

<b>Delegated Report</b>		<b>Analysis sheet</b>		<b>Expiry Date:</b>	<b>14/05/2013</b>
		N/A		<b>Consultation Expiry Date:</b>	<b>18/04/2013</b>
<b>Officer</b>			<b>Application Number</b>		
Aysegul Olcar-Chamberlin			2013/0833/P		
<b>Application Address</b>			<b>Drawing Numbers</b>		
11-12 Grenville Street London WC1N 1LZ			See draft decision notice		
<b>PO 3/4</b>	<b>Area Team Signature</b>	<b>C&amp;UD</b>	<b>Authorised Officer Signature</b>		
<b>Proposal</b>					
Change of use of entire building from office (Class B1), restaurant and café (Class A3) and retail (Class A1) into residential (Class C3) comprising 6x 1 bedroom and 1x 2 bedroom flats and 1x 3 bedroom maisonette together with erection of mansard roof extension, reinstatement of front lightwell with railing, alterations to the front elevation (new windows to shopfront), alterations to rear elevation including insertion of balconies to first, second and third floor levels and installation of new doors and windows, replacement of existing single storey rear extension (at no 11), erection of four storey infill rear extension (above ground floor level), alterations to south side and north side ground floor elevations and alterations to rear boundary wall and replacement of railing.					
<b>Recommendation:</b>		Refuse planning permission			
<b>Application Type:</b>		Full Planning Permission			

Conditions or Reasons for Refusal:	Refer to Draft Decision Notice					
Informatives:						
Consultations						
Adjoining Occupiers:	No. notified	38	No. of responses	00	No. of objections	00
			No. electronic	00		
Summary of consultation responses:	<p>A site notice was displayed from 22/03/2013 to 12/04//2013. A press notice was advertised on 28/03/2013.</p> <p>Five occupiers of neighbouring properties objected to the proposal. In summary, the grounds of their objection are:</p> <p>Design:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>The proposed fourth floor does not in keeping with the height of the block that 11-12 Grenville Street is part of.</li></ul> <p>Amenity:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>The additional proposed fourth floor will have an adverse impact on all the windows on the rear of Downing Court (west and south aspect) and would impair the quality of life of residents.</li><li>The proposal would interfere with the light in Downing Court.</li><li>During the building works there would be disturbance to the neighbourhood in terms of noise, dust and restricted access.</li></ul> <p>Others:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>The proposal would result in loss of the exiting café which provides valuable services in the locality.</li><li>Collective Enfranchisement and Freshwater Property Management Ltd are the freeholders of both Downing Court and 11-12 Grenville Street. The ownership of much of the land at the rear within the application (west aspect) is disputed. The garden space outlined in the proposed plans is part of land owned by Downing Court. The proposed development will encroach on the pen space behind the current building in the property</li><li>The proposal would impact the value of Downing Court properties.</li></ul> <p>Petition with 52 signatures from locals to object to the closure of the existing café was received.</p>					
CAAC/Local groups comments:	<p>The Church of England Pensions Board's comments:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>Despite planning permission was refused for the conversion of basement in Downing Court there were some drilling works in the basement.</li><li>Objections would be made from occupants at Grenville Court.</li></ul> <p><b>Bloomsbury CAAC</b> objected to the loss of retail and restaurant space and the proposed mansard roof extension. They considered the proposed roof extension to unbalance the building with the rest of the terraces.</p>					



## Site Description

The application site is a four storey, 5 bay wide Georgian terrace property on the west side of Grenville Road in the Bloomsbury Conservation Area. The property straddles the entrance to Colonnade. The facades of the property are constructed from a weathered stock brick with sash windows (although on the front elevation these are replacements). Reflecting the Georgian architecture character of subservient rear elevation to front elevation the rear of the building is plainer than the front. The rear elevation despite of unsympathetic alterations associated with services remain largely unaltered and is highly visible from the mews in Colonnade (most of which dates from a similar age to the application property).

