

Email: planning@camden.gov.uk

Phone: 020 7974 4444 Fax: 020 7974 1680 Development Management Camden Town Hall Extension Argyle Street London WC1H 8EQ

Application for Planning Permission and listed building consent for alterations, extension or demolition of a listed building.

Town and Country Planning Act 1990

Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990

Publication of applications on planning authority websites.

Please note that the information provided on this application form and in supporting documents may be published on the Authority's website. If you require any further clarification, please contact the Authority's planning department.

1. Applicant Na	ame, Address and Contact Details				
Title: Miss	First name: Eleanor	Surname: Red	mill		
Company name	Marek Wojciechowski Architects]			
Street address:	Marek Wojciechowski Architects]	Country Code	National Number	Extension Number
	Level 2	Telephone number:	020	75809336	013
	28 Margaret Street	Mobile number:		1	
Town/City	London	Wobile Humber.]	
County:		Fax number:			
Country:		Email address:			
Postcode:	W1W 8RZ	eleanor@mw-a.co.uk			
Are you an agent a	cting on behalf of the applicant? • Yes	○ No			
2. Agent Name	e, Address and Contact Details				
Title:	First Name: Eleanor	Surname: Red	mill		
Company name:	MW Architects				
company name.	INW AIGHTECTS]	Country	National	Extension
Street address:	28 Margaret Street	<u> </u>	Code	Number	Number
		Telephone number:			
		Mobile number:			
Town/City	London	Fax number:			
County:	London			_J	
Country:		Email address:			
Postcode:	W1W 8RZ	eleanor@mw-a.co.uk			
3. Description	of Proposed Works				
Please describe det	ails of the proposed development or works including details of prop the listed building(s):	posals to alter,			
	n Commercial (B1) to Residential (C3) to create 5No. Apartments ove dequate access. Retention of listed front facade and floor levels thro		on of rear facad	e and closet wing. Deepening	of pavement
Has the developme work(s) already star					

