

<b>Delegated Report</b>		<b>Analysis sheet</b>		<b>Expiry Date:</b>		<b>13/11/2012</b>	
<b>(Members Briefing)</b>		N/A / attached		<b>Consultation Expiry Date:</b>		<b>25/10/2012</b>	
<b>Officer</b>				<b>Application Number(s)</b>			
Amanda Peck				2012/4931/P			
<b>Application Address</b>				<b>Drawing Numbers</b>			
52-54 Mount Pleasant London WC1X 0AL				Refer to 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(s)</b>							
Variation of condition 2 (development to be carried out in accordance with the approved plans) and condition 3 (windows to be obscure glazed) pursuant to planning permission granted on 11/05/2012 (ref 2011/6016/P for the erection of a 3 storey extension to the east, a part 2 part 4 storey extension to the west of the site with roof terraces, new roof extension to the north block, external alterations to the façades, and other alterations) to allow for minor material amendments to include amendments to the footprint, height, unit mix and elevations to the West Building, associated changes to obscure glazed windows, alterations to the main building entrance and alterations and extensions to basement plant/store areas.							
<b>Recommendation(s):</b>		<b>Grant planning permission</b>					
<b>Application Type:</b>		<b>Variation or Removal of Condition(s)</b>					
<b>Conditions or Reasons for Refusal:</b>		<b>Refer to Draft Decision Notice</b>					
<b>Informatives:</b>							
<b>Consultations</b>							
<b>Adjoining Occupiers:</b>		No. notified	<b>31</b>	No. of responses	<b>24</b>	No. of objections	<b>24</b>
				No. Electronic	<b>00</b>		
<b>Summary of consultation responses:</b>		<p>A site notice was displayed between 27 September and 18 October and a press notice was in place between 4 October and 25 October. The following objections were received from 1, 5, 6, 7, 8, 11, 12, 13 (3 received), 14, 15, 18 Tiverton Mansions; 5 Rosebery Square West; 138, 140 (2 received), 144-148, 156-158, 162 Grays Inn Road; 33 Mullen Tower; 50 Dulverton Mansions; 60 Gray's Inn Buildings and 1 with no address given:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The new plans show a raised courtyard terrace to the rear of properties on Grays Inn Road and this will be a security issue. This 'raised courtyard' will be directly under the kitchen windows of Tiverton Mansions and will cause a noise nuisance and compromise security. (OFFICER COMMENT: please refer to paragraphs 3.2 to 3.4)</li> <li>It was previously agreed that there would not be roof terraces and now these are back in the proposal. The description includes reference to roof terraces and concern that this will cause noise issues. Not convinced that the flat roofs will not be accessed by residents of the hostel (OFFICER COMMENT: The original consent included two flat roof areas at first floor level with doors which could only be used to access these roof areas for maintenance purposes. Condition 4 specified that these roof areas could not be used as terraces. The</li> </ul>					

	<p>amended scheme has removed all doors to these roof areas and condition 4 will still apply to these roof areas.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Extensions to the west building and raised courtyard will create hidden corners for people to gather in a neighbourhood which is a known drugs hotspot. (OFFICER COMMENT: Please refer to paragraph 3.5)</li> <li>• Extension to the West Building will affect daylight/sunlight to residents and commercial with a rear lightwell at 140 Gray's Inn Road (OFFICER COMMENT: Please refer to paragraph 3.6)</li> <li>• Unclear what the reconfiguration of residential mix means (OFFICER COMMENT: Please refer to paragraph 3.7)</li> <li>• Construction impacts and concern that there will be additional construction impacts from the proposed changes. (OFFICER COMMENT: A Construction Management Plan was secured in condition 26 of the original permission and the amended scheme will also be subject to this condition. The removal of the basement from the scheme is likely reduce construction noise and lorry movements and therefore be an improvement for local residents)</li> <li>• Highly residential area already suffering from problems associated by late night drinking and drug taking. The proposed hostel would add to these problems. Problems in the past with anti social behaviour from hostel residents. Not clear if the hostel will be male or female or would include special needs residents. (OFFICER COMMENT: As the existing buildings were recently in Sui Generis hostel use a continuation of this use does not require planning permission. A 'Facilities and Locality Management Plan' was secured in condition 23 of the original permission and the amended scheme will also be subject to this condition)</li> <li>• The proposed 24 hour open courtyard could be a gathering point for larger numbers of people and will increase the anti social behaviour problems. (OFFICER COMMENT: This was considered as part of the original permission and the amended scheme will not impact on the size or use of the central courtyard).</li> <li>• Too little consultation with local residents on the hostel use. Camden have railroaded this proposal through regardless of local objections. Consultation letters were addressed to the 'owner/occupier' and were therefore disguised as junk mail (OFFICER COMMENT: Consultation was carried out as part of the assessment of this planning application with 31 consultation letters, a site notice and a press notice. It is not possible to address consultation letters to individual occupant or owners and all letters are addressed to the 'owner/occupier')</li> <li>• The 'statement of proposed work' is not fit for purpose as it is confusing, ambiguous and needs redrafting. (OFFICER COMMENT: It is presumed that the 'statement of proposed work' refers to the description of the proposal. The description is quite lengthy because the application is for amendments to a previous permission, however the description has been amended in order to make the proposals clearer.</li> <li>• The plan is misleading as Tiverton Mansions is marked as "140" and it appears that there are 2 other buildings which are in fact the bedrooms and kitchens of Tiverton Mansions. This mistake makes the courtyard appear further away from Tiverton Mansions than it really is. (OFFICER COMMENT: The site plan appears to incorrectly number the adjacent properties, but the buildings are all shown in the correct location on the site plan and relevant floor plans. The officer assessment has included all windows to the rear elevation of properties on Gray's Inn Road irrespective of their address.</li> </ul>
CAAC/Local groups comments:	No comments received