Bloomsbury Conservation Area Appraisal and Management Strategy identifies application property with the rest of the properties on this side of Grenville Street as making positive contribution to the appearance and character of the Conservation Area (Grenville Street 11-17 (consec), Downing Court and 83 Guilford Street). Immediately to the south is a small terrace of rebuilt Georgian style town houses which are similarly detailed to the application property. To the north is Downing Court which is an early 20<sup>th</sup> century six storey mansion block at the corner of Grenville Street and Bernard Street. The neighbouring streets of Bernard and Guilford are lined with Georgian town houses, most of which are Grade II listed (11- 28 Bernard Street and 75-82 Guilford Street).

The surrounding area has a mixed use character with predominance of institutional (hospital, university, education), recreational and community uses with secondary residential and office uses. The area is relatively busy during the daytime as a result of these uses.

The site falls within Central London Area.

## Relevant History

### Application property:

**2009/4992/P** – Planning application was withdrawn on 23/12/2009 for the erection of basement and five storey building comprising 9 flats [3x one-bedroom flats, 4x two-bedroom flats and 2x three-bedroom flats] (Class C3) with associated works to the Colonnade. The associated conservation area consent (ref: 2009/4993/C) for the demolition of existing building comprising basement, ground and three storeys above (Class A1, A3 and B1a) was also withdrawn on 23/12/2009. The proposed demolition was considered not to be sufficiently justifiable.

**9400452** - Planning permission was granted on 07/07/1994 for the change of use from retail (Class A1 in the Town and Country Planning (Use Classes) Order 1987) to a snack bar (Class A3 in the 1987 Order) and erection of extract duct on rear elevation.

## Relevant policies

### **National Planning Framework (2012)**

### **The London Plan (2011)**

### **LDF Core Strategy and Development Policies**

#### Core Strategy

- CS1 (Distribution of growth)
- CS5 (Managing the impact of growth and development)
- CS6 (Providing quality homes)
- CS7 (Promoting Camden's centres and shops)
- CS8 (Promoting a successful and inclusive Camden economy)
- CS10 (Supporting community facilities and services)
- CS11 (Promoting sustainable and efficient travel)

CS13 (Tackling climate change through promoting higher environmental standards)  
CS14 (Promoting high quality places and conserving our heritage)  
CS15 (Protecting and improving our parks and open spaces and encouraging biodiversity)  
CS16 (Improving Camden's health and well-being)  
CS18 (Dealing with our waste and encouraging recycling)  
CS19 (Delivering and monitoring the Core Strategy)

#### Development Policies

DP1 (Mixed use development)  
DP2 (Making full use of Camden's capacity for housing)  
DP5 (Homes of different sizes)  
DP6 (Lifetime homes and wheelchair housing)  
DP10 (Helping and promoting small and independent shops)  
DP13 (Employment premises and sites)  
DP16 (The transport implications of development)  
DP17 (Walking, cycling and public transport)  
DP18 (Parking standards and limiting the availability of car parking)  
DP19 (Managing the impact of parking)  
DP21 (Development connecting to the highway network)  
DP22 (Promoting sustainable design and construction)  
DP23 (Water)  
DP24 (Securing high quality design)  
DP25 (Conserving Camden's heritage)  
DP26 (Managing the impact of development on occupiers and neighbours)  
DP27 (Basements and lightwells)  
DP28 (Noise and Vibration)  
DP29 (Improving access)  
DP30 (Shopfronts)  
DP31 (Provisions of, and improvement to, open space and outdoor sport and recreation facilities)  
DP32 (Air quality and Camden's Clear Zone)

#### **Camden Planning Guidance (2011)**

CPG1 (Design) – Sections 2, 4, 5, 7 and 10  
CPG2 (Housing) – Sections 4 and 5  
CPG3 (Sustainability) – Sections 2, 4 and 9  
CPG4 (Basement and lightwells) – section  
CPG5 (Town Centres, Retail and Employment) – Sections 4 and 6  
CPG6 (Amenity) – Section 6, 7 and 8  
CPG7 (Transport) – Sections 5 and 9  
CPG8 (Planning obligations) – Sections 7,

#### **Bloomsbury Conservation Area Appraisal and Management Strategy (2011)**

Pages: 2-3; 5-10; 88-92; 107; 116-117; 121-122; and 147.