Town/City: London Description of location or a grid reference (most be completed by postodes is not known): Easility: 300944 Northing: 3009444 Northing: 300944 Northing:	Full poolal address of the site (including full posloode where available) House mane. Warwick House Chart Warwick Court Warwick Court Inan/City; London Coverty Warries Court Warwick Court Description Description Earling Earl											
House name. Warnisk House Chambers Warnisk London County. Postcode: Warnisk House Chambers Warnisk Development of London Development of London Warnisk Developme	Induse						D					
House name. Wavalds Rouse Chambers Were address. Were address. Were address. Were address. Were SDJ London County. Work SDJ Description of Lostion or a grid reference (must be completed if protecteds in the Lostion of a grid reference (must be completed if protecteds in the Lostion). Beautiful Solid Lostion or a grid reference (must be completed if protecteds in the Lostion). Beautiful Solid Lostion or a grid reference (must be completed if protecteds in the Lostion). Beautiful Solid Lostion or a grid reference (must be completed if protecteds in the Lostion). If Yes, please complete the following information about the advice you were given (this will help the authority to deal with this application more efficiently): Officer name. If Yes, please complete the following information about the advice you were given (this will help the authority to deal with this application more efficiently): Officer name. If Yes, please complete the following information about the advice you were given (this will help the authority to deal with this application more efficiently): Officer name. If Yes, please complete the following information about the advice you were given (this will help the authority to deal with this application more efficiently): Officer name. Deals of the pre-application advice rootweet from Hugh Miller and Alan Will or Canden Borough Council on 28/20/2014 (vg 2014/0899/PRB). The main points of this response are as construction of the pre-application advice variety of the following and reducible of the pre-application advice was received from the third pre-application advice variety of the following: - Leighth of the Appended for the Appended for morber of Flowage and a reducible of the pre-application and the extensive upgrade would be required. - A shortly or morber of the would be reduced the minimum requirements and the areas schedules would be included in the planning application. - A shortly or morber of the count of the Appended for the Appended for the Deals and Appended for	House name: Warwisk Rouse Chambers Warwisk Court Tover/City London County: Plottcride: WCHR 833) Description of location or a grid reference (must be completed if prostcode and known): Esting: \$30944 Worthing: \$30944 Worthing: \$30944 Worthing: \$30944 Worthing: \$30944 Worthing: \$30946 Worthing:	•	of the site (includir			le)	Desc	ription:				
Street address: WewWo Court	Street address: More	House:	8		ix:		٦					
Town/Clay: County: Perstander WC18 503 Description of location or a grid reference (must be completed if protecteds in not secure): Earting: S0594 Northing: S0594 Northing: S0594 Northing: S0594 Northing: S0594 Northing: S0594 Northing: S0594 S0594 Northing: S0594 S0594 Northing: S0594 S0594 S0594 S0594 S0594 S0694 S0794	TownClay	House name:	Warwick House C	hambers								
Description of location or a gild reference (must be completed it postoode is not Invavin): Facting \$29944 Northing \$29944 \$	Description of location or a grid reference (must be completed if postcode is not income); Easting Survival (India of the continuous); Easting Survival (I	Street address:	Warwick Court									
Description of location or a gild reference (must be completed it postoode is not Invavin): Facting \$29944 Northing \$29944 \$	Description of location or a grid reference (must be completed if postcode is not income); Easting Survival (India of the continuous); Easting Survival (I						_					
PostCode WC1R SDJ Description of Incutation or a girl reference (must be completed if post-code is not known): Earting: 30944 Northing: SP-e-application Advice Has assistance or prior advice been sought from the local authority about this application? If Yes please complete the following information about the advice you were given (this will help the authority to deal with this application more efficiently): Officer name: If We please complete the following information about the advice you were given (this will help the authority to deal with this application more efficiently): Officer name: If We please complete the following information about the advice you were given (this will help the authority to deal with this application more efficiently): Officer name: If We please complete the following information about the advice you were given (this will help the authority to deal with this application more efficiently): Officer name: If We please complete the following information about the advice you were given (this will help the authority to deal with this application more efficiently): Officer name: If We please complete the following information about the advice you were given (this will help the authority to deal with this application more efficiently): Officer name: If We pro-application advice received: Pre-planning advice was received from Hugh Miller and Alian Wito of Curnden Borough Council on 28/02/2014 (eff 2014/0889/196E). The main points of this response are as follows: Pre-planning advice was received from Hugh Miller and Alian Wito of Curnden Borough Council on 28/02/2014 (eff 2014/0889/196E). The main points of this response are as follows: If I is the proposed change of us of referred to effect the Carredottal use for the entire building acceptable in principle, given that the property is Crade II illied, originally built Miller and the advice will be adviced by the referred to a foreign and the second to a foreign and referred to a foreign and the second to a foreign and	Postcode WC1R SDJ Description of location or a girl orderone (must be completed if postcode is not known) Easting S0944 Northing 181683 S. Pre-application Advice Has assistance or prior advice been sought from the local authority about this application? If Yes, please complete the following information about the advice you were given (this will help the authority to deal with this application more efficiently): Officer name: Title: [Mr. First name: [Rugh	Town/City:	London									
Description of location or a grid reference (must be completed if postcode is not known): Easiling	Description of location or a grid reference (must be completed if postcode is not known): Easting \$20044 Northing: \$25094 N	County:										
(must be completed if postcode is not known): Easting \$3094.4 1816.83	(must be completed if postcode is not known): Fasting	Postcode:	WC1R 5DJ									
S. Pre-application Advice Has assistance or prior advice been sought from the local authority about this application? If Yes, please complete the following information about the advice you were given (this will help the authority to deal with this application more efficiently): Officer name First name: First name: First name: Date (DD/MM/YYYY): 2014/0889/PRE Date (DD/MM/YYYY): Details of the pre-application advice received: Pre-planning advice was received from Hugh Miller and Alan Wito of Camden Borough Council on 28/02/2014 (ef 2014/0889/PRE). The main points of this response are as follows: If I is have proposed change of use from 11 office to C3 recited half use for the entire building acceptable in principle, given that the property is Grade II listed, originally built will be pre-application advice would need to be justified within the application through analysis of the following: Length of Vacancy: Length of Vacancy: Lack of Office Intrastructure Asbestos removal: First planning advice was could need to be justified within the application through analysis of the following: Length of Vacancy: Lack of Office Intrastructure Asbestos removal: First planning advice with a first planning advice to the Assess to the proposals. Solid to the Marketing Report. 20 Is the proposed demolition of the rear feaced kind from the Assess to the proposals. Solid to the Cambridge and the Assess Statement for research into Brombour Branning Guidance (CPG2) then the mix would be acceptable. Refer to section 3.0 of this Design and Access Statement for the Assess to the proposals. Solid to the Cambridge and the Assess to the C3 suggested a review of bomb-damage maps in the area. Refer to section 3.0 of this Design and Access Statement for research into Bromb Damage and Access Statement for research into Bromb Damage. Solid that in the order the rear feaced is non-regional CEC reviewed information which showed the change in plann form through historical maps. CBC noted that the this would be investiga	S. Pre-application Advice Has assistance or prior advice been sought from the local authority about this application? If Yes, please complete the following information about the advice you were given (this will help the authority to deal with this application more efficiently): Officer name: Title: [Mr											
5. Pre-application Advice Has assistance or prior advice been sought from the local authority about this application? If Yes, please complete the following information about the advice you were given (this will help the authority to deal with this application more efficiently): Officer name: First name: First name: South First name: Hugh	5. Pre-application Advice Has assistance or prior advice been sought from the local authority about this application? For year and advice been sought from the local authority about this application? First name: Title: Mr First name: Hugh	Easting:	530944									
If Yes, please complete the following information about the advice you were given (this will help the authority to deal with this application more efficiently): Officer name: Illite: Mr	Has assistance or prior advice been sought from the local authority about this application? If Yes, please complete the following information about the advice you were given (this will help the authority to deal with this application more efficiently): Officer name: Title: Mr	Northing:	181683									
If Yes, please complete the following information about the advice you were given (this will help the authority to deal with this application more efficiently): Officer name: Illite: Mr	Has assistance or prior advice been sought from the local authority about this application? If Yes, please complete the following information about the advice you were given (this will help the authority to deal with this application more efficiently): Officer name: Titlle: Mr											
If Yes, please complete the following information about the advice you were given (this will help the authority to deal with this application more efficiently): Officer name: Title Mr First name: Hugh Suname: Miller Reference: 2014/0889/PRE 2014/0889/	If Yes, please complete the following information about the advice you were given (this will help the authority to deal with this application more efficiently): Officer name: Title: Mr	5. Pre-applicati	on Advice									
Officer name: Title: Mr	Office name: Title: Mr First name: Rugh Surname: Millior Date (DDAMMYYYY): 28/02/2014 (Must be pre-application submission) Details of the pre-application advice received. Per-planning advice was received from Hugh Miller and Alan Wito of Camden Borough Council on 28/02/2014 (ref 2014/0889/PRE). The main points of this response are as rollows: All 1s the proposed change of use from B1 office to C3 residential use for the entire building acceptable in principle, given that the property is Grade II listed, originally built as a residential dwelling and unsuitable for modern office use? All 1s the proposed change of use would need to be justified within the application through analysis of the following: Length of vacancy: Lack of office infrastructure Abstos removal: Also stops removal: Also stops removal: Also stops removal: Financial viability Refer to Appendix F for the Marketing Report. Z. Is the proposed mix of units (4 no. 2 bedroom units, 1 no. studio) deemed acceptable? CBC noted that I units needed to meet the minimum standards set out by Camden Planning Guidance (CPG2) then the mix would be acceptable. MWA confirmed that the units in fact exceeded the minimum requirements and that an area schedule would be included in the planning application. Refer to septem and Access Statement for the Areas of the proposals. J. Is the proposed demolition of the rear façade likely to be acceptable? CBC noted that they suspect that the rear façade is included in the Design and Access Statement for the Areas of the proposals. J. Is the proposed demolition of the rear façade likely to be acceptable? CBC noted that they suspect that the rear façade is included in the Design and Access Statement. Refer to section 3.0 of this begins and Access Statement for research into Bomb Damage A. Is the proposed demolition of the rear façade likely to be acceptable? CBC noted that in this would be investigated and included in the Design and Access Statement. Refer to section 3.0 of this begins and	Has assistance or pr	ior advice been so	ught from the l	ocal authority a	bout this applica	tion?		Ye	es O No		
Reference: 2014/0889/PRE Date (DD/MM/YYYY): 28/02/2014 (Must be pre-application submission) Details of the pre-application advice received: Pre-planning advice was received from Hugh Miller and Alan Wito of Camden Borough Council on 28/02/2014 (ref 2014/0889/PRE). The main points of this response are as follows: 17. Is the proposed change of use from B1 office to C3 residential use for the entire building acceptable in principle, given that the property is Grade II listed, originally built is as a residential dwelling and unsuitable for modern office use? MMA noted that the building was not suitable in its current state for modern office accommodation and that extensive upgrade would be required. CEC noted that the change of use would need to be justified within the application through analysis of the following: - Langth of vacancy - Lack of office infrastructure - Asbestos removal - Langth of vacancy - Lack of office infrastructure - Asbestos removal - State of the Americal visibility - State proposed mix of units (4 no. 2 bedroom units, 1 no. studio) deemed acceptable? 27. Is the proposed mix of units (4 no. 2 bedroom units, 1 no. studio) deemed acceptable? 28. Is the proposed mix of units (4 no. 2 bedroom units, 1 no. studio) deemed acceptable? 29. State of the state of the state of the minimum standards set out by Camden Planning Guidance (CPG2) then the mix would be acceptable. WMA confirmed that the units in face exceeded the minimum standards set out by Camden Planning Guidance (CPG2) then the mix would be acceptable. Refer to Section 3.0 of this Design and Access Statement for the Access of the proposals. CEC noted that the superposed of the proposals. CEC noted that the superposed of the proposals. Well of the proposals of the proposals of the proposals of the proposals of the proposals. A state proposal developed to cover this learn. CEC suggested a review of bomb damage maps in the area. WMA confirmed that this would be investigated and included in the Design and Access Statement.	Title: Mr Flist name: Hugh Surname: Miller 2014/0889/PRE 2014/089/PRE 20	If Yes, please compl	ete the following i	nformation abo	out the advice y	ou were given (th	nis will he	elp the autho	rity to deal w	ith this applica	ation more effici	iently):
Reference: 2014/0889/PRE Date (DD/MM/YYYY): 28/02/2014 (Must be pre-application submission) Details of the pre-application advice received: Pre-planning advice was received from Hugh Miller and Alan Wito of Camden Borough Council on 28/02/2014 (ref 2014/0889/PRE). The main points of this response are as follows: 17. Is the proposed change of use from B1 office to C3 residential use for the entire building acceptable in principle, given that the property is Grade II listed, originally built is as a residential dwelling and unsuitable for modern office use? MMA noted that the building was not suitable in its current state for modern office accommodation and that extensive upgrade would be required. CEC noted that the change of use would need to be justified within the application through analysis of the following: - Langth of vacancy - Lack of office infrastructure - Asbestos removal - Langth of vacancy - Lack of office infrastructure - Asbestos removal - State of the Americal visibility - State proposed mix of units (4 no. 2 bedroom units, 1 no. studio) deemed acceptable? 27. Is the proposed mix of units (4 no. 2 bedroom units, 1 no. studio) deemed acceptable? 28. Is the proposed mix of units (4 no. 2 bedroom units, 1 no. studio) deemed acceptable? 29. State of the state of the state of the minimum standards set out by Camden Planning Guidance (CPG2) then the mix would be acceptable. WMA confirmed that the units in face exceeded the minimum standards set out by Camden Planning Guidance (CPG2) then the mix would be acceptable. Refer to Section 3.0 of this Design and Access Statement for the Access of the proposals. CEC noted that the superposed of the proposals. CEC noted that the superposed of the proposals. Well of the proposals of the proposals of the proposals of the proposals of the proposals. A state proposal developed to cover this learn. CEC suggested a review of bomb damage maps in the area. WMA confirmed that this would be investigated and included in the Design and Access Statement.	Title: Mr Flist name: Hugh Surname: Miller 2014/0889/PRE 2014/089/PRE 20	Officer name:										
