

Delegated Report		Analysis sheet	Expiry Date:	(i) 20/09/2013 (ii) 14/08/2013
		N/A / attached	Consultation Expiry Date:	(i) 18/07/2013 (ii) 26/07/2013
Officer		Application Number(s)		
Elaine Quigley		(i) 2013/3487/P (ii) 2013/3754/C		
Application Address		Drawing Numbers		
142-150 Arlington Road London NW1 7HP		See draft decision notices		
PO 3/4	Area Team Signature	C&UD	Authorised Officer Signature	
Proposal(s)				
<p>(i) Extensions and alterations to existing building to provide 21 residential dwellings (16 private tenure and 5 affordable housing units) including change of use from use from Class D2 (assembly and leisure) to C3 (residential), following partial demolition and remodelling of the rear elevation, erection of part three, part four storey rear extension, roof extension above existing roof levels, installation of windows openings to the Underhill Street façade and creation of private amenity space at basement level to Stanmore Place with balconies and roof terraces to the upper floors.</p> <p>(ii) Demolition of the substantial part of the rear façade of the building fronting onto Stanmore Place and demolition of the roof of the building.</p>				
Recommendation(s):		(i) Refuse planning permission (ii) Refuse conservation area consent		
Application Type:	Full Planning Permission Conservation Area Consent			

Conditions or Reasons for Refusal:	Refer to Draft Decision Notice					
Informatives:						
Consultations						
Adjoining Occupiers:	No. notified	366	No. of responses	15	No. of objections	14
			No. electronic	00		
Summary of consultation responses:	<p>14 letters of objection received from neighbouring occupiers raising the following concerns:</p> <p>Loss of leisure facility</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Loss of leisure facility and space that are completely devoid in Camden • Minimal facilities for leisure and sport activities in this area and removing it for further flats clearly shows the priorities of making more money on overpriced flats • Numerous development in the area where communal space has been lost to developers for property e.g. Delancey Street/Parkway junctions, loss of Crown and Goose etc. <p>Height and scale</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Extension will make the building the tallest in the street and will be completely out of place in the conservation area • The proposed work is out of character and scale with the surrounding area with the erection of part three, part four storey rear extension. The roof extension above existing roof levels will be out of scale with the street scale • Proposed extensions and alterations are far too large and will destroy the integrity, character and scale of the current building which whilst not listed, is a very unusual characterful building <p>Design and appearance</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The developer should provide more detailed final design proposals on the how the area to the rear of the development will be improved from its current commercial status to be of residential quality in line with the change of use of Mornington Sports Centre. The present proposal is TOTALLY misleading in that the visualisations of this area do not show the metal fencing and access gates and the skips at the end of this road. • The character of the current building will be lost and degrade the street façade. The large building has very attractive The large building has very attractive multi-coloured stained glass fenestration which will be lost in the development • Object to the proposed location of low rental properties in the proposed redevelopment and the proposed access to those properties. The current design segregates the low rental properties from the owned properties and the low rental properties are also the only properties with access onto the rear of the development (i.e. with access onto the road adjacent to the M&S car park). This road area between the M&S car park and the redevelopment is currently an unsightly and difficult to police area. The low cost properties should have access integrated with the other residents or some owned 					

properties should have access onto the rear of the development creating a shared ownership by all residents of all the space around the new development and removing the current segregation by design.

- Sufficient regard for the provision of additional lighting and CC cameras in thoroughfare routes, to discourage drug dealing and anti-social behaviour.

Privacy

- Loss of privacy to residents in adjacent housing
- Privacy for rear patio at no. 140 Arlington Road will be reduced, so we would appreciate fewer windows to be included in the final building plans.

Views

- Erection of a top floor would alter vistas from neighbouring flats including views from living room, terrace and bedrooms.

Noise and construction

- Additional noise to the street and disruption to traffic along the road cannot be underestimated
- The demolition work will entail huge amounts of disruption to local residents and businesses in road closures, environmental pollution from the dust and debris, noise pollution caused by the demolition and construction. It is a large development and destructive to the right to the quiet enjoyment of homes of local residents
- Construction work and associated noise should be restricted to Monday to Fridays with no working on Saturdays and Sundays
- High quality noise proofing insulation should be incorporated into the construction of wall adjoining 154-160 Arlington Road to suppress noise from residents in the new development and also to suppress noise during construction.
- Liaison working group should be set up between the developer and the residents of adjacent properties (including 154-160 Arlington Road) to resolve any issues that arise

Parking

- If the development commences the Council will make no further parking bays for residents available. Residents parking bays in the area are only protected until 17:30 and then anyone can park. Additional housing will mean that there will be nowhere for anyone to park in the evenings.
- The area is already under significant car parking pressure and no new car parking permits should be issued for this development in line with a car free development

Access road

- Vehicle access must be maintained at all times to the road at the rear of 154-160 Arlington Rd (adjacent to the M&S car park) leading to the 154-160 Arlington Road Car Park and to the businesses at the end of the road. The security of that road should also be maintained by locking and unlocking of the access gate at the end of that road – there is a danger that workmen will leave this access gate unlocked and therefore allow drug users etc into the road at night – this must be avoided.

- Loss of access to the recycling bins at the rear of the building as access to the lane could be closed off to facilitate partial demolition and remodelling to the rear elevation of the building.
- The developer must make proposals on how the long term security of access to the road adjacent to the M&S car park will be maintained including:
 - detailed proposals on electrifying the rear access gate and providing a key pad code access for commercial drivers and remote key fobs for road users and a process and obligation for funding and maintaining this access gate.
 - detailed proposals on how the road adjacent to the M&S car park will be upgraded such that it becomes of residential quality and remains safe from vagrants and drug users bearing in mind that the current low cost rental units will be aimed at families with children.
 - the developer should address possible adoption requirements of this road with Camden Council as a possible improvement option.
- Due to narrowness of street and busy nature Underhill Road should not be used as an access road for goods and services. There should be also strict adherence to the current prohibition of >5T trucks between the following hours: 6:30pm > Midnight > 8.00am.

Party wall issues

- The developer must put in place a Construction All risks insurance policy to indemnify 154-160 Arlington Road flat owners and residents for any damage (direct or consequential) to their adjacent properties during construction. This is important because there is a party wall between 154-160 Arlington Road and the Mornington Sports Centre.

Comment

1 letter confirming that the application would not be directly connected to their property

CAAC/Local groups*

comments:

*Please Specify

Camden Town CAAC

No objection to the demolition of the substantial part of the rear facade fronting Stanmore Place and the demolition of the roof of the building.

We have met with the architects on three occasions and generally feel that the scheme has been much improved. However, we still have two important comments to make.