## Assessment

### Background

There were pre-application discussions for erection of mansard roof extension, rear extension and alterations to fenestrations from January to March 2012. The applicants were advised that mansard roof extension and rear extension would be unacceptable in design terms as they would harm the appearance and character of the existing building and wider Conservation Area.

### Proposal

It is proposed to change the use of entire building from office (Class B1), restaurant and café (Class A3) and retail (Class A1) into residential (Class C3) comprising 6x 1 bedroom and 1x 2 bedroom flats and 1x 3 bedroom maisonette together with the following extensions and alterations:

- erection of mansard roof extension with three front dormer windows and three rear dormer windows;
- alterations to the front elevation including two new sash windows to the large shopfront on north side of Colonnade entrance, filling in the small shopfront on the south side of Colonnade entrance and new windows and door to basement front;
- reinstatement of front lightwell with railings around;
- alterations to rear elevation including insertion of balconies to first, second and third floor levels and installation of new doors and windows;
- replacement of existing single storey rear extension (at no 11) with a new extension with similar dimensions
- erection of four storey infill rear extension over the Colonnade entrance (above ground floor level) – Top floor level would form part of the proposed mansard roof extension
- alterations to south side and north side ground floor elevations (facing onto Colonnade). These would involve new windows and doors and infilling of existing windows; and
- Use of the small retail unit would be used as storage spaces for bicycles and recycling bins ancillary the proposed residential flats.

### Land Use

The existing building consists of a floor area of 415.6sqm of which 26sqm is under Class A1, 46sqm is under Class A3 and 343.6sqm is in under Class B1 office use. The proposal would result in loss of all these commercial floor spaces in order to gain residential units.

The ground floor café/restaurant (Café Romano) is still operating and its lease is close to expiration. The small ground floor retail unit to the south of Colonnade entrance which used to be occupied by a newsagent is currently vacant. The rest of the building consists of vacant offices (rented by solicitors).

#### Loss of office use:

The offices have been vacant since 2005. The applicants argue that the existing office spaces are not viable to sustain as they lack features for a modern office environment and the proposed residential use would enable the maintenance of the building financially viable.

The existing offices above ground floor levels are accessed via winding staircase and reflect a layout

of a residential property rather than office building. A marketability Report dated February 2013 with this application to demonstrate why the features and layout of the existing office space is not suitable for modern office space and impracticality of the refurbishment of the existing office space to match the current office standards. The existing office space is larger than 100sqm and is on three floor levels (the internal area of the each of the floor space excluding the staircase is 79sqm).

Policy CS8 states that the Council will seek to support Camden's industries by safeguarding existing employment sites and premises in the Borough that meet the needs of modern industry. Policy DP13 states that the Council will retain land and buildings that are suitable for continued business use and will resist a change to non business use unless it can demonstrated to the Council's satisfaction that a site or building is no longer suitable for its existing business use and there is evidence that the possibility of retaining, reusing or redeveloping the site or building for similar or alternative business use has been fully explored over a period of time. It is also stated that where it has been demonstrated that a site is not suitable for any other business use other than B1(a) offices, the Council may allow a change to permanent residential or community uses.

