



PLANNING STATEMENT

In respect of

**1 Dumpton Place and
Land to the Rear of 90-
108 Gloucester Avenue,
NW1 8JB**

On behalf of

Izabelle Investments Ltd

February 2012

Author:
Valerie Scott
Director

Report Status:
Final

Issue Date:
22 February 2012

CgMs Ref:
VJS/12993

© **CgMs Limited**

No part of this report is to be copied in any way
without prior written consent.

Every effort is made to provide detailed and accurate
information, however, CgMs Limited cannot be held
responsible for errors or inaccuracies within this report.

© **Ordnance Survey maps reproduced with the
sanction of the controller of HM Stationery Office.**
Licence No: AL 100014723

CONTENTS	PAGE(S)
1.0 INTRODUCTION	4
2.0 SITE AND SURROUNDINGS	6
3.0 PLANNING HISTORY	8
4.0 POLICY CONTEXT	13
5.0 PLANNING APPRAISAL	29
6.0 CONCLUSIONS	35

APPENDICES

APPENDIX 1: Meeting Notes with Adrian Malcolm, Case Officer and other officers

1.0 INTRODUCTION

- 1.1 This statement has been prepared by CgMs Ltd on behalf of Izabelle Investments Ltd in support of an application for conservation area consent for the demolition of a former car repair workshop (Class B2) at No. 1 Dumpton Place and redevelopment to provide a modern business unit (Class B1) (839m²) together with four 2 x bedroom and two 3 x bedroom houses for private sale.
- 1.2 The proposed development has been the subject of two pre-application meetings with the Council's Planning, Policy, Conservation and Design and Transportation Officers. Notes of these pre-application meetings are enclosed in **Appendix 1**.
- 1.3 This statement describes the site and its surroundings, sets out the planning history and background to the submissions, examines the relevant planning policies and provides an appraisal of the scheme having regard to the site's location and the policy context.
- 1.4 In addition to this Planning Statement amended to support this revised scheme the following plans and reports are submitted with this application:
- Site Plan Scale 1:1250
 - Drawings Nos:
 - 01DP-1001 - Existing Site Plan
 - 01DP-1002 - Existing Floor Plans
 - 01DP-1003 - Existing Elevations
 - 01DP-1004 - Existing Sections
 - 01DP-1005 - Existing Photographs
 - 01DP-5001A - Proposed Site Plan (1:500)
 - 01DP-5002A - Proposed Basement Plan
 - 01DP-5003A - Proposed Ground Floor Plan
 - 01DP-5004A - Proposed First Floor Plan
 - 01DP-5005A - Proposed Second Floor Plan
 - 01DP-5006A - Proposed Third Floor Plan
 - 01DP-5007A - Proposed Roof Plan
 - 01DP-5011A - North & East Elevations
 - 01DP-5012A - South and Elevations
 - 01DP-5013A - Perspectives views
 - 01DP-5021A - Sections AA, BB & CC
 - 01DP-5022A - Sections DD, EE & FF
 - 01DP-5023 - Section Height Study
 - Photographs of site and surrounding area

- Design and Access Statement prepared by PMA Chartered Architects
- Heritage Statement prepared by CgMs Historic Buildings
- Employment Report prepared by Pater Johnson Merriman
- Transport Planning Statement Assessment prepared by Russell Giles Partnership
- Sunlight/Daylight Assessment prepared by Right of Light Consulting
- Sustainability Statement including Preliminary Code for Sustainable Homes and Preliminary BREEAM Report prepared by AJ Energy
- Energy Strategy prepared by AJ Energy
- Phase 1 Environment Assessment prepared by WSP
- Noise and Vibration Impact Assessment Report prepared by WSP
- Basement Impact Assessment prepared by Knapp Hicks & Partners Ltd