1. In looking at the computer visualizations it was hard to make out the fenestration of the West (front) and South elevations, so the submitted drawn elevations have given us the proposed detail for the first time. The fenestration on the front facade is very complicated in comparison with the existing fenestration and we suggest it should be redesigned and made much more straightforward and almost 'industrial' in keeping with the original building. The quirky placing of windows on the south elevation is quite arbitrary and conflicts with the strong symmetry of the elevation. We are sure this could be improved.

2. We also strongly feel that the elevations of the two, new, upper storeys should not be painted white. White is always dominant and will draw attention to these high storeys. We studied views of the Arlington Road streetscape and found that the elements that stood out were painted white. All the mansards in the road are grey and recessive. We understand that the architects of the scheme agree with this and appreciated that the white brickwork could be painted grey or another material could be used. We do hope this could be achieved as a more recessive colour would draw attention to the original building, which is rather a splendid one, rather than stressing its increased height.

Site Description

The application site is located on the east side of Arlington Road and comprises a building of two substantial storeys of yellow brick with red brick giant order pilasters. The existing building was constructed as a substation some time between 1930 and 1934 and then purchased by Camden Council for use as a sports and leisure centre in 1979 known as Mornington Sports Centre. The sports centre closed in December 2011 and is currently vacant with the purpose of being redeveloped.

The building is of two substantial storeys and constructed of yellow brick with red brick giant order pilasters. A deep stone cornice sits above the 2nd floor window openings with a substantial brick parapet above. The front elevation has a series of regularly spaced and proportioned fenestration with coloured glazing. The building retains much of its original industrial character with solid masonry walls and punched window openings. The side elevation onto Underhill Street is similar in appearance to the front elevation, with double height recessed brickwork panels in place of fenestration. The building extends to the boundaries of the site, reducing in scale to the rear where it appears as one very generous storey. The architectural treatment continues around the building although the rear elevation is plainer without the recessed panels found to Underhill Street and with later interventions such as louvred panels, condenser units and blocked up openings.

The surrounding context along Arlington Road is largely residential, characterised by 4 storey plus mansard late Georgian/early Victorian townhouses – those at 157-161 and 101-145 on the east side of the road are Grade II listed. Whilst the building is clearly different in terms of its bulk, scale and architectural treatment, it is a robust, imposing and attractive composition, testifying to its former use. Accordingly the building is identified within the Camden Town Conservation Area Appraisal and Management Strategy as making a positive contribution to its character and appearance.

To the rear of the site lies Stanmore Place that is gated from Underhill Street. The road is approximately 4m in width and runs along the rear boundaries of the application site and nos. 154-162 (evens) Arlington Road providing access to the car parking area for these properties and other local businesses. Beyond Stanmore Place lies the car parking area that serves Marks & Spencer (M&S) retail store that fronts onto Camden High Street

The site is located within the Camden Town Conservation Area. There are two prominent street trees (maple and london plane tree) to the front of the property along Arlington Road.

Relevant History

Planning permission was **granted** on 26/11/1992 for the erection of a second floor rear extension over the existing flat roofed area and the creation of a new entrance at the rear of the building (9200986). This permission was not implemented.

Planning permission was **granted** on 23/1/2009 for replacement of 4x air conditioning units on Stanmore Place elevation at ground/first floor level with 3 new units, installation of 4x new air conditioning units to the roof and installation of two new louvres at ground floor level on Underhill Street elevation to sports centre (Class D2) (2009/4076/P).

Relevant policies

National Policy Planning Framework

On 27th March 2012 the Government published the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF). The policies contained in the NPPF are material considerations which should be taken into account (from 27th March 2012) in determining planning applications. The NPPF replaces a number of national planning policy documents (listed at Annex 3 of the NPPF).

London Plan July 2011

LDF Core Strategy and Development Policies

Core Strategy Policies

CS1 Distribution of growth

CS3 Other highly accessible area
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
CS17 Making Camden a safer place
CS18 Dealing with waste and encouraging recycling
CS19 Delivering and monitoring the Core Strategy

Development Plan Policies

DP1 Mixed use development
DP2 Making full use of Camden's capacity for housing
DP3 Contributions to the supply of affordable housing
DP12 Managing impact of food and drink uses
DP14 Tourism development and visitor accommodation
DP15 Community and leisure uses
DP16 Transport implications of development
DP17 Walking, cycling and public transport
DP18 Parking standards and limiting the availability of car parking
DP20 Movement of goods and materials
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 Provision of, and improvements to, public open space and outdoor sport and recreation facilities.
DP32 Air quality and Camden's clear zone

Supplementary Planning Policies

Camden Planning Guidance (CPG) 2011

- CPG 1 Design
- CPG3 Sustainability
- CPG5 Town centres, retail and employment
- CPG 6 Amenity
- CPG 7 Transport
- CPG 8 Planning obligations

Camden Town Conservation Area Appraisal and Management Strategy (2007) (CAAMS).

Assessment

BACKGROUND

The site comprises a vacant building that was formerly used as a sports centre by Camden Council since 1980's. The Council advised their intention to close the sports centre in December 2010 identifying in the Cabinet Report by the Director of Finance and Director of Culture and the Environment that:

"Where assets no longer provide value to the community or support priorities and service for the future, the Council will look at whether disposal can support reinvestment elsewhere, for example with the proposed closure in early 2012 of Mornington Sports Centre (MSC) now that state of the art Kentish Town Sports Centre has reopened less than 1 mile away".

The decision to sell the site was taken in July 2011 with Officers advising that:

"With the refurbishment and re-opening of Kentish Town Sports Centre, the Council anticipates that public use of Mornington Sports Centre will significantly decrease from an already low annual usage rate. Kentish Town Sports Centre now provide state of the art facilities a good value to the public whereas MSC does not meet modern standards and would require significant ongoing investment to bring it up to current quality and access standards. Most users will be able to transfer to one of the Council's other sports centres for similar activities and services."

The report concluded:

"There is no alternative operational requirement for the building and it is recommended that the property is declared surplus to requirements and is sold at market value with the receipts contributing to the Community Investment Programme (CIP)"

The decision to dispose of the site was reached following detailed analysis of alternative sports provision in the area. It is understood that Mornington Sports Centre (MSC) closed in December 2011 and the Council subsequently marketed and sold the site to the applicant in July 2012.

PROPOSAL

The proposal includes the conversion of the existing building that covers the entire site to provide a residential development for 21 new self-contained residential units within part of the basement floor and the ground to fourth floors (six floors in total).

The proposed housing mix split by tenure and number of bedrooms/floorspace is set out in the table below:

Tenure	1 bed	2 bed	3 bed	Total	Floorspace (GIA sq. m)
Affordable rent	1	1	3	5	463 sq. m
Private sale	3	9	4	16	1421 sq. m
Total	4 (19%)	10 (47.7%)	7 (33.3%)	21 (100%)	1884 sq. m

Basement level

The front part of the basement level towards Arlington Road would comprise a large area for storage, plant, 28 cycle parking spaces, lift core and internal staircase. The rear part of the basement towards Stanmore Place would comprise three bedrooms associated with the lower floor of three affordable maisonettes with access to external courtyard areas.