### Site Description

The application site is located on the western end of Mount Pleasant, close to the junction with Gray's Inn Road. It is within the Central London Area, the Hatton Garden Conservation Area and an Archaeological Priority Area.

The site is currently occupied by a three-storey (including lower ground floor) hostel (Class Sui Generis)

building which is set out in a 'H' shape with two principle courtyards separated by a central 'link block.' Dual entrances on Mount Pleasant suggest that the buildings may once have operated as two semi segregated units. The main frontage building on Mount Pleasant along with the buildings fronting the eastern courtyard are constructed of red brick (the red courtyard), while the buildings fronting the western courtyard are constructed of yellow brick (the yellow courtyard). The property was constructed in 1901 and appears to have been in use as some form of accommodation for the homeless since its construction. The building is not statutory listed, but is noted in the Conservation Area Statement as a building which making a positive contribution.

The application site is flanked to the west by the rear of buildings to Gray's Inn Road which range in height from 4-6 storeys and have commercial/retail uses to the ground floor and residential uses to the upper floors; to the north by 5 storey commercial buildings; to the east by 6 storey residential units; and to the south by the rear of buildings to Roseberry Avenue which have some commercial/retail uses to the ground floor and residential uses to the upper floors.

### **Relevant History**

- 2011/6016/P - The erection of a 3 storey extension to the east, a part 2 part 4 storey extension to the west of the site with roof terraces, new roof extension to the north block, external alterations to the façades, installation of windows and doors, amendment to boundary wall on Mount Pleasant, removal of staircase on Mount Pleasant, the installation of new cycle parking storage area to the front ground floor courtyard and associated works to create a central courtyard with hard and soft landscaping, to provide an additional 21 rooms to existing 31 room hostel (Sui Generis). Granted 11 May 2012.
- 2011/6069/C- Demolition of the buildings within the central court yard. Granted 11 May 2012.

### **Relevant policies**

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

- CS5 – Managing the impact of growth and development
- CS6 – Providing quality homes
- CS9 – Achieving a successful Central London
- CS14 - Promoting high quality places and conserving our heritage
- CS16 – Improving Camden's health and wellbeing
- CS17 - Making Camden a safer place
- DP5 – Homes of different sizes
- DP6 – Lifetime homes and wheelchair homes
- DP8 – Accommodation for homeless people and vulnerable people
- DP24 – Securing high quality design
- DP25 – Conserving Camden's heritage
- DP26 – Managing the impact of development on occupiers and neighbours
- DP28 – Noise and vibration
- DP29 – Improving access

#### **Hatton Garden Conservation Area Statement**

#### **Camden Planning Guidance 2011**

### **Assessment**

#### **1. Proposal**

1.1 Following approval of the demolition of the central building and the erection of two new buildings at the eastern and western end of the site (refer to history section), the applicant has amended the scheme as follows:

##### Western building

- The permitted building was 4 storeys with a new excavated basement area and the proposal is to remove the basement level from the scheme and for the accommodation to be provided in a 3 storey building (with a raised ground floor level). The overall height of the building has reduced by 0.2m;
- In order to accommodate the same number of bedrooms within this building it now has a larger footprint and projects into the main courtyard a further 1.7m. The top floor also has a 1m reduction in width;
- Changes to roof profile – Because of the increased length and decrease in height the roof slope will be shallower than that approved;
- The unit mix will change from 1 x 2b cluster and 1 x 3b cluster to 2 x studios and 1 x 3b cluster; and
- Alterations to the elevations to reflect the new massing and room layouts.