Date (DD/MM/YYYY): 88/02/2014 (Must be pre-application submission) Details of the pre-application advice received: Pre-planning advice was received from Hugh Miller and Alan Wito of Camden Borough Council on 28/02/2014 (ref 2014/0889/PRE). The main points of this response are as follows: It is the proposed change of use from B1 office to C3 residential use for the entire building acceptable in principle, given that the property is Grade II listed, originally built as a residential dwelling and unsuitable for modern office use? MWA noted that the building was not suitable in its current state for modern office accommodation and that extensive upgrade would be required. CBC noted that the change of use would need to be justified within the application through analysis of the following: - Leaft of Office infrastructure - Asbestos removal - Financial viability Refer to Appendix F for the Marketing Report. 27. Is the proposed mix of units (4 no. 2 bedroom units. 1 no. studio) deemed acceptable? CBC noted that all units needed to meet the minimum requirements and that an area schedule would be included in the planning application. Refer to section 13 of this Design and Access Statement for the Areas of the proposals. 37. Is the proposed demolition of the rear façade likely to be acceptable? CBC noted that they suspect that the rear façade likely to be acceptable? CBC noted that they suspect that the rear façade is non-original. CBC reviewed information which showed the change in plan form through historical maps. CBC noted that plustification would be required to cover this item. CBC suggested a review of bomb-damage maps in the area. MWA confirmed that this would be investigated and included in the Design and Access Statement. Refer to section 3 of this Design and Access Statement for research into Bomb Damage 47. Is the proposed extension of the existing closet wing, to be increased in width and depth, likely to be acceptable in planning and heritage terms? CBC noted that in theory the extension	Date (DD/MM/YYYY): 28/02/2014 (Must be pre-application submission) Details of the pre-application advice received: Pre-planning advice was received from Hugh Miller and Alan Wito of Camden Borough Council on 28/02/2014 (ref 2014/0889/PRE). The main points of this response are as follows: It is the proposed change of use from B1 office to C3 residential use for the entire building acceptable in principle, given that the property is Grade II listed, originally built as a residential dwelling and unsuitable for modern office use? MWA noted that the building was not suitable in its current state for modern office accommodation and that extensive upgrade would be required. CBC noted that the building was not suitable in its current state for modern office accommodation and that extensive upgrade would be required. CBC noted that the building was not suitable in its current state for modern office accommodation and that extensive upgrade would be required. CBC noted that the building was for the Marketing Report. 2. Is the proposed mix of units (4 no. 2 bedroom units, 1 no. studio) deemed acceptable? CBC noted that all units needed to meet the minimum standards set out by Camden Planning Guidance (CPC2) then the mix would be acceptable. MWA confirmed that the units in fact exceeded the minimum requirements and that an area schedule would be included in the planning application. Refer to section 13 of this Design and Access Statement for the Areas of the proposals. 3. Is the proposed demolition of the reaf readed likely to be acceptable? CBC noted that the tys suspect that the reaf reade is non-original. CBC Previewed information which showed the change in plan form through historical maps. CBC noted that buildification mould be required to cover this item. CBC suggested a review of bomb-damage maps in the area. MWA confirmed that this would be investigated and included in the Design and Access Statement. Refer to section 3.0 of this Design and Access Statement for research into Bomb Damage 4. Is the p		First name:	Hugh				Surname:	Miller			
Details of the pre-application advice received: Pre-planning advice was received from Hugh Miller and Alan Witto of Camden Borough Council on 28/02/2014 (ref 2014/0889/PRE). The main points of this response are as follows: It is the proposed change of use from B1 office to C3 residential use for the entire building acceptable in principle, given that the property is Grade II listed, originally built as a residential dwelling and unsuitable for modern office use? MWA noted that the building was not suitable in its current state for modern office accommodation and that extensive upgrade would be required. CBC noted that the building was not suitable in its current state for modern office accommodation and that extensive upgrade would be required. CBC noted that the building was not suitable in its current state for modern office accommodation and that extensive upgrade would be required. CBC noted that the change of use would need to be justified within the application through analysis of the following: - Leak of office Infrastructure - Asbestos removal - In insulated in the acceptable of the proposed mix of units (4 no. 2 bedroom units, 1 no. studio) deemed acceptable? CBC noted that all units needed to meet the minimum standards set out by Camden Planning Guidance (CPC2) then the mix would be acceptable. MMA confirmed that the units in fact exceeded the minimum requirements and that an area schedule would be included in the planning application. Refer to section 13 of this Design and Access Statement for research into Bomb Design and Access Statement for the Acress of the proposals. 37. Is the proposed demolition of the rear façade likely to be acceptable? CBC noted that they suspect that the rear façade is non-original. CBC reviewed information which showed the change in plan form through historical maps. CBC noted that pushferiation and Access Statement for research into Bomb Damage 47. Is the proposed extension of the existing closet wing, to be increased in width and depth, likely to be accep	Details of the pre-application advice received: Pre-planning advice was received from Hugh Miller and Alan Wito of Camden Borough Council on 28/02/2014 (ref 2014/0869/PRE). The main points of this response are as follows: It is the proposed change of use from B1 office to C3 residential use for the entire building acceptable in principle, given that the property is Grade II listed, originally built as a residential dwelling and unsuitable for modern office use? MWA noted that the building was not suitable in its current state for modern office accommodation and that extensive upgrade would be required. CBC noted that the change of use would need to be justified within the application through analysis of the following: Length of Vacancy Lack of office infrastructure Asbestos removal Financial viability Refer to Appendix Ir or the Marketing Report. ZI. Is the proposed mix of units (4 no. 2 bedroom units, 1 no. studio) deemed acceptable? CBC noted that all units needed to meet the minimum standards set out by Camden Planning Guidance (CPG2) then the mix would be acceptable. MWA confirmed that the units in fact exceeded the minimum requirements and that an area schedule would be included in the planning application. Refer to section 31 of this Design and Access Statement for the Areas of the proposal. SI. Is the proposed demolition of the rear façade likely to be acceptable? CBC noted that they suspect that the rear façade is non-original. CBC reviewed information which showed the change in plan form through historical maps. CBC noted that justification would be required to cover this tem. CBC suggested a review of bomb-damage maps in the area. MWA confirmed that this would be investigated an included in the Design and Access Statement. Refer to section 3.0 of this Design and Access Statement for research into Bomb Damage 4/1. Is the proposed extension of the existing closes wing, to be increased in width and depth, likely to be acceptable in planning and heritage terms? CBC noted that in theory	Reference:	2014/0889/	/PRE				J				
Details of the pre-application advice received: Pre-planning advice was received from Hugh Miller and Alan Witto of Camden Borough Council on 28/02/2014 (ref 2014/0889/PRE). The main points of this response are as follows: It is the proposed change of use from B1 office to C3 residential use for the entire building acceptable in principle, given that the property is Grade II listed, originally built as a residential dwelling and unsuitable for modern office use? MWA noted that the building was not suitable in its current state for modern office accommodation and that extensive upgrade would be required. CBC noted that the building was not suitable in its current state for modern office accommodation and that extensive upgrade would be required. CBC noted that the building was not suitable in its current state for modern office accommodation and that extensive upgrade would be required. CBC noted that the change of use would need to be justified within the application through analysis of the following: - Leak of office Infrastructure - Asbestos removal - In insulated in the acceptable of the proposed mix of units (4 no. 2 bedroom units, 1 no. studio) deemed acceptable? CBC noted that all units needed to meet the minimum standards set out by Camden Planning Guidance (CPC2) then the mix would be acceptable. MMA confirmed that the units in fact exceeded the minimum requirements and that an area schedule would be included in the planning application. Refer to section 13 of this Design and Access Statement for research into Bomb Design and Access Statement for the Acress of the proposals. 37. Is the proposed demolition of the rear façade likely to be acceptable? CBC noted that they suspect that the rear façade is non-original. CBC reviewed information which showed the change in plan form through historical maps. CBC noted that pushferiation and Access Statement for research into Bomb Damage 47. Is the proposed extension of the existing closet wing, to be increased in width and depth, likely to be accep	Details of the pre-application advice received: Pre-planning advice was received from Hugh Miller and Alan Wito of Camden Borough Council on 28/02/2014 (ref 2014/0869/PRE). The main points of this response are as follows: It is the proposed change of use from B1 office to C3 residential use for the entire building acceptable in principle, given that the property is Grade II listed, originally built as a residential dwelling and unsuitable for modern office use? MWA noted that the building was not suitable in its current state for modern office accommodation and that extensive upgrade would be required. CBC noted that the change of use would need to be justified within the application through analysis of the following: Length of Vacancy Lack of office infrastructure Asbestos removal Financial viability Refer to Appendix Ir or the Marketing Report. ZI. Is the proposed mix of units (4 no. 2 bedroom units, 1 no. studio) deemed acceptable? CBC noted that all units needed to meet the minimum standards set out by Camden Planning Guidance (CPG2) then the mix would be acceptable. MWA confirmed that the units in fact exceeded the minimum requirements and that an area schedule would be included in the planning application. Refer to section 31 of this Design and Access Statement for the Areas of the proposal. SI. Is the proposed demolition of the rear façade likely to be acceptable? CBC noted that they suspect that the rear façade is non-original. CBC reviewed information which showed the change in plan form through historical maps. CBC noted that justification would be required to cover this tem. CBC suggested a review of bomb-damage maps in the area. MWA confirmed that this would be investigated an included in the Design and Access Statement. Refer to section 3.0 of this Design and Access Statement for research into Bomb Damage 4/1. Is the proposed extension of the existing closes wing, to be increased in width and depth, likely to be acceptable in planning and heritage terms? CBC noted that in theory	Date (DD/MM/YYYY	28/02/2014	ı (N	Must be pre-app	olication submissi	on)					
Pre-planning advice was received from Hugh Miller and Alan Wito of Camden Borough Council on 28/02/2014 (ref 2014/0889/PRE). The main points of this response are as follows: 1. Is the proposed change of use from B1 office to C3 residential use for the entire building acceptable in principle, given that the property is Grade II listed, originally built as a residential dwelling and unsuitable for modern office use? MWA noted that the building was on suitable in its current state for modern office accommodation and that extensive upgrade would be required. CBC noted that the change of use would need to be justified within the application through analysis of the following: 1. Leak of office infrastructure 1. Asbestos removal 1. Enancial viability 1. Financial viability 1. Enancial viabili	Pre-planning advice was received from Hugh Miller and Alan Wito of Camden Borough Council on 28/02/2014 (ref 2014/0889/PRE). The main points of this response are as follows: 1. Is the proposed change of use from B1 office to C3 residential use for the entire building acceptable in principle, given that the property is Grade II listed, originally built as a residential dwelling and unsuitable for modern office use? MWA noted that the building was not suitable in its current state for modern office accommodation and that extensive upgrade would be required. CBC noted that the change of use would need to be justified within the application through analysis of the following: - Length of vacancy. - Lack of office infrastructure - Asbestos removal - Financial viability. Refer to Appendix E for the Marketing Report. 2. Is the proposed mix of units (4 no. 2 bedroom units, 1 no. studio) deemed acceptable? CBC noted that all units needed to meet the minimum requirements and that an area schedule would be included in the planning application. Refer to section 13 of this Design and Access Statement for the Areas of the proposals. 3. Is the proposed demolition of the reaf façade likely to be acceptable? CBC noted that they suspect that the reaf façade is non-original. CBC reviewed information which showed the change in plan form through historical maps. CBC noted that this yould be investigated and included in the Design and Access Statement for research into Bomb Damage 44. Is the proposed extension of the existing closet wing, to be increased in width and depth, likely to be acceptable in planning and heritage terms? CBC noted that in theory the extension to the rear façade likely to be acceptable? CBC noted that in theory the extension to the rear façade likely to be acceptable? CBC noted that in the ory the extension to the rear façade likely to be acceptable? CBC oroged frawings P2, P1, P1, P1, B1 and P19 for revised proposals. 57. Is the proposed extension of the existing closet wing, to be increase						,					
CBC noted that the proposed replacement windows would need to be a like-for-like replacement.	MMMA noted that this would be included in the planning application	17. Is the proposed as a residential dwe MWA noted that the Length Lack of Asbeste Financi Refer to Appendix E 27. Is the proposed CBC noted that all u MWA confirmed that Refer to section 13 of 37. Is the proposed CBC noted that they that justification wo MWA confirmed that Refer to section 3.0 of 47. Is the proposed CBC noted that in the MWA will review the Refer to design draw 57. Is the proposed CBC suggested that MWA will review the Refer to design draw 57. Is the proposed CBC suggested that MWA will review the Refer to design draw 67. Is the principle of CBC noted that item Refer to design draw 87. Is the proposal to CBC noted that item Refer to design draw 87. Is the principle of CBC noted that item Refer to design draw 87. Is the principle of CBC noted that it wo MWA will include the Refer to section 16 of 97. Is the principle of 16 of 97. Is the principle of 17 of 18 the principle of 1	lling and unsuitable building was not change of use wou of vacancy office infrastructures removal al viability for the Marketing mix of units (4 no. nits needed to me at the units in fact of this Design and demolition of the rouse required to at this would be involved by the extension of the ex	le for modern o suitable in its culd need to be justed in its culd	ts, 1 no. studio) In standards set Isinimum require Int for the Areas Int to Be accepta Int for the Areas Int for the Ar	deemed acceptal out by Camden Fements and that a soft he proposals able? Creviewed informed a review of born Design and Acceptanto Bomb Dama ased in width and ous, providing that ous, providing the preferred over the preferred	ble? Planning an area s i. nation w mb-dam. ss Stater age d depth, at it is deserted the full proceptable and solution. Toposals new timb	Guidance (CF schedule wou hich showed age maps in t ment. likely to be ac signed consid	at extensive of following: PG2) then the lid be include the change in the area. Exceptable in plerately and vertical and	e mix would be d in the planning and havas in keeping	e acceptable. ing application. rough historical eritage terms? with the surrou	I maps. CBC noted undings