Ground floor

This would include an entrance foyer for the private flats, 1 x 2 bed flat facing onto Arlington Road, the upper floors of the 3 x 3 bed maisonettes facing onto Stanmore Place, the ground floor of an affordable 2 bed maisonette with its own separate access from Underhill Street, bin store and cycle store for 8 bicycles.

First floor

This would comprise the first floor of the 2 bed affordable maisonette, 1 x 1 bed market flat with external terrace, first floor of 6 x 2 bed market maisonette flats (2 bedrooms, bathroom and ensuite).

Second floor

This would comprise the upper floor of accommodation of 6 x 2 bed market maisonette flats

(living/dining/kitchen and wc) with external terrace facing Stanmore Place for 3 of these flats. It would also include 1 x 1 bed market flat with external terrace facing onto Stanmore Place.

Third floor

This floor would comprise 2 x 2 bed private flat with terraces fronting Arlington Road and Stanmore Place, and the bedrooms of 3 x 3 bed maisonettes and 1 x 2 bed maisonette.

Fourth floor

This floor would comprise the living rooms and bedrooms of the 3 x 3 bed maisonettes and 1 x 2 bed maisonette with external terraces.

External alterations and extensions

The front and side elevation of the existing building would be retained with alterations including enlargement of four of the existing window openings on the front elevation, and new window and door openings in the side elevation fronting onto Underhill Street. The proposal would include the demolition of the majority of the rear elevation of the existing building, retaining only the corner part of the building fronting Underhill Street and Stanmore Place. The façade would be replaced with a new stepped four storey façade with new window openings. The proposal would also include a new single and two storey extensions to the existing stepped roof that would be set back from the front façade with the top storey set back from all sides. Enclosed terraces would be created at first, second, third, fourth and fifth floor levels. The existing double height roller shutter would be removed and replaced by a glazed entrance that is centrally located within the Arlington Road elevation. This entrance would be used as the principal entrance into the building.

The total gross external floor area would be 3,080 sq. m and the gross internal floor area of the new residential flats would be 1884 sq. m.

Amendments and additional information

- Submission of air quality assessment
- Reconfiguration of cycle storage area to provide two tier cycle stands (Josta)
- Increase in the internal dimensions of the internal lift car (1100mm x 2100mm) to accommodate wide range of bicycles
- Cycle and bin store doors onto Underhill Street now inward opening
- Installation of horizontal glazing mullions within the windows to provide a more industrial appearance
- Change to the materials of the roof extension from painted white brickwork to grey cladding

ASSESSMENT

The main issues to be considered as part of the proposal are:

- Loss of leisure facilities – land use
- Residential units –land use
- Affordable housing
- Housing mix and tenure
- Principle of demolition
- Design and appearance
- Neighbouring amenity
- Transport
- Sustainability
- Air quality
- Trees
- Other matters

LAND USE

Loss of leisure facility (Class D2) – Land use

The overarching policy relating to leisure facilities in Camden in CS10 (Supporting community facilities and services) and DP15 (Community and leisure uses). The aim of the policy is support the retention and enhancement of existing community, leisure and cultural facilities.

It was agreed at the Council's Cabinet meeting on 20th July 2011 that MSC was surplus to requirement in light of the re-opening of the refurbished Kentish Town Sports Centre less than a mile away. Consequently, adequate alternative facilities were available within close proximity within the local area. In light of the above, the justification for the change of use of the sports centre to residential is therefore tested against part (e) of Policy DP15.

The justification for the loss in line with part (e) has been split into three areas:

- (i) review of the available facilities previously available at MSC
- (ii) identification of alternative indoor and outdoor sports facilities within the local area (the applicant has taken 1.2km as a radius in line with Camden's Open Space, Sport and Recreation Study Update 2008 that advises that this is an appropriate travel distance by foot to indoor sports facilities)
- (iii) Facilities available at alternative centres have been reviewed and compared to these previously available at MSC

(i) Facilities available at MSC

The former MSC provided a variety of facilities including a large sports hall that provided a range of sporting activities including badminton and basket ball. In addition, the sports centre also provided a group exercise studio, gym comprising 43 equipment stations and an aerobic section. "The Zone" activity area provided facilities for children and young people from the age of 5 to 15 years. The facilities were separated over three floors that were accessible by stairs only. The main pedestrian entrance to the centre was from Underhill Street by a number of steps.

(ii) Alternative facilities within the local area

The applicant has identified three indoor sports centres and two outdoor facilities open to the community within approximately 1.2km of the MSC. These include:

Indoor facilities

- Kentish Town Sports Centre – 1.1km
- Talacre Community Sports Centre – 1.1km
- Somers Town Community Sports Centre – 1.1km

Outdoor facilities

- Camden Town Sports Pitches – 0.8km
- Canteloves Gardens Sports facility – 1.2km

The information submitted by the applicant has been considered. Taking into consideration the number of alternative facilities within walking distance of the former MSC the local residents of the area would continue to have a variety of public sports facilities available for them to attend within walking distance.

(iii) Review and comparison of facilities available at alternative centres

The applicant has submitted evidence comparing the facilities that are available at alternative sports centres within 1.2km of the site in comparison to those provided by MSC. This demonstrates that equivalent or enhanced alternative leisure facilities continue to be available to local residents in the area. This includes better gym facilities at the refurbished Kentish Town Sports Centre that provides more than double the number of equipment stations than those available at MSC that are fully wheelchair accessible.

The information submitted by the applicant has been considered. It demonstrates that all of the facilities/activities previously on offer at MSC are available at nearby sports centres to an equivalent or larger size and equivalent or better standard. The other centres have superior access arrangements with wheelchair accessible entrances and lifts compared to the limited level access facilities available at MSC. Therefore it has been demonstrated that there are equivalent or enhanced facilities available within close proximity to the MSC. This would ensure that no shortfall in the provision of leisure facilities would be created as a result of the loss of MSC sports centre.

A local resident has raised concern about the loss of communal space within the area and cites examples of sites on the corner of Delancey Street/Parkway and the Crown and Goose Public House. The site at corner of Delancey Street and Parkway was originally occupied as a motor garage and was never in use as a communal space. The Crown and Goose Public House was a pub and a snooker hall. The issue of the loss of the snooker hall as a community facility was discussed at length during a public inquiry and the Inspector took the

view that there were sufficient alternative snooker facilities available to ensure that the loss of this snooker hall would not result in a shortfall.

Conclusion – loss of leisure facility

The policy stance in relation to the need to protect existing leisure facilities is generally worded however the information that has been submitted by the applicant to demonstrate that there would be no shortfall in [provision as a result of the loss of MSC would be in line with the policy requirement under DP15(e) and would be considered acceptable.

