Development Policies.*

*The proposed development, in the absence of a legal agreement securing necessary contributions towards highway works would fail to make provision to restore the pedestrian environment to an acceptable condition, contrary to policies Executive Director Supporting Communities Page 4 of 4 2016/1590/P CS11 (sustainable travel) and CS19 (Delivering and monitoring the Core Strategy) of the London Borough of Camden Local Development Framework Core Strategy and policies DP17 (walking, cycling and public transport) and DP21 (Development connecting to the highway network) of the London Borough of Camden Local Development Framework Development Policies*

*The proposed development, in the absence of a legal agreement securing a sustainability plan, would fail to ensure that the development is designed to take a sustainable and efficient approach to the use of resources, contrary to policies CS13 (tackling climate change) and CS19 (Delivering and monitoring the Core Strategy) of the London Borough of Camden Local Development Framework Core Strategy and DP22 (sustainable design and construction) and DP23 (water) of the London Borough of Camden Local Development Framework Development Policies*

*The proposed development, in the absence of a legal agreement securing a School Management Plan would fail to ensure that the proposed development would not have a detrimental impact on neighbouring amenity as a result of the proposal, contrary to policies CS6 (Managing the impact of growth and development) CS14 (Promoting high quality places and conserving our heritage) of the London Borough of Camden Local Development Framework Core Strategy; and policy DP26 (Managing the impact of development on occupiers and neighbours) of the London Borough of Camden Local Development Framework Development.*

2015/3217/L (BT Telephone Kiosk O/s 26 Rosslyn Hill, London, NW3 1PD) - Display of 3 x internally mounted LCD screens, removal of telephone equipment with replacement of glazing.  
**Refused 11 September 2015**

## **Relevant policies and guidance**

*National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) 2023*

*The London Plan 2021*

*Camden Local Plan 2017*

Policy A1 Managing the impact of development  
Policy A3 Biodiversity  
Policy A5 Basements  
Policy D1 Design  
Policy D2 Heritage  
Policy G1 Delivery and location of growth  
Policy H1 Maximising housing supply  
Policy H4 Maximising contribution to affordable housing  
Policy H2 Maximising the supply of self-contained housing from mixed use schemes  
Policy H6 Housing choice and mix  
Policy C1 Health and Wellbeing  
Policy C2 Community Facilities  
Policy C6 Access for all  
Policy E1 Economic Development  
Policy E2 Employment premises and sites  
Policy CC1 Climate Change Mitigation

Policy CC2 Adapting to Climate Change  
Policy CC3 Water and flooding  
Policy CC5 Waste  
Policy DM1 Delivery and monitoring

*Hampstead Neighbourhood Plan 2018*

Policy DH1: Heritage  
Policy DH2: Conservation areas and Listed Buildings  
Policy NE4: Supporting Biodiversity  
Policy TT4: Cycle and Car Ownership  
Policy HC1: Housing Mix  
Policy HC2: Community Facilities

*Camden Planning Guidance*

Amenity CPG 2021  
Design CPG 2021  
Energy efficiency and adaptation CPG 2021  
Employment Sites and Business premises CPG 2021  
Housing CPG  
Transport CPG 2021  
Water and Flooding CPG

*Hampstead Conservation Area Appraisal and Management Strategy (2001)*

**Site and surroundings**

The Application Site is located on the north side of Rosslyn Hill at the junction with Downshire Hill, between Hampstead and Belsize Park. The site is located within the Hampstead Conservation Area. The main building is Grade II listed, it was a former Police Station and Magistrates Court and has been vacant since 2013 (the Magistrates Court was last used in 1998). Ancillary to the main red brick building is the Stable Block (which is curtilage listed) and outbuildings to the rear. These do not form part of the site. A Victorian residence, 26 Rosslyn Hill immediately abuts the site to the south-east and was formerly used by the Metropolitan Police. The residence does not form part of the Site

The former police station is described as sui generis, being a use that does not fall within any defined use class. The building comprises a basement, ground floor and two upper storeys. Due to topographical changes (the site slopes down to the rear), the basement is at ground level at the rear. The building has two wings at the rear and forms a 'U' shape. The main building is three storeys, plus a basement, and constructed in red brick with stone dressings as designed by J Dixon Butler (1910-13).