Paragraph 7.3 of the CPG5 states that the Council may change of B1(a) office to another use in some circumstances, such as older office premises of buildings that were originally built as residential dwellings. However CPG5 also states that a number of considerations listed in paragraph 13.3 of policy DP13 need to be taken consideration. Careful consideration needs to be given to the loss of office accommodation as the application property is located in a highly accessible location by various transport means and has a potential for subdivision of the upper floor levels into smaller units which are suitable for small and medium size enterprises (SMEs). Given these a marketing exercise in accordance with the set criteria listed on page 87 of CPG5 is required in this case. The submitted marketability report does not cover any marketing records for the existing premises and costs and marketability analysis for the viability of the refurbishment of the existing office accommodation.

It is considered that in the absence of a robust marketing justification the loss of existing office accommodation is considered to be contrary to the aims of policies CS8 and DP13.

#### Loss of A1 and A3 units:

The application site is not located within in a classified frontage such as Central London Frontages or neighbourhood centres and is within 100m from Brunswick Centre which is a major retail centre with cafes and restaurants in this neighbourhood. The proposal would result in loss of two small commercial units which could be used by small independent businesses. No viable justification for the loss of the existing A1 and A3 units are submitted with the application.

Policy DP10 seeks to protect shops outside centres by only granting planning permission for net loss of shop floorspace outside designated centres provided that:

- Alternative provision is available within 5-10 minutes walking distance;
- There is clear evidence that the current use is not viable; and
- within the Central London Area, the development positively contributes to local character, function, viability and amenity.

Section 4 of CPG 4 gives detailed guidance on the Council's approach for securing small, affordable and independent shops in appropriate locations. Although the existing units are within 5-10 minutes walking distance to Brunswick Centre they are in a prominent location to be used by locals, workers and visitors. Although the small A1 unit is currently vacant the small A3 unit is still in operation and adds to the character, function and vibrancy of the area. The A3 unit also seems to be popular with the locals.

Given the location and scale of the existing A1 and A3 units their losses would affect the Council's ability to protect and promote small and independent shops which are already limited in this area. In the absence of a robust justification for the loss of these units in terms of viability of retaining these units and impact on the character, function and vibrancy of the area the proposal would be contrary to the aims of policy DP10.

#### Proposed residential use:

The proposed residential use is welcomed and in accordance with policies CS6 and DP2. However more detailed consideration needs to be given to mix of the proposed flats, the living standards and accessibility of the proposed flats, impact of the proposed alterations and extensions on the appearance and character of the existing building and the conservation area and the impact on the amenities of the neighbouring properties.

#### **Design and Appearance**

Policy DP24 states that the Council will require all developments, including alterations and extensions to be of the highest standard of design and respect character, setting, form and scale of the neighbouring properties and character and proportions of the existing building. Policy DP25 seeks to preserve and enhance important elements of local character in order to maintain the character of the conservation areas.

Bloomsbury Conservation Area Appraisal states the current issues concerning alterations and extensions as excessive scale, massing or height and inappropriate design of extensions, use of inappropriate materials and inappropriately detailed windows and doors, inappropriate roof level extensions (particularly where these interrupt the consistency of a uniform terrace or prevaillingly prominent in the streets) and loss of original details of traditional shopfronts.

#### Mansard Roof extension:

Section 5 of CPG1 considers the mansard roof type of roof extension to be the most appropriate form of extension for a Georgian or Victorian dwelling provided that there is such an established roof form in a group of buildings or townscape where a roof extension is proposed.

The proposed mansard roof extension would be immediately behind the parapet lines of the building (with a set back of between 40cm - 60cm from the front and rear building lines) and would have dormer windows on both the front and rear elevations. It would have a traditional appearance with slate finishing.

The parapet line and roofscape of the existing building closely matches to that of the neighbouring buildings and to the south and the buildings on Guilford Street. Although the application property is located next to Downing Court which is one storey taller than the application property The application site forms part of Georgian terrace group of houses on this side of Grenville Street and in terms of its design it ties with the buildings on Guilford Street. The proposed mansard roof extension would unbalance the architectural composition of these buildings and therefore it is considered to be unacceptable in principle.