4 Dedectrion and Vahiala Access Deads and Dights of Way
6. Pedestrian and Vehicle Access, Roads and Rights of Way
Is a new or altered vehicle access proposed to or from the public highway? Yes No
Is a new or altered pedestrian access proposed to or from the public highway? Yes No
Are there any new public roads to be provided within the site? Yes No
Are there any new public rights of way to be provided within or adjacent to the site? Yes No
Do the proposals require any diversions/extinguishments and/or creation of rights of way? Yes No
7. Waste Storage and Collection
Do the plans incorporate areas to store and aid the collection of waste? No
If Yes, please provide details:
Please refer to drawing P_02 and Design and Access Statement, section 19. Each apartment is fitted with a waste and recycling unit built into the kitchen area. The bin and recycling central storage is located at lower ground floor level within the pavement vault. The transportation of waste and recycling is to be by a management company whio will use a mechanical lifting device to transport the bins between lower ground and ground floor levels.
Have arrangements been made for the separate storage and collection of recyclable waste? Yes No
If Yes, please provide details:
Refer to Design and Access Statement (Section 19). The kitchen unit installations and the waste and recycling store allow for the separation of waste and recycling.
8. Authority Employee/Member
 (a) a member of staff (b) an elected member (c) related to a member of staff (d) related to an elected member Do any of these statements apply to you? Yes • No
9. Demolition
Does the proposal include total or partial demolition of a listed building? • Yes • No
Which of the following does the proposal involve?
a) Total demolition of the listed building Yes No
b) Demolition of a building within the curtilage of the listed building • Yes No
c) Demolition of a part of the listed building
What is the total volume of the listed building? 1275.0000 m3
What was the date (approximately) of the erection of the part to be removed? Month: Year: 1960 (Date must be pre-application submission)
Please describe the building or part of the building you are proposing to demolish:
1/. Removal of non-original closet wing 2/. Removal of non-original rear facade 3/. Removal of non-original lower ground floor door
4/. Removal of non-original internal paritions 5/. Deepening pavement vault by approximately 200mm (800mm excavation for construction)
5/. Deepening pavement vault by approximately 200mm (800mm excavation for construction) Why is it necessary to demolish or extend (as applicable) all or part of the building(s) and or structure(s)?
5/. Deepening pavement vault by approximately 200mm (800mm excavation for construction)