The listing description describes the building as follows:

*A bold and assured composition of considerable civic presence, the strict uniformity of the pedimented principal elevation offset by the picturesque elements of the entranceway and courthouse, built to a high standard in good quality materials; Intricately planned to provide separate areas for the different primary functions of the building, with careful consideration of the requirements of the various parts; The hierarchy of spaces is expressed in the internal detailing, and the stairs, in particular, reflect the status and character of the different areas; The high-status of the courthouse is manifest in the internal joinery and plasterwork, and the courtroom has an extensive scheme of panelling and furniture; The police station is plainly detailed internally, but has architectural features, such as the rounded angles of the walls, and its plan form, which reflect its function.*

The building is referred to in the Hampstead Conservation Area Statement as an imposing feature of the Rosslyn Hill and Downshire Hill streetscape character. It is a red brick building with stone dressings by J Dixon Butler (1910-13)

The site falls within the area covered by the Hampstead Neighbourhood Plan and the proposals are assessed against the policies within this plan as well as those of the Local Plan. The Hampstead Neighbourhood Plan designates this part of the conservation area as Character Area 3 – 19th Century expansion.

The main entrance is on Rosslyn Hill, with other entrances including the vehicular entrance on Downshire Hill. The Judges' Chamber area of the Magistrates' Court is accessed off Downshire Hill. To the rear, the slope of Downshire Hill results in level access to the lower ground floor. The building has two wings to the rear, at each end of the façade, forming a U-shaped building. There is a two-storey stable block to the eastern corner of the site, which was built at the same time as the main building.

The site has a PTAL rating of 4, which is a 'good' accessibility level and the site sits within a controlled parking zone.

It is believed that the building was occupied by the Metropolitan Police from 1913 until 2013. The site is currently owned by the Educational Funding Agency (EFA), who purchased it in 2013. The purchase was part of a wider scheme promoted by the Mayor of London, through which public land and property was to be freed up across Greater London to accommodate 11 free schools.

The surrounding area is predominantly residential. The site is bounded by the rear gardens of flats on Downshire Hill to the north-west and north, by the rear gardens of properties on Hampstead Hill Gardens to the north-east and borders the side of 24 Rosslyn Hill to the south-east.

## **ASSESSMENT**

The principal planning considerations are the following:

1. Change of use principle
2. Design and Heritage
3. Quality of Accommodation
4. Unit Mix
5. Affordable Housing
6. Neighbouring amenity
7. Transport

8. Energy and sustainability
9. Air quality
10. Community Infrastructure Levy

## **1. Change of Use Principle**

As discussed in the previous pre-app reports, whilst the use of the former Hampstead Police Station would fall under a sui generis category it still remains community related and therefore policy C2 of the 2017 Local Plan is relevant.

In the current iteration, the proposal includes a Class E(e) (potentially in the form as a private health centre) which does provide a community use and listed as a community use within our local plan. Having the building open to the public is welcomed and contributes to the retention of the 'civic' character.

The site is located just outside of the Hampstead Town Centre and therefore outside a Local Plan Centre where these types of uses are directed to. The redevelopment would provide 801sqm of new Class E office space on the lower ground, ground and partly on the first floor.

The previous report raised concerns regarding the viability and demonstrating that office accommodation was not needed on site as it did not fall within a central London area or local plan centre. The cover letter explains that an architecture firm have expressed an interest in taking the space occupied currently by the courtrooms thus demonstrating a viable need. Whilst it is accepted that this is a good start in terms of interest, more details should be provided in relation to office take up statistics and similar developments within the area.

Any formal submission should also take into consideration Affordable Workspace (AW) and the provision of this on site. Under the Camden Planning Guidance, the Affordable Workspace requirement is triggered when there is an uplift of 1000sqm or more (GIA of employment floorspace). We normally ask for AW in one of the following ways:

- 20% of the workspace to be provided at 50% of comparable market values
- An element of the floorspace to be offered to an affordable workspace provider (to be approved by the Council) at a peppercorn rent (i.e. a very small or token rent); or
- 20% of the desks in the open workspace (hot-desking) area to be offered at 50% of market value

Whilst this may not quite meet the trigger, the Council would recommend at least some AW included within the scheme and would provide a significant benefit in relation to the scheme. Overall there is likely be less than substantial harm in relation to the internal and potentially external works depending on the quality of the design. This is assessed against the public benefit from scheme which at the moment is not particularly prevalent. The scheme incorporates some office floorspace and a small amount of very large flats with no affordable housing and so this is where the scheme could really improve its public benefit case.