The proposed mansard roof extension by reason of its lack of set back from the building edges would also be highly visible from the vintage public views from the surrounding streets and open spaces. The proposed extension would harm the street views and the character and appearance of the wider conservation.

#### Infill rear extension:



The rear elevation of the building is important as it is clearly visible from public views and terminates the view along Colonnade. Compared to the front elevation the rear elevation is more informal. Nevertheless the detailing quality of the existing rear elevation adds to the character of the Conservation Area. The proposed infill rear extension with projecting balconies would significantly alter the informal character of the existing rear elevation by making it more formal and would also result in loss of the interesting features such as gable wall and mansard roof at the rear.

The proposed infill rear extension is considered to be unacceptable in principle as it would significantly erode the characteristic appearance of the existing rear elevation.

#### Single storey rear extension:

The proposed single storey rear extension would replace the existing plain looking single storey rear extension and would follow the footprint of the existing rear extension. In terms of fenestration detailing the proposed rear extension would be a lot more elaborate than the existing rear extension and would not be in keeping with the plain style of the existing elevation. The proposed rear extension would be visible from the Colonnade and would not be in keeping with the character and appearance of the host building.

Subject to appropriate detailing the replacement of the existing rear extension is considered to be acceptable in principle. However the proposed rear extension by reason of its inappropriate detailing would be unacceptable in design terms.

#### Other alterations:

The other alterations would involve loss of the shopfronts on the front elevation to install new sash windows and doors, new windows and door to the front basement elevation, installation of railings associated with reinstatement of front lightwell and alteration to the openings on the north and south side elevations (facing Colonnade) in connection with the proposed residential use. The railings and lightwells are part of the street character and therefore the reinstatement of the front lightwell is considered to be acceptable in design terms. The rest of the alterations are also considered to be minor and on their own are acceptable in design terms.

Cumulatively, the proposed extensions and alterations would significantly detract from the character and appearance of the host building and the wider Conservation Area.

#### **Mix of units**

Policy DP5 aims to contribute to the creation of mixed and inclusive communities by securing a range of self-contained homes of different sizes. "Dwelling Size Priorities Table" of policy DP5 (Homes of different sizes) identifies two bedroom units as a high priority, three or four bedroom units as a medium priority and one bedroom units as a lower priority. The aim of policy DP5 is to gain 40% of two bed flats in the proposed mix of dwellings.

The proposed mix would be 6 x 1 bed, 1 x 2 bed and 1 x 3 bed units. The majority of the proposed units (75%) would be one bed units. The proposed two bed units in the mixture would be 12.5%. The ratio/ percentage of the proposed 2 bed units would be significantly below the Council's expectation for new residential developments.

The supporting text in paragraph 5.5 of policy DP5 expects proposals to include some dwellings that meet the very high priorities wherever it is practicable to do so. The proposed mix would include too many one bed units than there is a demand for and there is much higher demand for 2 bed units. Given the layout of the host building there is a scope for provision of more than one 2 bed unit therefore the proposed mix is considered to be contrary to the aims of policy DP5.

#### **Living Standards**

The windows would be upgraded to provide thermal and acoustic benefits. Insulation of walls and

airtightness would also provide resistance to outside noise.

The floor areas of the proposed residential units in relation to their capacity of occupancy in accordance with the minimum size standards set out in section 4 of CPG2:

	Floor areas (m <sup>2</sup> )	Maximum persons occupancy	Council's space standards for new self-contained units (m <sup>2</sup> )
3 bed unit on basement and ground floor levels	140.4	5	84
Rear 1 bed unit on first floor	39.9	1	32
Front 1 bed unit on first floor	53.7	2	48
Rear 1 bed unit on second floor	36.6	1	32
Front 1 bed unit on second floor	53.6	2	48
Rear 1 bed unit on third floor	36.9	1	32
Front 1 bed unit on third floor	54.3	2	48
2 bed unit on fourth floor level	62	3	61

The proposed residential units would be spacious and would comply with the Council's space standards. The proposed rooms would also have acceptable sizes. Majority of the proposed units would also benefit from acceptable outlook and daylight.

