

Application ref: 2022/4196/PRE  
Contact: Ewan Campbell  
Tel: +44 20 7974 5458  
Email: Ewan.Campbell@camden.gov.uk  
Date: 19/10/2022

**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 (Class E) and residential on first, second and roof (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

Drawing Nos: Pre-application Heritage Statement (July 2022), Pre-application Design Document (July 2022) and Cover letter (21/07/2022)

#### **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 Rosslyn 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 Rossllyn 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) 2021*

*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 application site is the vacant Former Hampstead Police Station at 26 Rosslyn Hill. The site is located on the north side of Rosslyn Hill at the junction with Downshire Hill. 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 building has been vacant since 2013.

The building is Grade II listed and sits within the Hampstead Conservation Area. 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 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 appeal statements and committee 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.

Policy C2 (Community Facilities) aims to work with partners to ensure community facilities and serves the changing needs of the borough. The Council will seek planning obligations to secure new and improved community spaces, expecting additional floor space for community facilities within new development and support investment plans of research bodies to enhance their operations within the borough amongst other things. Hampstead Neighbourhood Plan policy HC2 (Community Facilities) also seeks to protect existing facilities.

The proposal would involve therefore a loss of a community use would have to meet the requirements outlined in paragraph g of the policy. This is listed below:

*ensure existing community facilities are retained recognising their benefit to the community, including protected groups, unless one of the following tests is met:*

*i. a replacement facility of a similar nature is provided that meets the needs of the local population or it's current, or intended, users;*

*ii. the existing premises are no longer required or viable in their existing use and there is no alternative community use capable of meeting the needs of the local area. Where it has been demonstrated to the Council's satisfaction there is no reasonable prospect of a community use, then our preferred alternative will be the maximum viable amount of affordable housing;*

The proposal, in its current form, does not provide a community use which would meet the needs of the local area and residents. The civic use of the building is being removed and efforts should be made to mitigate this issue. However, in reference to point ii, if it can be demonstrated that a community use is no longer viable or required in the area and already has enough community services, failing to re-provide on site could be considered acceptable.

In relation to employment use, policies E1 (Economic development) and E2 (Employment premises and sites) and CPG *Employment sites and business premises* encourage the provision of employment uses such as offices (Class B1).

Policy E1 aims to secure a successful and inclusive economy in Camden by creating the conditions for economic growth to support residents and local businesses. This is achieved through maintaining premises that are suitable for a variety of businesses, supporting local enterprise and business, promoting Knowledge Quarter as a location and directing new offices to growth areas.

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

The principle of the change of use is considered acceptable however there is a question regarding viability and marketing. Hampstead and even Hampstead Town Centre, has a distinctly suburban character, where residents live to commute into commercial areas and where there is a very low provision of offices. Therefore some marketing and viability evidence should be submitted in support of the application demonstrating there is a need for office space within this area.

The other use proposed is residential (C3) and occupies the first, second and third 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 to support this needs to be provided to demonstrate that more, potentially smaller units cannot be provided on site because, in relation to policy G1, H1 and H7, the Council aims to resist development that makes inefficient use of Camden's limited land; maximise the boroughs housing supply in accordance with the Housing Delivery Test and provide a range of unit sizes. For context, point d of policy H1 is provided below:

*d. where sites are underused or vacant, expecting the maximum reasonable provision of housing that is compatible with any other uses needed on the site.*

The mixed use nature and the demonstration that the provision of Class E uses are required is relevant here as the policy points indicate that the sites should fulfil their



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.

Finally, whilst this will be covered in other sections, it is important to mention that currently the overall scale and therefore GIA remain unacceptable for this site and mean that there will have to be a reduction in floorspace. However on the whole there needs to be an appreciation of the site's different spaces and the appropriateness of the uses proposed within these spaces. The proposal should aim to have an overall acceptable balance of uplift in GIA and land use with heritage considerations as well as policy.

## 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 proposed first floor plan appears to show the complete removal of the Magistrates Court fixtures and fittings. While on site there were additional discussions around plans to remove the Magistrates dais and create a new door directly through from the Magistrates stair. This layout is not shown on the drawings I have but from the description alone I believe this would fundamentally alter the Courthouse and involve the loss of historic fabric unacceptably.
- 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.
- This current proposal has to be seen within the context of the previously dismissed appeal and is a material consideration. Paragraph 71-79 of the Inspectors report for the includes much of the assessment on internal works but also includes the following:

*The extent of the harm caused by the internal alterations to structure and layout significantly outweigh the benefits. The NPPF indicates that when considering the impact of a proposed development on the significance of a designated heritage asset, great weight should be given to the asset's conservation, irrespective of whether any potential harm amounts to substantial harm, total loss or less than substantial harm to its significance. The proposed scheme would conflict with the heritage protection aims of LP policy D2 and NP policy DH2. In accordance with paragraph 196 of the NPPF, this harm has to be considered in the balance in the light of the public benefits.*

- Within the previous application, it appears that there were actually less or less harmful internal alterations being proposed which were still considered to cause unacceptable harm. Therefore any full application should consider the comments above and ensure that as much of the internal fabric, which contributes significantly to the asses' heritage, be retained.