The other use proposed is residential (C3) and occupies all of the floors with the accommodation being located in the first and second floors. Policy H1 of the Local Plan aims to secure a sufficient supply of homes to meet the needs of existing and future households and will seek to exceed the target for additional homes in the borough by regarding self-contained housing as the priority land use of the Local Plan.

Policy H2 of the Local Plan promotes the inclusion of residential development where non-residential development is proposed as part of a mix of uses. The Council will consider the

character of development, size of the site, Local Plan priorities and whether or not the proposal serves a public purpose. Policy H7 of the Local Plan aims to secure a range of homes of different sizes that will contribute to the creation of mixed, inclusive and sustainable communities and reduce mismatches between housing needs and existing supply.

Looking at the proposed floor plates, whilst the residential GIA is very large, it is claimed that potentially only larger units could be accommodated because of the quality of spaces. Evidence in the form of option plans have been submitted to demonstrate the difficulty of doing this. Overall this is accepted and the number of units proposed is an appropriate number in line with policy G1, H1 and H7. However, because of this relatively low number, maximising the retention of historic fabric, made easier by keeping housing units low on site, must be a priority.

Notwithstanding the above, the demonstration that the provision of Class E uses are required is relevant here as the policies indicate that sites should maximise housing potential and therefore should be prioritised as a use. However if it can be demonstrated the site can facilitate Class E uses which are required in the area then a mixture of uses can be accepted.

## **2. Design and Heritage**

### Internal Works

A considerable amount of demolition is involved, including the loss of all the police cells, a large part of the remaining floor plan, rear roof pitches and the front steps on Rosslyn Hill. Indeed the proposed plan of each floor shows walls/windows/doors and slab to be demolished.

The Magistrates Court entrance including the original timber glazed screen and the Courthouse waiting hall still remain intact and in relatively good condition. The main entrances to these areas are on Downshire Hill. In the waiting hall there is an impressive window which retains the original Arts and Crafts metal work. Some original cornicing is retained in these areas. The cells are still evident and the staircases. The original floor plan remains discernible in areas and there are a few interesting details relating to policing such as the curved plaster corners.

### Courtroom

Of particular historic value is the intact courtroom. Following previous pre-apps the scheme now will retain much of the existing joinery and panelling around the outside. The scheme also retains the original desks and tables which form the traditional layout of the courtroom.

The Council welcomes these alterations and officers agree this is a good start and would recommend that this sort of detailed analysis of alterations to internal works is continued throughout the site.

In general this scheme could be supported if there were greater retention of significant fabric. As it stands the current scheme involves an unacceptable level of harm to the heritage asset which needs to be addressed before the proposal can be fully supported. Any harm will need clear justification and clear public benefit to flow from the development as prescribed by the NPPF. In terms of the loss of fabric and alterations to the structure, I do not consider the current scheme overrides the concerns the Inspector had with the previous proposal.

### Rear Extensions



The excessive scale of the rear extensions is such that they would be considered just as over-dominant and unacceptably on an unlisted building as they are on a listed building such as this. The Council has taken a consistent approach to the the scale and massing of the external works which have moved on very little since the first pre-app design. There is far too much scale, massing but also depth of development to the rear in the form of the large 'wing' rear extensions. The rear extensions still mean that the kitchen wing will be, essentially, tripled in size. Its elevations are to be almost entirely demolished or obscured by the extensions. Again, as discussed in previous pre-apps, the 'massing first' approach does not in any way link to the listed building. The massing appears to be dictated by gaps in the building rather than how a design has been formulated that best suits a listed building

Not only is the massing a significant concern but the detailed design and materiality appears contrived and without much thought. The glazing, whilst reduced, still appears excessive and there are a number of railings visible on all levels which create a level of clutter. The proposal still seems at odds with the listed building and these elements have not taken it into account.