10. Listed building alterations			
Do the proposed works include alterations to a listed buildi	ng?	○ No	
If Yes, will there be works to the interior of the building?	Yes	○ No	
Will there be works to the exterior of the building?	Yes	○ No	
Will there be works to any structure or object fixed to the property (or buildings within its curtilage) internally or exte	rnally?	○ No	
Will there be stripping out of any internal wall, ceiling or floor finishes (e.g. plaster, floorboards)?	Yes	○ No	
If the answer to any of these questions is Yes, please provid removed, and the proposal for their replacement, including			
State references for these plan(s)/drawing(s):			
P_00 Location Plan P_02 Demolition and Proposed Lower Ground Floor Plan P_03 Demolition and Proposed Ground Floor Plan P_04 Demolition and Proposed First Floor Plan P_05 Demolition and Proposed Second Floor Plan P_06 Demolition and Proposed Third Floor Plan P_07 Demolition and Proposed Roof Plan P_08 Demolition Front Elevation P_09 Proposed Front Elevation P_10 Demolition Front Elevation (Section) P_11 Proposed Front Elevation (Section) P_12 Demolition and Proposed Rear Elevation P_13 Demolition Section AA P_14 Proposed Section AA P_15 Demolition Section BB P_16 Proposed Section BB P_17 Demolition and Proposed Section DD			
11. Listed Building Grading			
If known, what is the grading of the listed building (as stat the list of Buildings of Special Architectural or Historical In		know Grade I • Grade II*	Grade II
Is it an ecclesiastical building? Don't know	Yes • No		
12. Immunity from Listing			·
Has a Certificate of Immunity from listing been sought in re-	spect of this building?	Yes • No	
13. Vehicle Parking			
Please provide information on the existing and proposed n	imber of on-site parking spaces.		
Type of vehicle	Existing number	Total proposed (including spaces	Difference in
Cars	of spaces	retained)	spaces
Light goods vehicles/public carrier vehicles	0	0 0	0
Motorcycles	0	0	0
Disability spaces	0	0	0
Cycle spaces	0	6	6
Other (e.g. Bus)	0	0	0
Short description of Other		v	
·			
14. Materials			`
Please provide a description of existing and proposed mate	rials and finishes to be used in the	build (demolition excluded):	
External walls - add description	nais and misnes to be ased in the	suma (demonition excitated).	
Description of <i>existing</i> materials and finishes:			
Front Facade Brick facade generally; Alternative colour brickwork at wind floor central window; Recessed stone archways with plinths			
Parapet Level in brick and Stone; Mansard windows at third Rear Facade:			a noor level, becording dornied at
Parapet Level in brick and Stone; Mansard windows at third Rear Facade: Brick facade Generally; no specific detailing.			a noon level, beconding connectat
Rear Facade:	floor (refer to roof finishes section)).	