The proposed basement and ground floor unit would have two bedrooms on the basement level which would receive limited outlook and daylight as they would be served by the proposed front lightwell. Given the proposed basement and ground floor unit would have a living room and master bedroom on the ground floor level which would benefit from good outlook and daylight overall it is considered to provide acceptable living standards for the future occupiers

Overall, the proposed residential units are considered to provide acceptable living standards for the future occupiers.

### **Access and Lifetime Homes**

The main entrance to the building would be retained. The proposed development would be entirely accessed entirely from the Grenville Street. The existing route of Colonnade through the development would remain unchanged. The existing internal staircase is retained and would be used communally.

Policy DP6 requires all new housing developments to comply with Lifetime Homes criteria as far as reasonably possible. Given the site constrains it would be unreasonable to expect compliance of all

16 lifetime homes criteria. According to the Access Statement attached to the submitted Design and Access Statement the proposed development would be in compliance with Part M Building Regulations and given the constraints imposed by the existing building the proposed development would not fully comply with the Lifetime Homes standards. The Council's access officer reviewed the proposed plans and the access statement and considered that some element of Lifetime Homes criteria such as bedroom circulation space and accessible bathrooms could be achieved. This could be rectified by way of a condition for further details of Lifetime Homes.

### **Neighbouring Amenity**

Policy DP26 aims to protect the quality of life of neighbours that might be affected by developments. Given the relationship with the neighbouring properties there would be no adverse impact on the amenity of the nearby residential properties in terms of loss of daylight/sunlight, outlook or privacy.

The proposed rear infill extension would not project beyond the rear wall of the building immediately adjacent to 13 Grenville Street and the proposed single story rear extension would not project beyond the existing rear extension. However the proposed rear infill extension would include projecting balconies. Given limited projection of these balconies and their relationship with the windows of the neighbouring residential properties this element of proposal would not cause unacceptable overlooking issues. The proposed roof mansard roof extension would also not worsen the existing situation.

The proposal is considered to comply with the aims of policies CS5 and DP26.

### **Transport**

#### Car parking

Policies CS11 and DP17 seek to encourage sustainable modes of transport in Camden and DP18 addresses the supply of car parking in the borough to reduce congestion and promote the use of more sustainable modes. The application site benefits from a high connectivity to public transport with a PTAL rating of 6b (excellent public transport accessibility) therefore it is suitable for a car free development in accordance with policy DP18.

Given the parking stress and the highly accessible location of the site the proposed residential units should be made car-free through a Section 106 legal agreement. The absence of S106 agreement would warrant a reason for refusal.

#### Cycle parking

DP18 requires development to sufficiently provide for the needs of cyclists, which are contained in Appendix 2 of the Development Policies document. The London Plan also provides guidance on cycle parking standards these are outlined in Table 6.3 of The London Plan 2011. Camden's Parking Standards for cycles states that one storage or parking space is required per residential unit, however for larger residential units (3+ beds), the London Plan requires two cycle parking spaces per unit. Provision of at least 9 cycle storage or parking spaces is required for the proposed development.

It is proposed to use the small vacant retail unit for cycle storage for 10 bicycles. Two tier bike racks would be used for parking and securing the bicycles. The proposed arrangement is considered to be acceptable.

#### Construction Management Plan

Policy DP21 seeks to protect the safety and operation of the highway network. For some development this may require control over how the development is implemented (including demolition and construction) through a Construction Management Plan (CMP) secured via S106. Due to the scale and kind of this development and the likely method of construction a CMP will be required in order to mitigate any adverse impacts. This needs to be secured via S106 agreement.

The submitted CMP includes details of a consultant team and their responsibilities and do not address all issues which are referred on pages 41-43 of section 8 of CPG6. The absence of sufficient CMP will be a reason for refusal.