2.0 SITE AND SURROUNDINGS

- 2.1 The site is a linear strip of land to the rear of the terrace of 3-storey early Victorian residential properties, Nos. 90-108 Gloucester Avenue. The site is accessed from the western side of Dumpton Place which is a short cul-de-sac leading in a northerly direction from Gloucester Avenue. This is currently occupied by a Part 3/ part 5-storey car repair service building with a single storey workshop to the rear at No. 1 Dumpton Place. This building was previously used as part of a Volvo Servicing Centre. The service centre also included a single storey workshop opposite the site at No. 1 Dumpton Place and to the rear of Nos. 52-88 Gloucester Avenue. This workshop has now been demolished and the site is being developed for residential use with a new 3-storey commercial Class B1 (a – c) unit fronting Dumpton Place.
- 2.2 To the north of the site are a number of railway tracks leading to Euston Station and to the south are the rear gardens of residential 3-storey mid 19th Century terraced properties, Nos. 90 to 108 Gloucester Avenue. A high brick wall, part of the workshop building, runs along the southern boundary. This wall is approximately 6m above the ground level of the proposal site and is 4.85m above the level of the rear gardens of properties on Gloucester Avenue. It is proposed to retain this as part of the development scheme.
- 2.3 The site is located within the Primrose Hill Conservation Area. There are no buildings on or adjoining the site which are listed but the terraced mid 19th Century houses at Nos. 90-108 Gloucester Road are buildings that are considered to make a positive contribution to the area. The existing premises at No. 1 Dumpton Place is a post-war development of primarily 3–storeys with a 2-storey lift and motor room positioned in the centre of the front elevation. The building is of fairly brutal Art Deco design faced with red bricks and including flat roofs. It is completely at odds with the appearance and character of its surroundings and is considered to make a negative impact on the conservation area.
- 2.4 The site is well served by public transport with regular bus routes along Prince Albert Road to the south and Chalk Farm Road to the north providing access to Camden Town, Swiss Cottage, Hampstead and Central London. Chalk Farm

Underground Station is approximately 450m from the site. This also provides quick and easy access to Camden Town, Hampstead and Central London. There are a wide range of local services and amenities in the area including a local neighbourhood centre at Regents Park Road. The site is also close to Regents Park and Primrose Hill offering excellent public open space facilities.

- 2.5 The site is within a Controlled Parking Zone as an area that suffers from parking stress. However, due to the fact that the area has a low to medium PTAL rating of 3 it is considered appropriate to allow some off-street parking for the residential element of the scheme. It is accepted, however, that it would be necessary to enter into a Section 106 Agreement preventing residents of any proposed residential development to be prevented from obtaining car parking permits.

3.0 PLANNING HISTORY

Nos. 1 and 2 Dumpton Place

- 3.1 In November 2004 planning permission was granted for the redevelopment of a larger site comprising the erection of a 3-storey B1 Use Class (business use) building located on the site of No. 1 Dumpton Place and land to the rear of Nos. 90-108 Gloucester Avenue (the current proposal site); the erection of a 2-storey B1 Use Class (business use) building on the site to the rear of Nos. 68-88 Gloucester Avenue; the erection of a 2-storey plus basement terrace of 6 x 3 bedroom houses to the rear of Nos. 52-66 Gloucester Avenue (now completed); and the erection of a pair of 4-storey plus basement 5 bedroom houses at 46 Gloucester Avenue (also completed) with a 9 space car park to the rear. A separate consent for the demolition of the existing building on the site was obtained. These applications have the following references (References: PEX0200634 and CEX0200635).
- 3.2 The Section 106 requirements were for car-capped housing (i.e. residents not allowed any car parking permits) and an education contribution.
- 3.3 The conditions of the permission were discharged and the scheme has been implemented with the demolition of No. 2 Dumpton Place and construction of the residential elements of the approved scheme.

2 Dumpton Place

- 3.4 In March 2009 an application was made for the redevelopment of No. 2 Dumpton Place, land to the rear of Nos. 52-88 Dumpton Place and No. 46 Gloucester Avenue comprising the erection of 2 x 5 bedroom houses, 1 x 4 bedroom house and 6 x 3 bedroom houses and a 2-storey office building (943 sq m) with access from Dumpton Place and associated car parking and landscaping. These applications (References: 2008/3495/P and 2008/3713/C) were withdrawn following officers advice. The Case Officer had advised that the proposed development would need to include affordable housing on the basis that the site had capacity for 10 or more homes and the proposed floor area exceeded 1,000 sq m. In addition the design of the houses on Gloucester

Avenue were not considered acceptable. Further the development would have occupied the entire extent of Site No. 15 of the Schedule of Land Use Proposals of the 2006 UDP, allocated for mixed use including residential and Class B1.