The extensions are clad in red brick, seemingly to fit in with the building. Whilst officers are not against the use of red brick, it can create a pastiche character and especially with the amount of development, appears to impact harmfully on the character of the listed building. The pictures below on pg.13 seemingly only show pictures of where red brick has been used but are these listed buildings? Are these extensions to listed buildings? Further work on proposed materials is required.

#### Infill Extension

Following from the previous pre-app report, this element has not changed significantly. The infill extension is located in the rear courtyard between the two wings of the police station and improves the circulation of the building and aids with the separation of uses. The extension does not have a significant depth and extends two stories. Overall the principle of an extension in this location is accepted however the design also needs to be better rationalised in relation to the host building.

#### Main Entrance

The front elevation is not changing significantly with like-for-like replacement windows and a new entrance design to accommodate accessibility issues.

It is still not completely clear the appearance of the new entrance and if this can accommodate a lift. The removal of the entrance would be of significant concern. If the steps are retained however providing the design and materials are sympathetic, then there is no objection in principle to the alterations.

#### Design Addendum

A pre-app addendum was submitted for further review. Overall, the second iteration of the third pre-app is a move in the right direction and it is clear that the comments within the meeting have been considered within the new design.

The rear extensions have been set back further and on the inside of the canteen wing do not go over two storeys. There is a four storey extension still proposed on the outside of the canteen wing to the south however this has been identified as the least sensitive part of the site and therefore the Council accepts something of a similar scale can go there.

The roof is now untouched but does contain a boxy plant room on the top of the wing. This still appears quite ad hoc and is quite prominent. One suggestion was locating this to the south of the canteen wing. The glazing and balustrade are still of concern with the size of and number of balconies at upper floors still remaining an issue.

Overall the scale is now at a point where the Council is more comfortable and, whilst it still is not an acceptable design, the Council accepts the scale and massing represent something that could go on the site.

The lack of design rationale continues to be a concern for Council officers. Throughout this pre-app process officers have highlighted the design as being contrived and not focusing enough on the listed building. This, along with lots of other Dixon Butler buildings, have many architectural features with a strong language that could be used as inspiration for the design. The design needs to focus on being more expressive and bolder as well as making a genuine links to the listed building. Currently the only link that the design has attempted is the windows which is poor considering the location and existing building. To be clear officers have never accepted this design approach and therefore we should not have the original design as a starting point and work back from it.

During the meeting it is clear that the analysis of the listed building and using this to inform the design has not meaningfully taken place. Currently the only thing that has seemingly been used to justify the design is the red brick and window placement. The rear of the building draws on its Queen Anne influence and contains asymmetrical elements and therefore there is potential for high quality design which can be expressive as well as work with the setting and character of the listed building.

### 3. Quality of Accommodation

All units would well exceed the national space standards in terms of overall GIA. Below a table shows the GIA of each flat, with the nationally described space standards.

| <b>Flat Number</b> | <b>Overall GIA</b> |
|--------------------|--------------------|
| Apt 1 (2b3p)       | 137sqm             |
| Apt 2 (2b4p)       | 138sqm             |
| Apt 3 (2b4p)       | 132sqm             |
| Apt A (3b6p)       | 237sqm             |
| Apt B (2b4p)       | 225sqm             |

The minimum requirement for private amenity space is 5sqm which is easily exceed for all units in the form of the respective terraces.

In terms of internal configuration most of the units, due to their spacious nature, appear acceptable and the layout seems appropriate and considered. However there are a couple of issues which need further consideration. For example in Apartments 2, 4 and 5 in order to get to the residential terrace you have to go through bedrooms which is not an ideal arrangement.

The site lies on Rossllyn Hill and is a former police station, therefore occupies a relatively open and standalone site. This means outlook is very high quality for all units. There are concerns regarding the glazing, but even if there were reductions, the level of outlook would still be of good quality. All the units are dual aspect and therefore an acceptable level of outlook and light will benefit the units.

One thing that needs to be considered within any full application is the amount of privacy and perception of overlooking potential residents will feel in relating to the other proposed residential units. Because of the 'U' shape which is narrow at points the terraces and windows of the apartments are quite close to the amenity space and windows of the other units. There may be a way of designing these issues out in terms of reducing glazing or reducing the size of terraces however does need to be considered in any full application.