Residential (Class C3) – Land use

It is acknowledged that residential can be an appropriate use within a town centre location. Policies CS6 and DP2 of the Core Strategy and Development Plan policies seek to maximise the supply of additional homes in the borough. The proposed development would accord with the aims of this policy, and furthermore would achieve additional units without the loss of any open space or other type of use protected by Camden's planning policies. Therefore, subject to the loss of the leisure facility being addressed (as already detailed above) the proposed use is considered acceptable, and broadly compatible with the surrounding area.

Affordable housing

Policy DP3 provides a clear rationale for seeking affordable housing in schemes for 10 or more additional dwellings or 1000m² of floorspace (gross external area). DP3 expects the affordable housing contribution to be made on site, but where it cannot practically be achieved on site the Council may accept off site affordable housing or exceptionally a payment in lieu.

This application proposes 21 residential flats that would occupy 3080 sqm gross external area (GEA) which would require a target of 30.8% of the floorspace being affordable floorspace or 924 sq. m. The applicant has proposed 5 affordable housing units that provide 579.3 sq. m. This represents 18.8% of the floorspace being affordable housing floorspace. This falls substantially below 30.8% target of affordable housing floorspace by 12% or 344.7 sq. m of floorspace that would be required to be provided by a development of this size. The applicant has justified the number of units due to the circumstances of the site and the constraints of the building. However the application has not been accompanied by a financial viability report to demonstrate that policy-compliant scheme with more affordable housing would not be financially viable. Officers are therefore unable to assess whether a more meaningful contribution towards affordable housing could be created on site. In the absence of sufficient justification for the shortfall in provision of on-site affordable housing the proposal is recommended for refusal on this basis.

Housing tenure and mix

CS6 sets out the Council's aims to secure high quality affordable housing. This includes guidelines of 60% social rented housing and 40% intermediate affordable housing. The proposal includes 5 affordable housing units that are to be provided as affordable rent.

The London Plan proposes to define affordable rent as "*rented housing provided by registered providers of social housing, that has the same characteristics as social rented housing except that it is outside the national rent regime, but is subject to other rent controls that require it to be offered to eligible households at a rent of up to 80% of local market rents*". The proposed rent would be charged at between 40% and 65% of open market rents. The larger three bed units would be charged at approximately 40% of the open market. The applicant has advised that this is closer to the previously grant subsidised social rent levels and is equivalent to Local Housing Allowance for properties of this size. Given the status of the London Plan and its compliance with the Affordable Rent mechanism set out in the Government's Affordable Homes Programme, it would have considerably more weight than the Council's own revised CPG2 guidance. Therefore the proposal would be considered to comply with the London Plan in terms of the affordable. The affordable housing tenure would be secured by s106 agreement. Given the context of the recommendation this consequently forms a further reason for refusal of the application, although an informative will also specify that without prejudice to any future application or appeal, this reason for refusal could be overcome by entering into a legal agreement in the context of a scheme acceptable in all other respects.

Policy DP5 seeks to provide a range of unit sizes to meet need across the borough. In order to define what kind of mix should be provided within residential schemes, Policy DP5 includes a Dwelling Size Priority Table. The Council would expect any housing scheme to meet the priorities outlined in the table, or provide robust

justification for not providing a mix in line with the table and the requirements outlined in paragraph 5.5 of the supporting text to the policy. Studio and one bed units are identified as a low priority in the market sector. The proposal is for 16 private residential flats (3 x 1 bed, 9 x 2 bed, 4 x 3 bed) and 5 residential flats for affordable rent (1 x 1 bed, 1 x 2 bed, 3 x 3 bed).

Market housing

The Council aims for at least 40% of market housing to contain 2-bedrooms, as DP5 identifies 2-bed units as a “very high” priority in the dwelling size table in paragraph 5.4. It is proposed that the two bedroom units would make up 56% of the total, which is supported. The percentage of 1 bedroom units is also 19%, and 3 bedroom properties make up the remaining 25%.

Affordable housing

In terms of the affordable rent units the proposal would create 1 x 1 bed, 1 x 2 bed, 3 x 3 bed. The applicant has confirmed that, due to the constraints of the site and need to balance the retention of historic and architectural features of significance against the provision of residential units with appropriate standards of amenity, this has limited the ability of the scheme to provide four-bedroom units. To account for this and reflect the need for family accommodation, a higher proportion of the affordable rented units have been provided as three-bedroom, equivalent to 60% of the total number of affordable units. Given to the physical constraints of the building in terms of the floor plate depths and window openings, the lack of larger 4 bed family sized units is considered acceptable in this instance and has support from the Council's Housing Partnership Team.

Quality of new residential accommodation

Development Plan Policy DP26 requires residential developments to provide an acceptable standard of accommodation in terms of internal arrangements, dwelling and room sizes, amenity space and an internal living arrangement which affords acceptable levels of sunlight, daylight, privacy and outlook.

With regards to dwelling and rooms sizes, all 21 flats would meet, with many exceeding the minimum space standards set out in the Mayor of London's Housing SPG. The standards in this guide exceed Camden's own Planning Guidance, for example Camden requires 48 sq. m for a 2 person flat, whereas the Mayor of London's SPD is 50 sq. m. All flats would also have usable layouts to maximise functionality and liveability for future occupiers. The market housing would be accessed via the newly created entrance area at ground floor level from Arlington Road using a centrally located lift core. The affordable housing maisonette units to the rear part of the building would each have their own separate entrances from Stanmore Place with one of the other affordable flats having its own separate entrance from Underhill Street. Each flat would be entirely self-contained. This is largely a conversion, with a large floorplate depth. Of the 21 flats 14 of the flats would be dual aspect onto Arlington Road and Stanmore Place and the 7 single aspect units would not face north. The flats are mainly generous in size with large window openings. It is considered that the inclusion of the single aspect units is acceptable.

Daylight and sunlight

An independent daylight and sunlight report by Savills has been carried out in line with the BRE's site layout planning for Daylight and Sunlight – A guide to Good Practice (2011 as amended). The daylight levels have been assessed in the context of the existing street trees that are located outside the building on pavement on Arlington Road. The report concludes that the vast majority of the rooms, including those at the rear basement level would enjoy good levels of internal daylight in excess of the ADF targets for the specific room use. To the front elevation, all of the rooms apart from a single ground floor living room/kitchen/dining room would also enjoy daylight levels in line with or exceeding the ADF targets. The window of this flat would achieve an ADF level of 0.83 that is 0.7 below the minimum requirement. Due to its deep floor plate and the fact that there is no potential to include secondary window openings the arrangement of this room inherently reduces the ADF when the whole room is taken into consideration. It must be noted that the overall layout of this flat meets the minimum floor area requirements and has an acceptable internal layout. Consequently it is considered that the overall quality of the flat would be of a satisfactory standard and would be considered acceptable. Given the fact that the other remaining 20 flats all meet and exceed the ADF levels the overall the levels of daylight and sunlight received into the new flats would be considered acceptable.