14. Materials (continued)

Roof covering- add description

Description of existing materials and finishes:

Main Roof: Asphalt to main flat roof and closet wing.

Mansard: Slate tile to slope of Mansard

Dormer Windows: Lead lined cheeks and cappings to dormer windows with white painted timber fascias

Description of proposed materials and finishes:

Main Roof: Removal of asphalt to structure, installation of an insulated single ply membrane system. AOV as indicated to be polyester powder coated alumnium.

Mansard: As existing - refurbished as required

Dormer Windows: As existing - refurbished as required

Chimney - add description

Description of existing materials and finishes:

None present

Description of proposed materials and finishes:

None proposed

Windows - add description

Description of existing materials and finishes:

Front Facade: White painted, single glazed, original timber sash windows. Window at lower ground floor has penetrations for services through frame. Windows at other floors have broken panes and holes for vents in glass.

Rear Facade: White painted, non original, crittall casement/fixed windows.

Description of proposed materials and finishes:

Front Facade: White painted, double glazed, traditionally detailed timber sash windows, to match existing to fit into existing reveals.

Rear Facade: Aluminium framed sliding doors at lower ground floor level. Aluminium framed tilt-turn windows and cantilevered glass juliette balconies at ground to third floor levels.

Closet wing: Aluminium framed sliding doors at lower ground floor level. Aluminium framed tilt-turn windows and cantilevered glass juliette balconies at ground to third floor levels with vertical metal brise soleil as indicated on design drawings. Acoustically attenuated louvre enclosure behind brise soliel to enclose air condensers.

External doors - add description

Description of existing materials and finishes:

Front Door: Solid Core front door painted black with fixed glazed side and overhead panels

LGF (lower ground floor) Lightwell door: Non-original flat panel timber door painted black.