## Four Storey Rear Extension

- The four storey rear extension infills the space within the courtyard area but also extends the east wing to the left and right of the original building. The overall depth and maximum is not being extended or altered however the width and overall bulk and scale to the rear is increasing significantly, especially at first, second and roof level (which will be discussed in the section below).
- The extension includes multiple residential amenity terraces secured by railings, significant amount of glazing to the rear for the connecting link and residential units.
- Architecturally the extension of the building is to be carried out in matching red brick with powder coated window framing. The materials are considered to complement the existing.
- Whilst an extension that covers all four levels could be accepted in principle, the east wing's bulk and consequential loss of traditional features is of concern.
- The overall increase in bulk as a consequence of the extension is considerable and ultimately fails to maintain an acceptable level of subordination. The extensions make the east wing and overall rear elevation almost unrecognisable and therefore fails to preserve or enhance the character of the conservation area or listed building itself.
- The proposed rear of the East wing is mostly characterised by terraces and large full length glazing to the residential units. These windows appear to dominate the back of the building particularly due to the large plain glazing and the dark powder coated colouring which contrasts with the white of the refurbished traditional multi paned sash windows of the original building.
- The proposed windows to the rear appear particularly dominant, stark and somewhat dour in contrast to the existing retained windows. It could help if the design incorporated mullions and transoms to break down the scale so that the contrast is not so extreme.

## Roof Extension

- The roof extension includes the total removal of half of the pitched roof to accommodate additional residential units. A new terrace and metal railings for the roof unit is also added with new dormer windows and roof plant enclosure
- The roof extension itself is proposed to be black metal cladding the main roof slope facing south is opened up to accommodate a box form extension, also with full length windows.
- The scale of the extension is 'full width', extending all along the roof and therefore significantly dominates the rear elevation. The extension would be very visible however longer views down Downshire hill would be impacted. The scale remains a significant concern but it is just as much the different design elements at this level which contributes to clutter and a 'messy'/ uncoordinated design at this level. The proposed rear elevation shows metal clad dormer windows, railings and red brick plant enclosure. Whilst reducing the scale is needed, the cluttered or disordered appearance needs to be attended to also.
- The loss of the pitch does contribute to the unacceptable loss of historic fabric in the building. Efforts should be made to overcome this loss by either making amendments to the roof extension design or doing significantly more to retain internal and external historic fabric elsewhere in the site.

## Infill Extension

- 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 but does extend four storeys with a significant amount of glazing on the ground and first floor.
- 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; the rear elevation shows floor to ceiling glazing on the ground floor, glazed windows on the first and small brick windows on the second. Each of these three floors remains different in design and means it is read differently to the whole scheme.
- The significant amount of glazing is also of concern and should be reduced.

### 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 not completely clear the appearance of the new entrance and this can accommodate a lift, however providing the design is sympathetic, along with the materials, then there is no objection in principle to the alterations.
- In general this scheme could be supported if there were greater retention of significant fabric. As it stands I consider 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.

Whilst, for ease, the elements have been broken up in the assessment, the development and architecture needs to relate better to the host building and respond in a more sympathetic manner as a whole. The extensions demonstrate that there needs to be more consideration to what development the host building can take or why the decisions on scale have been taken. For example paragraph 5.6 of the Heritage Statement states:

*To the rear of the building, repair and refurbishment works are proposed to all elevations, whilst extensions are proposed to the rear eastern wing at lower ground, ground, and first and second floor level. Where extensions are proposed, these are to be constructed from a contextual material, matching the red brick of the existing building, whilst maintaining a clear distinction between old and new through the use of modern glazing and balconied areas secured by contextual iron railings. New sash windows are proposed to match those seen across the façade, creating degree of order to the rear elevation of the eastern rear wing (currently comprising blocked up openings and an irregular fenestration pattern).*

This only goes into the materials in any sort of detail and reinforces the point that, whilst it is accepted that rear extensions could go on the site, there needs to be a more proportionate balance between heritage concerns and GIA uplift.

### **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 (2b3p)	125sqm
Apt 4 (4b6p)	239sqm
Apt 5 (3b5p)	260sqm

The minimum requirement for units is 5sqm which is easily exceeded 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 Rosslyn 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 (or studio)</b>	<b>2-bedroom</b>	<b>3-bedroom</b>	<b>4-bedroom (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 aims to maximise the supply of affordable housing. The Council expects a contribution towards affordable housing from all developments that provide one or more additional homes and involve a total addition to residential floorspace of 100sqm GIA or more

The Council will assess the capacity for additional homes on the basis of multiples of 100sqm GIA, rounding the additional residential floorspace to the nearest 100sqm GIA so the assessed capacity will always be a whole number. 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 or 100sqm added to capacity.

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.

### **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 stand alone in character 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, and daylight and sunlight are not significantly impacted upon, issues of privacy and perceived issue of overlooking could be. The roof extensions and balconies to the rear could potentially see into properties along Downshire Hill and the large building to the other side (22 Rossllyn 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 Rossllyn Hill as well from these terraces. More of an in depth analysis needs to be undertaken to ensure these amenities are protected.

For East wing side the 'extension 4' extends beyond no.26 Rossllyn 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 Rossllyn 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.

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 Rossllyn 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.

No details of energy or sustainability measures have been provided as part of the pre-application documents.

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.

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:

MCIL2 = £80 x 895m<sup>2</sup> = £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 the principle of a mixed use scheme and extensions to the building could be acceptable, however currently the design appears excessive and fails to properly attend to heritage concerns internally and externally. The uses and concentration of uses need proper examination considering how viable the proposed commercial use (Class E) is and the potential for more housing to go on site.

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

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.