Outlook and sense of enclosure

In terms of outlook, 14 of the 21 flats would enjoy dual aspect equating to 66% which is higher than what is usually achieved. None of the 7 single aspect flats would be directly north facing. Concern was raised at pre-

application stage in regards to the 3 basement and ground floor maisonettes experiencing a harmful sense of enclosure by virtue of the close proximity of the metal fence and car parking area beyond. However given that the units would comfortably exceed the minimum floor space standards and part of the rooms of these flats would be set further back from this fence by approximately 5m, it is considered that these maisonettes would still present a good level of amenity for future occupiers. Overall, the scheme offers a high quality outlook to prospective residents.

Privacy

Generally all new flats would achieve high levels of privacy with neighbouring residential properties being located approximately 16m on the opposite side of the Arlington Road. The neighbouring property at no. 140 Arlington Road is approximately 8m away but the elevation that faces the development is a flank wall with two windows at first and second floor level. In order to ensure that there is no direct overlooking between the first floor window of no. 140 and the first floor living room window of one of the new flats a condition would be attached that this window is obscure glazed.

Private amenity space

Private amenity space has been provided in the form of private balconies and terraces for 14 of the 21 units (66%). All the three bedroom units would have access to private amenity space. This is considered to be acceptable.

Lifetime homes and wheelchair accessibility

Policy DP6 requires all new dwellings be designed to meet Lifetime Homes standards. A lifetime homes assessment has been submitted with the applications and which shows that it is possible to meet all the 16 criteria. Policy DP6 (Lifetime Homes) states that 10% of homes development should either meet wheelchair housing standards or be easily adapted to them. If all of the criteria cannot be met a 'best endeavours' exercise should be undertaken by the applicants to justify the reasons why the development cannot meet the criteria. The proposal includes all units to be easily convertible to wheelchair accommodation and this is considered acceptable. If the scheme was acceptable in all other respects conditions would have been recommended requiring the provision of further details to show compliance with lifetime homes and wheelchair housing requirements.

PRINCIPLE OF DEMOLITION

Policy CS14 seeks to ensure preservation and enhancement of Camden's heritage assets and their settings. In that respect policy DP25 aims to prevent the total or substantial demolition of an unlisted building that makes a positive contribution to the character and appearance of the conservation area. In addition to that, the Conservation Area Statement seeks to retain buildings that positively contribute to the character and appearance of the conservation area.

The existing building is listed in the conservation area statement amongst those properties that make a positive contribution to the character and appearance of the conservation area. The proposal would include the removal of the roof of the building, the internal floors and a substantial section of the rear façade. Given that the front façade, the side elevation fronting onto Underhill Street and a corner section of the existing building fronting onto Stanmore Place would be retained as well as the nature of the building, the extent of the demolition works would be considered acceptable, subject to a suitable replacement scheme.

DESIGN AND APPEARANCE

The building is of two substantial storeys and constructed of yellow brick with red brick giant order pilasters. A deep stone cornice sits above the 2nd floor window openings with a substantial brick parapet above. The front elevation has a series of regularly spaced and proportioned fenestration with coloured glazing. The building retains much of its original industrial character with solid masonry walls and punched window openings. The side elevation onto Underhill Street is similar in appearance to the front elevation, with double height recessed brickwork panels in place of fenestration. The building extends to the boundaries of the site, reducing in scale to the rear where it appears as one very generous storey. The architectural treatment continues around the building although the rear elevation is plainer without the recessed panels found to Underhill Street and with later interventions such as louvred panels, condenser units and blocked up openings. The surrounding context along Arlington Road is largely residential, characterised by 4 storey + mansard late Georgian/early Victorian townhouses – those at 157-161 and 101-145 on the east side of the road are Grade II listed. Whilst the building is clearly different in terms of its bulk, scale and architectural treatment, it is a robust, imposing and

attractive composition, testifying to its former use. Accordingly the building is identified within the Camden Town Conservation Area Statement as making a positive contribution to its character and appearance.

The building essentially consists of one large open internal space, with additional accommodation over two storeys within the smaller scale rear wing. On the face of it this should allow significant flexibility in terms of its conversion and offer the opportunity to create high quality residential accommodation with a unique character. It is appreciated that there are certain constraints in terms of the deep plan form of the building and the need to introduce light into the newly created residential rooms and that the existing window openings and cornice line represent a challenge in terms of accommodating new floor structures.

This site has been the subject of extensive pre application negotiations. Initial proposals involved setting back the skin of the new accommodation from the front façade, however this has now been omitted and the accommodation will utilise the front elevation and its openings.

The last pre application meeting was held in February 2013 and follow up design comments were forwarded to the applicants in March 2013. In these it was indicated that there were still serious reservations regarding the roof extensions, both from Arlington Road and in views up Underhill Passage. Whilst there appear to have been some alterations to the setback of the upper storey from Underhill Street and revisions to the materials and detailing of the upper sections of the building, fundamental design objections to the scheme remain. These have been highlighted and reiterated several times during the course of pre application meetings. It is considered that these issues have not been sufficiently overcome so as to allow officers to recommend approval from a design perspective. The issues are as follows:

Height

Concern remains about the overall height of the development. From the drawings it still appears that the floor plate of the 4th floor aligns with the top of the parapet. Whilst a single additional floor could generally be supported, in this case the entire floor would rise above the existing parapet height of the building. In most cases when adding an additional floor to a building the existing parapet would screen the lower portion, thus minimising its visual impact. As outlined before, this building is already the tallest and bulkiest on this part of Arlington Road and the roof extension as proposed would harm the character and appearance of the Conservation Area.

Bulk

The existing building consists of two separate portions, reducing in scale to the rear of the site. The Council's preferred option would be a stepped approach, with the addition of a single storey of accommodation to each section. The proposed scheme does not follow this advice. Rather, the proposed 5 floors of accommodation run through the depth of the site, giving the impression of a new block 'slotted' into a retained envelope, rather than a conversion with real integrity and with additions that relate to the original form and profile of the building. This is evident on the proposed side elevation onto Underhill Street where the uppermost storey projects beyond the line of the final giant order pilaster. This adds significantly to the bulk of the building at the rear and in views up Underhill Passage

Rear elevation treatment

Concern has consistently been expressed about the design approach of the rear elevation and the retention of more of the existing façade in this location was explored at pre-app stage. The retention of the full height section of brickwork on the corner of Underhill Street and Stanmore Place is welcomed. However, the proposed new development then rises substantially higher than the retained parapet level of this section and is designed with prominent bays and vertical panels of brickwork that relate to the later 20th century buildings to the north of the site. Re-iterating the form and rhythm of these buildings is not considered a useful precedent and it would be preferable to see additions that reflected the character of the host building and its profile. The design and articulation of the rear additions has not significantly altered from the February 2013 pre-application submission and still lack coherency. When combined with concerns regarding the lack of a stepped profile to the roof extensions, the overall bulk, massing and design at the rear is considered inappropriate.