##### Main building entrance

- Setting back the proposed platform lift; and
- Retention of existing boundary railings and brick pier/gate at the western end of the boundary.

##### Main building basement plant/store areas

- Extension underneath the main staircase entrance to enable changes to be made to the size and location of the plant area;
- Extension to provide a new store cupboard underneath the metal staircase in the courtyard; and

- Changes to internal layout of storage and plant areas.

1.2 The changes outlined above are to be considered as a minor material application relating to condition 2 (development to be carried out in accordance with approved plans and documents). Condition 3 stipulates that a number of windows shall be obscure glazed and fixed shut up to a height of 1.7m. Given the changes outlined above a number of these windows have been removed from the north and south elevations on the west building and the application is also to vary the wording of this condition accordingly.

## 2. Revisions

2.1 The scheme has been revised during the course of the assessment of the application as follows:

- The proposal was originally to change the roof profile of western building and to have a flat roofed building. As approved the sloped roof was 1.4m above the boundary wall parapet to the rear and 3m to the front and the proposal was for it to be 3m above the parapet along its entire length. The overall height of the building has now been reduced and there have been internal changes to floor to ceiling heights and it is now 1.4m above the parapet to the rear and 2.8m to the front.
- The small courtyard adjacent to the western building was to be raised by 1.1m above the height of the central courtyard. As approved this courtyard was to be lowered by 1.4m to accommodate the basement level. Because of the overall reduction in height of the building this courtyard is now raised by 0.7m above the height of the central courtyard.
- There was originally a new balcony proposed at first floor level facing the main courtyard with door access from one of the bedrooms. This balcony has now been designed so that it is not accessible from the bedroom (the door is now a window and the balcony is slightly set away from the elevation).

## 3. Assessment

### Condition 2 – amendments to the scheme

#### **Western Building**

##### *Design*

3.1 The reconfiguration of the layout of the western building has resulted in changes to the main elevation which fronts onto the central courtyard. The amended building remains of a high quality, contemporary design which complements the Hatton Garden Conservation Area.

##### *Noise//security/anti social behaviour*

3.2 In the original scheme the small courtyard adjacent to the western building was to be lowered by approximately 1.3m; the proposal is now for this courtyard to be raised by 0.7m (a total difference of 2m). Concern has been raised by local residents regarding the inclusion of a raised courtyard in the scheme and whether there would be any noise implications from residents using this area and being closer to their windows. It is considered that the raising of this smaller courtyard by a total of 2m, which means it becomes 0.7m higher than the main courtyard, will not have any noise implications because:

- The boundary wall at this point is relatively high and will still be 6.2m in height when measured from the raised courtyard;
- The closest residential windows are then approximately 3m away from this boundary wall;
- This courtyard area will provide access to 1 x studio and 1 x 3 bed unit only and will be gated and only accessible by these 4 hostel residents.

3.3 The amendments to the proposed first floor balcony will ensure that there are no noise implications from the use of this balcony. Condition 4 restricts the use of the first floor flat roofs for maintenance purposes only and this condition will still apply.

3.4 Concern has also been raised by local residents regarding security to their properties. The scheme now includes the raised courtyard described above and an external staircase which provides access to the 1 x studio and 1 x 3 bed unit. It is thought that any existing security issues which have resulted in intruders accessing the rear of the properties on Gray's Inn Road could be due to the existing three storey fire escape staircase which is attached to the building to the north and which is close to the existing boundary wall. The approved scheme removes this fire escape staircase and this is still the case with the amended scheme. It is considered that there are no new security issues as a result of the proposed amendments because:

- The proposed external staircase only provides access to first floor level and is much lower than the existing three storey fire escape staircase and the adjacent boundary wall.
- The top landing of the proposed external staircase will be approximately 4m below the top of the adjacent boundary wall and this is considered to be too high for anyone to scale; and
- Whilst the proposed external staircase is adjacent to the boundary wall there are no steps or shelves in the boundary wall to allow any scaling of this wall.