#### Financial contribution towards highway works:

In order to mitigate the impact of the increase in trips this development would generate, and to tie the development into the surrounding urban environment, a financial contribution should be required to repave the footway adjacent to the site. This work and any other work that needs to be undertaken within the highway reservation will need to be secured through a Section 106 Agreement with the Council. The amount of financial contribution would be calculated by the Council's Highways Design Team.

#### **Sustainability**

Policy DP22 requires developments to incorporate sustainable design and construction measure. The applicants submitted BREEAM assessment against the BREEAM Domestic Refurbishment 2012 criteria and Energy Statement to address this policy. It is aimed to achieve 'very good' in BREEAM by gaining 74% of available credits from energy category, 70% of available credits from water category and 49% of available credits from materials category. The proposed sustainability measures would include:

- Compliance with secured by design principles;
- Airborne insulation of walls to improve sound performance;
- Improving thermal performance of walls, windows, roof upper floor slabs and floor finishes;
- Improving 'U' values of walls and windows;
- Fitting smoke and fire alarms;
- Use of energy efficient appliances and lighting;
- Use of Band A combi-boiler (90% efficient);
- Use of water efficient appliances;
- Encouraging use of green transport modes by providing cycle storage;
- Provision of home office facilities;
- Choosing materials from responsible sources;
- Use of permeable surfaces on any new hard standing areas;
- Provision of recycling facilities

Due to the form of building and the site constraints no low or zero carbon technologies to generate energy are considered to be appropriate to the proposed development.

The submitted energy statement states that the scheme will provide and an area weighted energy efficiency rating of 70 which is an improvement in area weighted energy rating of 36. This is based on the compared baseline figures of pre and post refurbishment energy efficiency rating figures for each of the proposed flats.

It is considered that the applications gave careful and sufficient consideration to the suitable sustainability measures. Implementation of these measures needs to be secured via S106 agreement.

#### **Refuse Storage**

It is proposed to use rear of the small vacant retail unit for storing recycling bins. The submitted Design and Access Statement also confirms that there would be adequate internal and external storage space for non-recyclable waste and recyclable household waste. However no storage capacity details and refuse collection details were submitted with the application. This could be rectified by way of condition for details of refuse storage and management.

### **Others**

CIL: As the existing office spaces have been vacant more than 6 months within the last 12 months the proposed development would be liable to the Mayor's CIL. If planning permission had been granted the CIL contribution would have been £17,085 (341.7sq m x £50).

Educational contributions from residential developments: LDF policy CS10 sets out the Council's overreaching approach to protecting and providing the community facilities (including schools) that meet the needs of Camden's growing population. According to section 4 of CPG 8 the threshold for education contributions for new residential developments is 5 units and contribution will not be sought for single bedroom or studio dwellings. Accordingly, the proposed development would be liable to make a financial contribution of £8,535 towards educational facilities. This needs to be secured via S106 agreement.

Public open space contribution: LDF policy DP31 considers schemes that involve 5 or more additional dwellings increase the demand for public open space. Section 11 of CPG8 and section 11 of CPG6 give details on the calculation of financial contributions towards maintenance of public open spaces. Accordingly, the proposed scheme would be liable to make a financial contribution of £5,255. This needs to be secured via S106 agreement.

### **Conclusion**

In the absence of a robust justification the loss of the existing A1 and A3 commercial units would harm the character, function and vibrancy of the area. In the absence of a robust marketing justification the loss of the existing office accommodation the proposal would fail to support the economic activity in Camden (in particularly small and medium businesses). The proposed development by reason of the provision excessive number of one bed units would not contribute to the creation of mixed and inclusive communities. The proposed extensions and alterations would significantly detract from the character and appearance host building and the wider Conservation Area. In particular the proposed mansard roof extension and rear infill extension by reason of their location, size, bulk and detailed design would erode the characteristic appearance of the host building and would hamper the street views.

### **Recommendation**

Refuse planning permission.