Roof extensions

The proposed design of the roof extensions has been altered since pre-application stage, with sheet metal cladding replaced by light coloured brickwork. The submission suggests that a preference for a light coloured treatment to the roof extension originated from conservation officers however this is not the case – there does

seem to be a reference to a light coloured material being raised as a preference as part of the public consultation. This has been amended by the applicant to confirm that the roof extension would be clad in grey cladding. Officers are still uncomfortable with the detailed design of the roof additions and there is still concern that an appropriate balance between solid to void has still not been reached. This is more critical given that so much of the additional floors are visible above the parapet of the host building giving them additional prominence.

This proposal has not sufficiently addressed the design concerns raised at pre application stage. Consequently, the scheme is considered unacceptable in terms of its height, bulk, massing and detailed design and would fail to preserve and enhance the character and appearance of the Camden Town Conservation Area.

AMENITY

Policy DP26 states that the Council will only grant permission for development that does not cause harm to amenity. It states that the Council should consider the impact on daylight, sunlight, outlook, privacy, noise and odour/cooking fumes. This policy also requires acceptable standards of accommodation in terms of internal arrangements and facilities such as refuse storage and recycling.

Overlooking and loss of privacy

Window openings

CPG6 advises that it is good practice to locate directly facing habitable rooms 18 metres apart to ensure that privacy between properties is of an acceptable level. The existing facades of the buildings along this section of Arlington Road are located approximately 16m away and thus fall short of the recommended 18m separation distance. The separation distance of 16m represents an established pattern within the local built environment and therefore the new windows would not introduce any additional harmful overlooking of the properties opposite the application site along Arlington Road. The residential property at no. 150 Arlington Road has window openings at first and second floor level in the side elevation facing Underhill Road. Given that the new window openings in the side elevation of the application building would serve as secondary windows to habitable rooms that would be located approximately 8m away there may be potential for overlooking into the windows in the side elevation of this property. The applicant claims that these windows serve non-habitable rooms. Having checked the planning history associated with this property it would appear that the first floor side window serves a living room and the second floor side window serves a staircase. Consequently it would be considered necessary to require the larger first floor window in the side elevation of the affordable housing unit identified as 1.01 on the plans to be obscure glazed. If an acceptable scheme had been in place this would have been required by condition. It must be noted that the property at nos. 5-6 Underhill Road is occupied as office accommodation. Although there are new window openings in the side elevation of the part of the building that faces this office building they would not be considered to result in harmful overlooking to this commercial property and would be considered acceptable. Taking this into consideration, it is considered that the proposal would not result in a loss of privacy to the neighbouring occupiers subject to the attachment of a suitably worded condition.

Roof Terraces

New terraces would be included at first, second, third and fourth floor levels on the rear elevation of the building. At third floor level terraces would be created in front of the new roof extension fronting onto Arlington Road. These terraces do not appear to be accessed by any door openings. The fourth floor level new terraces would be created adjacent to Underhill Road elevation and adjacent to the side elevation of the neighbouring property at no. 154 Arlington Road. The terraces that front onto Underhill Road at third and fourth floor levels would be enclosed by 1.1m high metal balustrades. The terraces to the rear of the property would face onto Stanmore Place and the M & S car park beyond. They would not result in any additional overlooking or loss of privacy to neighbouring properties. The terrace at third floor level that faces onto Underhill Road would be located opposite the office building at no. 5-6 Underhill Road. Given its location at third floor level it may allow views down into the windows of the office building. However given that this is not a residential dwelling it is not considered to harm the amenity of the commercial building and would be considered acceptable. Views from this terrace back towards the side windows of no. 140 Arlington Road would be acute and would therefore not be considered harmful to the amenity of this property in terms of overlooking.

The roof terraces at 4th floor level would look down onto the roof of the neighbouring property at no. 140

Arlington Road that is three storey's in height. The views from this terrace would not allow direct views into the side windows of this property and would be considered acceptable. The part of the 4th floor terrace closest to properties fronting Arlington Road would be approximately 22m from the windows in the front elevation of these properties. This would represent a satisfactory separation distance to ensure that there would be no direct overlooking of windows from this roof terrace.

Daylight, sunlight and sense of enclosure

A comprehensive daylight and sunlight study has been prepared to assess the impact on all the surrounding buildings along Arlington Road and Underhill Road. It concludes that all windows meet relevant criteria on daylight using the Vertical Sky Component (VSC) and No Sky Line (NSL) analyses. It should be noted that all windows of Camden Studios are not significantly affected and all meet the relevant tests.

The application building is 8m from the windows in the side elevation of no. 140 Arlington Road and 8.3m from the front elevation of the three storey office building at no. 5-6 Underhill Road. Due to the height of the existing building and the fact that the proposed roof extensions would be set back from the side façade the additional extensions would not result in loss of outlook or increased sense of enclosure to these properties.

Due to separation distance (16m) between the application site and the properties opposite fronting onto Arlington Road and the orientation of the neighbouring properties at nos. 154-162 (evens) Arlington Road the additional extensions would not result in loss of outlook or increased sense of enclosure to these properties.

Noise

Noise can have a major effect on amenity and health and therefore quality of life. Policy DP26 and DP28 seek to ensure that new development does not cause noise disturbance to future occupiers or neighbouring properties. It states that development will not be granted for development that is likely to generate noise pollution or development that is sensitive to noise in locations with noise pollution, unless appropriate attenuation measures are provided. It also states that the Council will seek to minimise the impact of noise from demolition and construction.

The Council's standard requirement is that that noise from operational plant is at least 5dB below the background noise level. Where it is anticipated that plant will have a noise that has a distinguishable, discrete continuous note and/or if there are distinct impulses then that plant should operate at least 10dB below the background noise level. A basement plant room is proposed. The exact plant specifications are unknown at this stage. A Noise and Vibration report has not been provided in support of the application and it is therefore unclear if the proposed plant would be designed to meet the Council's noise standards of 5dBA below background levels. Consequently the proposal is recommended for refusal on this basis.

SUSTAINABILITY

London Plan climate change policies and Camden's Core Strategy and Development Policies CS13 and DP22 require all developments to contribute to the mitigation of and adaptation to climate change, to minimise carbon dioxide emissions and contribute to water conservation and sustainable urban drainage.

Climate change mitigation

A Sustainable Energy Statement has been prepared by Stilwell Partnership and forms part of the application. The overall approach to reducing CO2 emissions should be through a range of measures in line with a 3-step hierarchy of i) using less energy; ii) supplying energy efficiently; and iii) using renewable energy. The benchmark used is the Part L 2010 Building Regulations over which a 25% improvement should be achieved in the period 2010-2013.