In terms of waste storage and collection, the details are listed below:

### Waste collection in Camden

8.10 The Council currently offers waste collection of the following minimum volumes per dwelling with three bedrooms or less, per week:

- 120 litres of bin, box or sack volume for general waste or 'refuse'
- 140 litres of mixed dry recycling
- 23 litres of food waste

Looking at the pre-application plans these standards are incorporated into both the residential and office elements.

## 4. Unit Mix

Policy H7 of the Local Plan aims to secure a range of homes of different sizes that will contribute to the creation of mixed, inclusive and sustainable communities and reduce mismatches between housing needs and existing supply. The policy requires that all housing development, including conversion or extension of existing homes and non-residential properties contributes to meeting the priorities set out in the Dwelling Size Priorities Table (DSPT) (see below); and includes a mix of large (3 or more bedrooms) and small homes.

**Table 1: Dwelling Size Priorities**

|                          | <b>1-bedroom<br/>(or studio)</b> | <b>2-bedroom</b> | <b>3-bedroom</b> | <b>4-bedroom<br/>(or more)</b> |
|--------------------------|----------------------------------|------------------|------------------|--------------------------------|
| Social-affordable rented | lower                            | high             | high             | medium                         |
| Intermediate affordable  | high                             | medium           | lower            | lower                          |
| Market                   | lower                            | high             | high             | lower                          |

The Council considers that each development should contribute to the creation of mixed and inclusive communities by containing a mix of large and small homes overall. In terms of policy H7, the application would also provide three 2 bedroom market flats, one 3 bedroom market flat and one 4 bedroom market flat. Whilst the unit mix contains 2 and 3 bedroom market flats which are listed as a high priority, as stated above, the potential of more units on site needs to be explored.

## **5. Affordable Housing**

Policy H4 seeks to maximise the provision of affordable housing. A sliding scale target applies to developments that provide one or more additional homes and have capacity for fewer than 25 additional homes starting at 2% for one home and increasing by 2% for each home added to capacity. Capacity for one additional home is defined within the Local Plan as the creation of 100m<sup>2</sup> of additional residential floorspace (GIA). In assessing capacity, additional residential floorspace is rounded to the nearest 100m<sup>2</sup> (GIA). Where developments have capacity for fewer than 10 additional dwellings (or 1000sqm), the Council will accept a payment-in-lieu of affordable housing.

The current application proposes the creation of 895sqm (GIA) of residential floorspace, which would trigger an affordable housing contribution in line with Policy H4. The sliding target in this instance would require a provision equal to 18% of the total C3 floorspace (expressed in GEA). Policy H4 accepts that a payment-in-lieu is often the most appropriate means to secure this provision in schemes of under 10 units and no longer requires off-site provision to be explored for schemes of this scale.

The expected provision is then calculated as a percentage of the overall uplift of residential floorspace. The conversion provides an additional 895sqm GIA of floorspace which equates to a capacity for 9 additional homes at an 18% contribution. The Council's current adopted multiplier for calculating a payment-in-lieu (PIL) with market residential schemes is £5,000 per sqm. Using the sliding scale formula and multiplier (18% of 895 GIA x £5,000 per sqm), this means that £805,500 would be required as payment-in lieu for affordable housing, provided all other elements of the proposal were acceptable, which currently they are not.

## **6. Neighbouring Amenity**

Policy A1 of the Local Plan seeks to protect the quality of life of occupiers and neighbours. The factors to consider include visual privacy, outlook; sunlight, daylight, and overshadowing; artificial lighting levels; noise and vibration; odour, fumes, and dust; and impacts of the construction phase, including the use of Construction Management Plans.

The site itself is fairly unique in character (given surrounding context) and is of considerable scale to begin with. The alterations to the front, on Rosslyn Hill and the side elevation along Downshire Hill will not have any significant impact. From the drawings, this side elevation will not be changing in appearance anyway and the front elevation is set far back from the road. Therefore any issues relating outlook, increased sense of enclosure, privacy, daylight/sunlight and overlooking are not considered to be significant.