3.5 In the original scheme this smaller courtyard was accessed via a small set of steps, 2m in length, to the side of the western building. The new scheme alters the footprint of the western building and consequently increases the length of this accessway to a 4m long 'corridor'. Concern has been raised by local residents regarding the creation of hidden corners which will encourage anti social behaviour. This smaller courtyard area provides access to 1 x studio and 1 x 3 bed unit only, will be gated and only accessible by these 4 hostel residents. Given the fact that this courtyard will be gated and used by a small number of residents it is considered that the creation of a 'corridor' access will not encourage anti social behaviour. It should also be noted that the applicant's intention is that the western building will be occupied by residents at the last step of the 'pathway approach', ie. those ready to move into independent accommodation, and not those at the early steps who need specialist support.

#### *Daylight/sunlight and outlook*

3.6 Due to the change to the footprint of the western building there will be an increase in the length of the building visible above the boundary wall parapet. It is considered that the amended scheme will not detrimentally affect outlook or daylight/sunlight to existing residential properties or to existing commercial windows, which face onto the existing lightwell behind the boundary wall, because:

- There is an overall decrease in height of 0.2m from the approved scheme;
- The building has a shallower roof pitch;
- The first floor is set away 0.5m further away from the boundary with Tiverton Mansions; and
- There is a total distance of between 7.5m and 8m from the residential windows at Tiverton Mansions

3.7 The change to the mix of units (from 1 x 2b cluster and 1 x 3b cluster to 2 x studios and 1 x 3b cluster) will not alter the overall number of bedrooms on site and there are not considered to be any policy implications or impact on local residents from this change.

#### *Overlooking*

3.8 The raised courtyard is adjacent to an existing boundary wall which is approximately 6m in height. The top landing of the proposed external staircase will be approximately 4m below the top of the adjacent boundary wall. It will therefore be impossible to overlook any existing windows from the raised courtyard or proposed external staircase. The top floor is the only floor which is above the existing boundary wall and the main window is located on the front elevation facing the main courtyard. There are two small windows in the north elevation, one is blocked by existing building to the north and will not therefore have any overlooking into existing residential windows. The other is a small WC window which will not cause any overlooking issues.

#### **Main building entrance**

3.9 The retention of an existing section of boundary railings and brick pier/gate is considered to be an enhancement on the original scheme. The setting back of the proposed platform lift is a minor change that will have minimal impact on the design of the main entrance. Given the fact that there this involves the retention of existing boundary railings and brick pier/gate and the fact that the platform lift is to be set back into the main entrance, it is considered that there will not be any impacts on existing residents in terms of daylight/sunlight or overlooking.

#### **Main building basement plant/store areas**

3.10 The proposed extensions are located underneath existing staircases to the front and rear of the building and are considered acceptable in terms of design and location. Given their sheltered basement locations it is considered that there will not be any impacts on existing residents in terms of daylight/sunlight or overlooking.

#### Condition 3 – amended wording

3.11 The condition is currently worded as follows:

*“All of the following windows, as denoted on approved plans 0099\_L\_02P rev D, 0099\_L\_03P rev D, and 0099\_L\_04P rev E, shall be permanently obscure glazed and fixed shut up to a height of 1.7m above the floor of the room in which the windows are installed before occupation of the extensions hereby permitted and shall be permanently retained and maintained thereafter:*

- Northern elevation bedroom window to bedroom 2E.01 in Cluster 2E at Upper Ground floor level;
- Northern elevation bathroom window to bathroom in Cluster 2E at Upper Ground floor level;
- Northern elevation bedroom window to bedroom 2E.02 in Cluster 2E at First floor level;
- Northern elevation bathroom window to bathroom in Cluster 2E at First floor level;
- Southern elevation bedroom window to bedroom 2E.02 in Cluster 2E at First floor level;
- Two western elevation bedroom windows to bedroom 4A.01 in Cluster 4A at second floor level.”

3.12 The proposal is to remove the first five bullet points from the condition as these all relate to windows in the north and south elevation of the west building which have now been removed from the scheme. The amended

condition would therefore only relate to the last point relating to 'two western elevation bedroom windows to bedroom 4A.01 in Cluster 4A at second floor level'. Given the fact that the windows on the north and south elevation of the west building have all been removed from the scheme, this amendment is considered acceptable.

#### **4. Recommendation**

4.1 Approve planning permission

**Disclaimer**

***This is an internet copy for information purposes. If you require a copy of the signed original please telephone Contact Camden on (020) 7974 4444***