The submitted energy statement outlines various passive design features and demand reduction measures to reduce CO2 emissions by using less energy. Such features include enhanced insulation measures to achieve an efficient envelope of U-values and air-tightness, low energy lighting and ventilation equipment, high thermal mass, and use of Building Energy Management (BEMS) system with appropriate time and temperature controls. These measures will reduce regulated CO2 emissions to 6% below the Part L baseline.

London Plan and Camden policy seeks to prioritise decentralised energy. The London Heat Map does not show any existing or proposed district heat networks in the area to which the development could connect. A single on-site heating network for the development has been shown to be viable and the applicant has provided

a commitment ensuring that this will be designed to allow future connection to a district heating network should one become available.

The Energy Statement calculates that the predicted total annual operational energy demand of the development would be 2,503 kg/year which is 5.9% of CO₂ savings through energy efficiency measures. The statement also predicts that CHP system would achieve a reduction in regulated CO₂ emissions of 11,625 kgCO₂ or 26.8% of total CO₂ emissions. The total estimated annual CO₂ emissions reduction would be 14,002 kgCO₂ or 32.2%. This would meet and exceed the London Plan target of 25% and would therefore be considered acceptable.

In regard to the third stage of the hierarchy, the use of renewables has been subject to a feasibility study with practical consideration given to renewable technologies that do not conflict with a CHP system. This includes (i) solar thermal panel systems and (ii) photovoltaic (PV) roof top systems. The applicant has expressed a preference for the flat roof of the building to be allocated for PV panels. If the scheme were in other respects considered acceptable there would be a requirement to secure PV's by s106 agreement. Given the context of the recommendation this consequently forms a further reason for refusal of the application, although an informative will also specify that without prejudice to any future application or appeal, this reason for refusal could be overcome by entering into a legal agreement in the context of a scheme acceptable in all other respects.

Notwithstanding the non-inclusion of renewables the energy efficiency measures and CHP engine will still achieve a predicted 37.7% reduction in regulated CO₂ emissions in line with the London Plan and LDF targets and would be acceptable in broad terms.

Code for sustainable homes

This requires developments to minimise overheating and contribution to heat island effects, minimise solar gain in summer, contributing to flood risk reductions, including applying sustainable urban drainage principles, minimising water use and protecting and enhancing green infrastructure. Camden Planning Guidance (CPG3 2011) sets target ratings in various subcategories for BREEAM and CfSH. The CPG expectation is that percentage targets of 60:60:40 are achieved for the respective BREEAM subcategories of Energy/Water/Materials.

The applicant has prepared a Code for Sustainable Homes pre-assessment for the residential accommodation. A pre-assessment is submitted which shows an indicative strategy for meeting ratings of level 4. The site wide energy strategy, water efficient fixtures and fittings and proposed use of materials would ensure that percentage scores of 61%, 83% and 58% are achieved in the respective sub-categories of energy, water and materials. This meets and exceeds the percentage targets and would be considered acceptable.

A post-construction sustainability statement would be required in line with the submitted pre-assessment and secured through section 106. Given the context of the recommendation this consequently forms a further reason for refusal of the application, although an informative will also specify that without prejudice to any future application or appeal, this reason for refusal could be overcome by entering into a legal agreement in the context of a scheme acceptable in all other respects.

The whole of the proposed roof area is proposed to be covered in a green roof system which will reduce surface water run-off and improve the biodiversity value of the site in line with policies DP23 and CS15. Further flat roof areas at the rear of the development are proposed as green roofs together with areas of green walling. In addition, it is proposed that provisions for both bird and bat boxes will be installed where appropriate in line with CPG3 (biodiversity). Full details of all of these would be required as a condition if planning permission were to be granted.

TRANSPORT

Car-free development

No off-street parking is currently provided as part of the existing site and none is proposed. In line with primarily policy DP18, given the site has a PTAL rating of 6a, all 21 residential units would need to be designated as being car free units. This is in order to ensure the proposed scheme does not lead to an increase in pressure on on-street parking permit spaces. If the scheme had have been able to be supported this would have been

secured via Section 106 Legal Agreement. Given the context of the recommendation this consequently forms a further reason for refusal of the application, although an informative will also specify that without prejudice to any future application or appeal, this reason for refusal could be overcome by entering into a legal agreement in the context of a scheme acceptable in all other respects.

Cycle parking

Camden's Parking Standards (and those of the London Plan) for cycles, policy DP18, states that one storage or parking space is required per residential unit up to two bedrooms, for residential units with three or more bedrooms, two spaces are required. The proposal is for 21 residential units including one three bedroom unit; therefore 28 cycle storage/parking spaces are required. The applicant has included plans for 28 bikes within a dedicated storage area within the basement level and 8 bikes at ground floor level (36 bikes in total). This would exceed the cycle storage requirement. Revised plans were submitted to reconfigure the layout and provide two tier josta cycle stands as well as increase the size of the lift to accommodate a variety of bicycles. This is considered to comply with the CPG guidance. If an acceptable scheme had been in place the provision of the cycle parking spaces would be required by condition.

Construction management plan (CMP)

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 nature and scale of the development a CMP would be required. If the scheme was acceptable in all other respects a construction management plan which includes a section on construction traffic management would be secured via a S106. In the absence of such a legal agreement this forms a further reason for the refusal of the application.

Highways works

In order to cover the costs of any damage caused to the public highways during the construction phase of this development, and to ensure that the footway ties the development into the surrounding urban environment, a financial contribution is considered to be required to repave the footway adjacent to the site on Arlington Road and Underhill Road. In addition, the existing vehicle crossover along Arlington Road should be removed and full height kerbs reinstated, the paving along Underhill Road is also identified for improvement from concrete finish to paving slabs to tie the development into the surrounding area. This S106 obligation should also require plans demonstrating interface levels between development thresholds and the Public Highway to be submitted to and approved by the Highway Authority prior to implementation. The Highway Authority reserves the right to construct the adjoining Public Highway (carriageway, footway and/or verge) to levels it considers appropriate.

Given the extensive works likely to be associated with the proposal, a highways contribution is considered to be necessary in line with policies CS5, CS11, CS19, DP21 and DP26 of the LDF. An estimate cost for the works would be calculated by Highway Engineering to be agreed with the applicant, which would have been secured via S106 had the scheme been acceptable. Given the context of the application it is thus a further reason for refusal of the application, although an informative will also specify that without prejudice to any future application or appeal, this reason for refusal could be overcome by entering into a legal agreement in the context of a scheme acceptable in all other respects.

A financial contribution would be required to promote environmental, public realm, walking and cycling improvements and £20,000 would be appropriate, given the scale and kind of the development and should be secured within a S106 agreement. Given the context of the application it is thus a further reason for refusal of the application, although an informative will also specify that without prejudice to any future application or appeal, this reason for refusal could be overcome by entering into a legal agreement in the context of a scheme acceptable in all other respects.