In terms of the rear elevation and roof extensions, whilst loss of outlook are not significantly impacted upon, issues of privacy and perceived issue of overlooking could be. Since the previous pre-app meeting, the design has not changed significantly and the proposal still includes roof extensions, large glazing and balconies to the rear which could potentially see into properties along Downshire Hill and the large building to the other side (22 Rosslyn Hill). The Stables building to the rear which was originally part of the site is within close proximity to the rear windows and terrace. There is the potential of oblique views into 26 Rosslyn Hill as well from these terraces.

For East wing side the 'extension 4' extends beyond no.26 Rosslyn Hill at ground and first floor level. For the ground floor the bulk surpass the building line is not considered large or would impact amenities of residents in no.26 Rosslyn Hill. However the number of roof terraces in this location mean that overlooking and loss of privacy could potentially be an issue and further examination of this is required.

Since the previous design iteration, not much work has been seemingly done to address these concerns and there is a potential eventually where the impacts to amenity are significant enough for refusing the application. There is already concern over the number and location of terraces to the rear especially considering this is a listed building in terms of design. Providing opaque balustrading to try and remedy this issue will only increase bulk on the upper floors and reduce the quality of the design. Officers would strongly recommend against doing this and object to the introduction of these in principle. More analysis including overlooking studies need to be conducted as this remains a significant part of the acceptability of the scheme.

A daylight/sunlight study would be useful in demonstrating the rear extensions would also not impact on the neighbours daylight/sunlight. At this moment it is not clear whether this would however due to the proximity with properties on Downshire Hill and the stables building itself – this should be investigated.

Construction Management Plans are discussed in the 'Transport' section.

## **7. Transport**

Policy T1 aims to promote sustainable transport by prioritising walking cycling and public transport. This is achieved by improving pedestrian friendly public realm, road safety and crossings, contributing to the cycle networks and facilities and finally improving links with public transport. All these measure are in place to ensure the Council meets their zero carbon targets.

Policy T2 limits the availability of parking in the borough and requires all new developments in the borough to be car-free. This will be done through not issuing parking permits, resisting development of boundary treatments and using legal agreements to secure these actions.

The applications site has a PTAL score of 4 which indicates that it has a good level of accessibility by public transport. The nearest station is Hampstead Heath Overground station, located to the west of the site, whilst Hampstead Underground station is located to the North West and Belsize Park Underground station is located to the south east. Numerous bus services run past the site on Rosslyn Hill, whilst additional services are available from Pond Street to the south.

In line with Policy T1 of the adopted Camden Local Plan, there is an expectation that cycle parking is going to be provided in accordance with the standards set out in the London Plan. For residential units with 2 or more bedrooms, the requirement is for 2 spaces per unit although the Hampstead Neighbourhood Plan requires the provision of 3 spaces per 3 bedroom unit. The proposals include the provision of 12 cycle spaces in two tier racks within the basement for the residential units (equivalent to 2 spaces per 2 bedroom unit and 3 spaces per 3/4 bedroom unit). These would be accessed directly from the rear court yard via the ground floor from an undersized platform lift or a short set of steps within the court yard. A wheel channel would be provided on the steps.

For the commercial floor space, 18 spaces would be provided in two tier racks in a separate store within the basement, which would be accessed from within the building via what appears to be an undersized lift, or from the outside via a door to the bin store or the rear office entrance. The door between the bin store and the cycle store should be removed so that the two uses remain separate. Showers and lockers would be provided adjacent to the cycle store. The level of cycle parking is 2 spaces short and slightly below the required standard of 1 space per 75 sqm, therefore efforts should be made to accommodate more cycle parking if possible.

Visitor cycle parking would be provided in the rear court yard in the form of 2 spaces (1 Sheffield stand) plus a non-standard sized cycle space (1 Sheffield stand).

In accordance with Policy T2 of the adopted Camden Local Plan, all 5 of the residential units should be secured as on-street Resident parking permit (car) free by means of a Section 106 Agreement. This will prevent the future occupants from adding to existing on-street parking pressures, traffic congestion and air pollution, whilst encouraging the use of more sustainable modes of travel such as walking, cycling and public transport. The commercial spaces should also be secured as on-street Business permit free by means of the Section 106 Agreement. Whilst the plans refer to the central court yard, no attention is given to the rear car parking area. This area of car parking should be removed and the space used for garden landscaping. The retention of any car parking spaces on site is not acceptable.