LGF Vault Door: Non-original Timber door, painted black.

LGF Courtyard Door: Single glazed crittall door, painted white.

Description of proposed materials and finishes:

Front Door: As exisitng - refurbished as required (new locking, paint, re-hung)

LGF Lightwell door: to become window - refer to window section for description.

LGF Vault Door: Timber louvre door, painted white.

LGF Courtyard Door: Glazed alumnium framed sliding door in new facade.

Third Floor Terrace Door: Glazed alumnium framed swing door in new part of facade.

Ceilings - add description

Description of existing materials and finishes:

Non-original plaster ceiling with non-original coving, throughout.

Description of proposed materials and finishes:

To be removed and replaced with new suspended plasterboard ceiling system

Internal walls - add description

Description of existing materials and finishes:

Plastered masonry wall running tranversely

Panelised partitions

Description of *proposed* materials and finishes:

Insulated plastered partitions and lined masonry walls.

Party walls to be acoustically and thermally lined

Floors - add description

Description of existing materials and finishes:

Structure: Reinforced concrete frame

Finish: Carpet over timber boarding

Description of *proposed* materials and finishes:

Structure: To be retained. New structure (to extension) to be reinforced concrete supported on a steel frame.

Finish: Carpet, Hardwood and Tiles (as appropriate) over a floating screed.

Internal doors - add description

Description of existing materials and finishes:

Non-original, painted, flat panel and panelled doors.

Description of proposed materials and finishes:

Painted solid core timber doors.

14. Materials (continued))				
Rainwater goods - add descript Description of <i>existing</i> materials a					
Plastic pipework surface fixed to Plastic pipework internally fixed i		ring.			
Description of <i>proposed</i> materials					
Plastic pipework internally fixed t		I pipework to facades.			
Boundary treatments - add des Description of existing materials a	scription	T			
Masonry party wall to each side.					
Masonry garden wall to courtyar	d				
Iron railings to front of lightwell.					
Description of <i>proposed</i> materials		ovetom			
Masonry party walls to be acoust Masonry garden wall to courtyar			ghtwell to be	refurbished (painted/infilled). Gates as indicated on design	ın drawings.
Vehicle access and hard standi					
Description of <i>existing</i> materials a	and finisnes:				
None existing Description of <i>proposed</i> materials	e and finishes:				
None proposed	s and ministres.				
Notie proposeu					
Lighting - add description Description of <i>existing</i> materials a	and finishes:				
Flourescent batten lighting withi					
Pendant fittings elsewhere.					
Description of proposed materials	s and finishes:				
Low energy lighting throughout. Decorative pendant to entrance Low energy recessed fittings in c Low level task lighting in living a Low level external lighting in fror Surface mounted lighting to bin	hallway. eilings of apartments th nd bedrooms. nt lightwell, rear courtya	_			
Others - add description Other					
Description of <i>existing</i> materials a	and finishes:				
Description of <i>proposed</i> materials	s and finishes:				
Are you supplying additional info		drawings or plans?	Yes	○ No	
If Yes, please state plan(s)/drawir	ıg(s) references:				
P_02 Lower Ground Floor Plan P_03 Ground Floor Plan P_04 First Floor Plan P_05 Second Floor Plan					
P_06 Thrid Floor Plan					
P_07 Roof Plan					
P_08 Demolition Front Elevation P_09 Proprosed Front Elevation					
P_10 Demolition Front Elevation	(Section)				
P_11 Proposed Front Elevation (S					
P_12 Demolition and Proposed R P_13 Demolition Section AA	lear Elevation				
P_14 Proposed Section AA					
P_15 Demolition Section BB					
P_16 Proposed Section BB P_17 Demolition and Proposed S	Section DD				
P_18 Detailed Rear Facade	ection DD				
P_19 Detailed Rear Facade					
15. Foul Sewage					
Please state how foul sewage is t	to be disposed of:				
Mains sewer	\boxtimes	Package treatment plant		Unknown [
Septic tank		Cess pit	_ _	_	
•		- 300 p.r.			
Other					
Are you proposing to connect to	the existing drainage sy	vstem?	○ No	Unknown	
If Yes, please include the details o	of the existing system or	n the application drawings and s	tate reference	es for the plan(s)/drawing(s):	
P_02 Lower Ground Floor Plan	2. 2.0 Calaing System of	application drawings and s			

16. Assessment of Flood Risk		
Is the site within an area at risk of flooding? (Refer to the E flood zones 2 and 3 and consult Environment Agency star requirements for information as necessary.)		y Yes • No
If Yes, you will need to submit an appropriate flood risk as	sessment to consider the risk to the propose	d site.
Is your proposal within 20 metres of a watercourse (e.g. riv	ver, stream or beck)?	Yes No
Will the proposal increase the flood risk elsewhere?	Yes No	
How will surface water be disposed of?		
Sustainable drainage system	Main sewer	Pond/lake
Soakaway	Existing watercourse	
17. Biodiversity and Geological Conservation	n	
	guidance notes for further information on w	hen there is a reasonable likelihood that any important biodiversity d by your proposals.
Having referred to the guidance notes, is there a reasonab on land adjacent to or near the application site:	le likelihood of the following being affected	adversely or conserved and enhanced within the application site, OR
a) Protected and priority species		
Yes, on the development site Yes, on	land adjacent to or near the proposed deve	opment No
b) Designated sites, important habitats or other biodiversi	ty features	
Yes, on the development site Yes, on	land adjacent to or near the proposed deve	opment No
c) Features of geological conservation importance		
	land adjacent to or near the proposed deve	opment No
18. Existing Use		
Please describe the current use of the site:		
Vacant		
Is the site currently vacant? • Yes (No	
If Yes, please describe the last use of the site: Commercial B1 Offices		
When did this use end (if known) (DD/MM/YYYY)?	01/06/2013	
Does the proposal involve any of the following? If yes, you will need to submit an appropriate contaminati	on assessment with your application	
	Yes No	
Land where contamination is suspected for all or part of th	ne site? Yes • No	
A proposed use that would be particularly vulnerable to the	ne presence of contamination?	○ Yes ● No
19. Trees and Hedges		
Are there trees or hedges on the proposed development s	ite? Yes • No	
And/or: Are there trees or hedges on land adjacent to the development or might be important as part of the local la		nce the Yes No
	application. Your local planning authority sho	ur local planning authority. If a Tree Survey is required, this and the buld make clear on its website what the survey should contain, in mendations'.
20. Trade Effluent		
Does the proposal involve the need to dispose of trade eff	luents or waste?	Yes No
21. Residential Units		
Does your proposal include the gain or loss of residential u	units? • Yes • No	
2005 Jose proposar molade the gant of foss of residential t	WING. (** 163 (** 180	