Development connecting to the highway network

In reviewing the plans at ground floor level it was noted that there were two locations where doors were shown opening outwards onto the public highway. One location was to the cycle storage area on Underhill Road and the other is the new entrance foyer to the residential block on Arlington Road. Doors opening outwards are not supported by Transport as they are considered to represent a highway safety concern for pedestrian movements. Although it is recognised that the door on Underhill Road already exists, this was designed as a fire exit route only, the revised plans no longer intend to use this as a fire exit as it being turned into a cycle storage area. In connection to the Arlington Road access, although it is noted that this is a service vehicle

access, there are no doors opening outwards along this façade, given the increased level of pedestrian movements in this location the doors opening outwards would not be supported. The agent has submitted revised drawings showing the doors to open inwards and this is now considered acceptable.

In addition, it is noted that there is a gate restricting access along Stanmore Place to the rear of the proposed site, which is of particular concern as certain drawings in the Design and Access Statement show this fully open and being proposed as a public realm feature.

No details have been submitted that identify the ownership of this area however the applicant has confirmed that they do not own this road but do have right of access over it. The area is currently gated and restrictions are obviously in place, and it is not clear if they have any rights to remove the gate. The applicant has confirmed that they do not intend to undertake upgrading works to this road, as it is outside their ownership. Concern has been raised by local residents and the Council's Transport Officers about the removal of the existing gate and its relocation further along Stanmore Place to allow access to the ground floor flats along Stanmore Place. It is not considered to benefit the area and it could actually lead to an increased level of illegal parking taking place along Stanmore Place, either by new residents or people wishing to use the Marks and Spencer car park adjacent to the site. Therefore it is considered that the proposal could be unacceptable as the development is seeking to introduce a negative impact on the integration within the network and is considered to cause harm to the highway network particularly in the context of emergency vehicle access and would be contrary to policy DP16 and DP21. An informative would be attached to the decision notice advising the applicant that any future application should include further details relating to this area including how this will be managed and funded and what agreements are in place with the land owners to use and alter this access way.

Concern has been raised by local residents that construction traffic may block the Stanmore Place access preventing the residents of nos. 154-162 Arlington Road from gaining access. The applicant has confirmed that access to the residents car park will be maintained at all times and the contractor will produce a specific Traffic Management Plan to demonstrate how vehicle, pedestrian and cycle access is to be maintained and to avoid any nuisance. If ever a situation arises that may have an impact on the car park, full liaison shall take place prior to this to agree any mitigating measures.

Local residents have also raised concern about the hours of construction works. Work would be restricted to the normal working hours by Environmental Health legislation. No works would be permitted outside these hours.

AIR QUALITY

Camden's Core Strategy Policy CS16 recognises the impact of poor air quality on health and well being and aims to reduce pollution levels. The whole of Camden Borough is an Air Quality Management Area. The applicant has submitted an air quality assessment in support of the proposal due to the extent of the demolition involved and as a combined heat and power system (CHP) is being proposed. The report concludes that a CHP system of the size proposed would be low risk and would not have an unacceptable impact on air quality in this location. The Council's Sustainability Officer has reviewed the information and disputes the claim that this is a low risk site. Due to the number of properties being proposed it is considered as a medium risk site and there would be a requirement to install up to two dust monitors within the building in locations to be agreed with the air quality officer. This information would be required to be secured by condition if the scheme had been acceptable in all other respects. In order to ensure the compliance with the air quality assessment it would be secured by s106 agreement. Given the context of the recommendation this consequently forms a further reason for refusal of the application, although an informative will also specify that without prejudice to any future application or appeal, this reason for refusal could be overcome by entering into a legal agreement in the context of a scheme acceptable in all other respects.

TREES

There are two prominent street trees (maple and london plane tree) to the front of the property along Arlington Road. The Tree Officer has confirmed that the proposed works would not have an adverse impact on the health and well-being of the trees and would be considered acceptable.

Other matters

Refuse and recyclable storage

Refuse and recyclable storage, sufficient to serve the development, is provided within the building at ground level and will be accessed from Underhill Street. The applicant has advised that servicing will take place from Arlington Road as per the previous arrangement for the sports centre.

Public open space

Policies CS15 and DP31, in addition to CPG6/8 require developments of 5 or more additional dwellings which give rise to an overall increase in the number of visitors or occupiers to contribute to the provision of public open space. It is expected for new developments to provide for the open space needs of its occupiers at a ratio of 9sqm per residential occupier. This would normally be expected on site in areas with an under provision of open space or in developments which provide 100 or more dwellings, otherwise a financial contribution may be made towards the provision or enhancement of open space off-site. In this instance it is not practical to provide public open space on site as the existing building covers the entire footprint of the site. Thus a financial contribution would have been secured via S106 Legal Agreement had the scheme been able to be supported in all other respects. Given the recommendation this forms another reason for refusal, with an informative also stating this could be overcome by entering into a legal agreement in the context of a scheme acceptable in all other respects.

Educational infrastructure

A financial contribution towards educational infrastructure is also required in line with CS10, CS19 and DP15. Each new dwelling created in the Borough places increased pressure upon education places and costs. Hence CPG provides a formula which is applied across the Borough, is proportional to the number and size of dwellings proposed and will be used to improve capacity and expand education provision to accommodate additional children. In line with CPG guidance the contribution amounts to £15,174 (3 x 1 bed - no contribution; 9 x 2 bed – 9 x £2213 = £19,917; 4 x 3 bed - 4 x £6,322 = £25,288; combined total = £45,205). In the absence of an acceptable scheme, this forms a reason for refusal of the application. An informative would state this could be overcome by entering into a legal agreement in the context of a scheme acceptable in all other respects.

Concern has been raised by local residents that the area around Stanmore Place is not being upgraded as part of the development given that the road is becoming residential in nature rather than commercial. Stanmore Place is adjacent to the application building is a semi-private accessway to the car parking area for the residents of nos. 154-162 (evens) Arlington Road. It will be unaffected in its width and location and indeed will be enhanced in its security by having windows in the rear elevation of the building providing natural surveillance. The applicant has confirmed that the proposed rear development would be set back from the existing building line to create 'breathing space' along Stanmore Place, improving the current environment generally. The proposed direct engagement of residential entrances onto Stanmore Place and Underhill Street will increase foot traffic and create a substantially more active street frontage than currently exists. In addition, high level balconies overlooking Stanmore Place will result in natural surveillance over the area.

CIL

If supported, the proposals would have been liable for the Mayor of London's Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL), as residential units are sought to be created. The CIL would have been collected by Camden after the scheme had been implemented and could have been subject to surcharges for failure to assume liability, for failure to submit a commencement notice and/or for late payment, and subject to indexation in line with the construction costs index. An informative would have been added to the decision notice reminding the applicant of the CIL requirement if the scheme had been supported.

Recommendation

Refuse planning permission and conservation consent.