Given the sensitive location of the site, surrounded by residential properties, it will be necessary to secure a Construction Management Plan and associated Implementation Support Contribution of £9,456 and Impact Bond of at least £15,000 by means of the Section 106 Agreement. This will help prevent the proposed development from having an undue impact on the operation of the local highway network or neighbouring amenity.

Given that the development will lead to an increase in the number of trips from this vacant site, it is considered appropriate that it should be subject to a Pedestrian, Cycle and Environmental Contribution of at least £20,000 and that this be secured by means of the Section 106 Agreement.

Given the location of the site adjacent to the footway on Rosslyn Hill and Downshire Hill, a highways contribution towards repaving the adjacent footway may also be necessary. This will also need to be secured by means of the Section 106 Agreement.

## **8. Energy and Sustainability**

The Council requires all development to minimise the effects of climate change and encourage all developments to meet the highest feasible environmental standards that are financially viable during construction and occupation. The Council promotes zero carbon development and requires all development to reduce carbon dioxide emissions through following the steps in the energy hierarchy; requires all major development to demonstrate how London Plan targets for carbon dioxide emissions have been met, including zero carbon development; and expects all developments to optimise resource efficiency. All major developments are required to assess the feasibility of connecting to an existing decentralised energy network, or where this is not possible, establishing a new network.

Policy CC1 requires all development to reduce carbon dioxide emissions by following the steps in the energy hierarchy; supports and encourages sensitive energy efficiency improvements to existing buildings; and expects all developments to optimise resource efficiency.

Policy 5.2 of the London plan requires development to be designed in accordance with the energy hierarchy: be lean (use less energy), be clean (supply energy efficiently), be green (use renewable energy). In addition chapter 5 of the London Plan sets out the need for schemes to secure a minimum 35% reduction in regulated CO2 emissions below the maximum threshold allowed under Part L 2013. The Council expects zero carbon development, with at least 35% reduction to be made on-site. A carbon offset contribution would be required for the shortfall. This would be used to secure the delivery of carbon reduction measures elsewhere in the borough.

Developments are also expected to implement the sustainable design principles as noted in policy CC2 by achieving a BREEAM 'Excellent' rating and minimum credit requirements under Energy (60%), Materials (40%) and Water (60%).

Policy CC2 requires all development to adopt appropriate climate change adaptation measures such as:

- A. the protection of existing green spaces and promoting new appropriate green infrastructure.
- B. not increasing, and wherever possible reducing, surface water runoff through increasing permeable surfaces and use of Sustainable Drainage Systems.
- C. incorporating bio-diverse roofs, combination green and blue roofs, and green walls where appropriate; and
- D. measures to reduce the impact of urban and dwelling overheating, including application of the cooling hierarchy.

The development is classed as a medium development (5-9 units / between 500 – 1000 sqm) by *CPG Energy Efficiency and adaptation*. All medium applications for new dwellings should demonstrate that they meet sustainable design principles and are also required to meet a target of 19% reduction in carbon emissions below Part L of the Building Regulations 2013, of which 20% is achieved by on-site renewable technologies.

An initial MEP services document has been provided within the addendum pack which outlines locations of air intake louvres, risers, ASHP units and mechanical ventilation units. It is difficult to know the precise nature of this however must link up with the retention of historic fabric. To be clear this must be incorporated early within the scheme to ensure it can be accommodated and it is considered. No details at this stage is concerning and therefore significant attention should be paid to these issues and how to incorporate sustainability measures within the scheme.

Active cooling, especially for the residential areas will not be supported in any full application and should not be included in a proposal. The south elevation is to the front and contains limited glazing meaning the solar gain potential is limited anyway. With the commercial spaces, this could be justified however information relating to the units need to be provided and the following of the cooling hierarchy needs to be demonstrated. Noise Impact Assessments for the plant equipment also need to be provided.

Retrofitting the building with more energy efficient measures to minimise energy consumption (draught-proofing, thermally efficient windows and insulation) should be considered and involved as part of any refurbishment works.