			Number of bedrooms					Num	ber of	bedrooms			
		1	2	3	4+	Unknown			1	2	3	4+	Unknown
Houses							Houses						
Flats/Mai	sonettes	1	3	1			Flats/M	aisonettes					
Live-Worl	k units						Live-W	ork units					
Cluster fla	ats						Cluster	flats					
Sheltered	l housing						Shelter	ed housing					
Bedsit/Studios							Bedsit/	Studios					
Unknown							Unknov	vn					
Proposed	Market Housing	Total		5			Existing	Market Housing	Total		0		
Overall R	esidential Unit T	otals											I
	Total pro	nosad ras	identialıı	nits		5							
			dential un			0							
	Total exi	sting resid	ueritiai ui	1113									
	r proposal involve	-				orspace residential floorsp	ace?		Yes	○ No			
	Use class/	type of us	se		f	sting gross internal oorspace uare metres)	internal f lost by ch de	Gross oorspace to be nange of use or molition are metres)	floorsp (including	ss new inte ace propose changes of are metres)	ed	internal following o	ional gross floorspace developmen e metres)
A1	Shops	Net Trada	able Area			0.0		0.0			0.0		
A2	Financial ar	nd profess	sional serv	vices		0.0)	0.0			0.0		
A3		urants ar						0.0			0.0		
A4					0.0								
		ng estabi			0.0			0.0			0.0		
A 5		food take			0.0)	0.0			0.0		
B1 (a)	Offic	e (other th	han A2)			370.0		370.0			0.0		-37
B1 (b)	Researc	h and dev	/elopmen	it		0.0)	0.0			0.0		
B1 (c)	Li	ght indus	trial			0.0		0.0			0.0		
B2	Ger	neral indu	ıstrial			0.0		0.0			0.0		
B8	Stora	ge or dist	ribution			0.0		0.0			0.0		
C1	Hotels a	nd halls o	f residenc	e		0.0)	0.0			0.0		
C2	Resid	ential inst	titutions			0.0		0.0			0.0		
D1	Non-res	idential ir	nstitution	s		0.0		0.0			0.0		
D2		mbly and						0.0			0.0		
						0.0							
Other	۲	Please Specify				0.0					0.0		
		Total				370.0		370.0)		0.0		-37
	, residential instit Jse Class		d hostels, Types of u	·		ndicate the loss o coms to be lost by or demolition	change of u	se Total rooms	proposed (Net addition	al rooms
								- Contract	.5-0 01 430	,			
_	oloyment	u 6- II			!!								
i Kriown,	please complete	une follow	ring infori				1		F., 1 1		c c. u ··		
	- · · ·			Full-tim	e	Part-time			Equivalen	t number o	r tull-ti	me	
	Existing employer Proposed employ			0		0				0			
				-		-							
	rs of Opening		pening (e	.g. 15:30) f	or each no	n-residential use į	proposed:						
Use	M Start T	onday to	Friday End Tim			Sati Start Time	urday End Tim			nday and B art Time		lidays d Time	Not Know

25. Site Area
What is the site area? sq.metres
26. Industrial or Commercial Processes and Machinery
Please describe the activities and processes which would be carried out on the site and the end products including plant, ventilation or air conditioning. Please include the type of machinery which may be installed on site:
Residential property requires plant equipment for incoming services and air conditioning, this includes one external unit per apartments Air Conditioning specification:
Is the proposal for a waste management development? Yes No
27. Hazardous Substances
Is any hazardous waste involved in the proposal? Yes No
28. Site Visit
Can the site be seen from a public road, public footpath, bridleway or other public land?
If the planning authority needs to make an appointment to carry out a site visit, whom should they contact? (Please select only one)
The agent Other person Other person
29. Certificates (Certificate B)
Certificate Of Ownership - Certificate B Certificates under Article 12 – Town and Country Planning (Development Management Procedure) (England) Order 2010 & Regulation 6 - Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Regulations 1990

I certify/ The applicant certifies that I have/the applicant has given the requisite notice to everyone else (as listed below) who, on the day 21 days before the date of this application, was the owner (owner is a person with a freehold interest or leasehold interest with at least 7 years left to run) and/or agricultural tenant ("agricultural tenant" has the meaning given in section 65(8) of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990) of any part of the land or building to which this application relates.

. Certifi	icates (Certificate	B - continu	ied)					
wner/Agric	ultural Tenant							Date notice served
Name	Estates Department, C	ity University						
Number:		Suffix:						
Street:	Northampton Square				11/00/0011			
_ocality:								14/03/2014
Гown:	London							
Postcode:	EC1V 0HB							
Name	Sun 99 Ltd							
Number:	37	Suffix:						
Street:	Conway Street	- Carrix						
ocality:	oonway street							14/03/2014
own:	London							
Postcode:	W1T 6ST							
55.5000.								
Name	Fulwood House							
Number:	12	Suffix:						
Street:	Fulwood Place							14/03/2014
ocality:				11/00/2011				
Гown:	London							
Postcode:	WC1V 6HR							
Name	Fulwood Invest S.AR.L							
Number:		Suffix:						
Street:	Rue Joseph Hackin							
_ocality:								14/03/2014
Town:	Luxembourg							
Postcode:	L-1746							
Name	Hunters Solicitors							
Number:	9	Suffix:						
Street:	New Square	Julia.						
ocality:	Lincoln's Inn							14/03/2014
own:	London							
Postcode:	WC2A 3QN							
le: Miss	First name:	Eleanor			Surname:	Redmill		
rson role:	Applicant	De	eclaration date:	14/03/2014			Declaration	n made
ditional inf	ration apply for planning perm formation. I/we confirm en are the genuine opin	that, to the be	est of my/our know	wledge, any facts sta	ompanying plans/c ted are true and acc	drawings and curate and any	\boxtimes	Date 14/03/2014