There is a preliminary energy assessment which has been reviewed by our sustainability officer. The following points should be addressed:

- Clarification about why there is a calculated 13% increase in emissions for the residential at Be Lean above baseline:

*Table 4: Regulated carbon dioxide savings from each stage of the energy hierarchy for residential buildings*

|   | <b>Regulated residential carbon dioxide savings</b> |            |
|---|---|------------|
|   | (Tonnes CO <sub>2</sub> per annum)                  | (%)        |
| Be lean: savings from energy demand reduction     | -2.4  | -13%       |
| Be clean: savings from heat network               | 0.0   | 0%         |
| Be green: savings from renewable energy           | 16.1  | 90%        |
| <b>Cumulative on site savings</b>                 | <b>13.8</b>   | <b>77%</b> |
| <b>Cumulative Savings (Heritage Preservation)</b> | <b>12.7</b>   | <b>71%</b> |

- The overall emission reductions as presented are acceptable and the introduction of non-combustion heat pump led heating across the site is strongly encouraged.
- Opportunities to maximise renewables such as by introducing solar PV should be investigated.
- More detail on the specific fabric improvements and other energy reduction measures that will be introduced should be submitted as part of a full application.

The Council will also seek to ensure that development does not increase flood risk and reduces the risk of flooding where possible, through the incorporation of water efficiency measures (policy CC3).

Developments must be designed to be water efficient. This can be achieved through the installation of water efficient fittings and appliances (which can help reduce energy consumption as well as water consumption) and by capturing and re-using rain water and grey water on-site.

Policies D1 and CC2 of the Local Plan encourage sustainable urban drainage systems, green roofs and walls and high quality hard and soft landscaping. The inclusion of a green roof is therefore welcomed.

## 9. Air Quality

The Council will take into account the impact of air quality when assessing development proposals, through the consideration of both the exposure of occupants to air pollution and the effect of the development on air quality.

Owing to the site's location near to a Rosslyn Hill and in the context of the reason for refusal in the previous application there is the possibility that new occupants will be exposed to poor air quality. Furthermore, the demolition and construction work could have a detrimental impact on local air quality. As such, a basic Air Quality Assessment should be submitted with an application. For more information, refer to CPG Air Quality

## 10. Community Infrastructure Levy

If the proposal was deemed acceptable it would be liable for both Mayoral and Camden CIL. This would be based on Mayor's CIL2 (MCIL2) and Camden's latest CIL charging schedule from 2020. As the proposal includes an uplift of 420m<sup>2</sup>, the CIL estimate is:

$$\text{MCIL2} = \text{£}80 \times 895\text{m}^2 = \text{£}71,600$$



Camden CIL (Zone C) = £644 x 895m<sup>2</sup> = £576,380

Total CIL = £71,600 + £576,380 = £647,980

Officers note that the floor areas and calculations above are approximate and sums are indicative. Final payable contributions would be calculated (following any potential approval of the scheme) by the Council's CIL officers.

## CONCLUSION

It is considered that the principle of a mixed use scheme and extensions to the building could be acceptable. However, the current design appears excessive and fails to properly address the significant heritage concerns officers have regarding both the internal and external alterations. The uses and concentration of uses need proper examination considering how viable the proposed commercial use (Class E) would be and the potential for more housing to go on site. There is also concern over impact on amenity for properties to the rear.

Given the sensitive nature of the site itself, it is recommended you begin early with consultation and engagement with local resident groups, societies and the CAAC to ensure local residents are consulted.

Moving forward this proposal is considered to be a case that would benefit from being presented to the Design Review Panel (DRP).

This document represents the Council's initial view of your proposals based on the information available to us at this stage. It should not be interpreted as formal confirmation that your application will be acceptable, nor can it be held to prejudice formal determination of any planning application we receive from you on this proposal.

If you have any queries about the above letter or the attached document, please do not hesitate to contact **Ewan Campbell**

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

It is important to us to find out what our customers think about the service we provide. To help us in this respect, we would be very grateful if you could take a few moments to complete our online survey at the following website address: [www.camden.gov.uk/dmfeedback](http://www.camden.gov.uk/dmfeedback). We will use the information you give us to help improve our services.