1 Dumpton Place

- 3.5 In October 2009 planning permission was granted for the erection of a building comprising basement, ground and 2 upper floors to provide offices (Class B1) and a building comprising ground and two upper floors to provide six residential units (1 x 1 bedroom and 1 x 2 bedroom flats and 4 x 3 bedroom houses) (Reference: 2008/1322/P).
- 3.6 The Section 106 requirements included financial contributions for open space, education and improvements to the highway in front of the premises. There was also a requirement for sustainability measures and a construction management plan.

2 Dumpton Place

- 3.7 On 30 November 2009 planning permission was refused in respect of a scheme for the erection of 5 x 3 bedroom single family dwellinghouses and a 3-storey office building (939m²) (Ref: 2009/1296/8).
- 3.8 The refusal of this application primarily related to the fact that the proposal for development of this smaller site was regarded by the Council as a device to avoid the provision of affordable housing and that no justification had been put forward to justify the subdivision of the site for which planning permission had already been granted. Other reasons for refusal included the bulk, height and design of the proposed office building, the internal layout of the proposed houses, lack of sustainability provision, outlook, sunlight and daylight and community safety, although most of these matters could possibly have been addressed by amendments to the plans. The scheme was also refused on grounds of there being no Section 106 Agreement in place.

2 Dumpton Place

- 3.9 On 5 November 2010 applications were made by CgMs Ltd on behalf of Sarena Ltd for conservation area consent and planning permission for the demolition of the remaining part of the vacant workshop premises at the above site (part demolished following implementation of applications (Refs: PEX0200634 and CEX0200635) and redevelopment for a mixed use scheme comprising a modern business unit (534m²) together with a terrace of four houses (two 2 x bedroom and two 3 x bedroom houses).
- 3.10 The applications were withdrawn following an email sent to CgMs on 20 January 2011 advising that officers had concerns with regard to certain issues and that the Council were minded to refuse planning permission. Mr Sheehy advised that officers were not in a position to accept revisions or further information. He invited the applicants to withdraw the application and to resubmit a revised proposal addressing the comments in the email.

2 Dumpton Place

- 3.11 In March 2011 revised applications were made by CgMs Ltd on behalf of by Sarena Ltd for conservation area consent and planning permission for the demolition of the remaining part of the vacant workshop premises and redevelopment for a mixed use scheme comprising modern business unit (610m²) together with two 3x bedroom and two 4 x bedroom houses for private sale and two 2 x bedroom flats as shared ownership affordable housing (Ref: 2011/1603P and 2011/1604/C).
- 3.12 The revised scheme prepared by PMA Chartered Architects addressed the Council's previous concerns by including on-site affordable housing provision providing a larger and more flexible Class B1 unit and addressing concerns relating to the impact on the amenities of adjoining properties in relation to outlook and light. The application was considered by the Planning Committee on 11 August 2011 with a unanimous decision to grant planning permission and conservation area consent. Members complimented the Architects on the high standard of design, the dwelling mix and good levels of sustainability.

Current Applications

- 3.13 The applications now being submitted relate to a revised mixed use development scheme for the site of 1 Dumpton Place. The proposals prepared by PMA Chartered Architects follow similar design principles to those used in respect of the recently approved scheme for No. 2 Dumpton Place.
- 3.14 The proposals would provide for replacement commercial premises designed to accommodate a range of Class B1 (a – c) uses with good servicing facilities, high ceilings and the staircase and lift to all floors located close to the entrance to allow subdivision of the premises if required. The proposed commercial unit has 4 floors and a basement and has a gross floor area of 839m².
- 3.15 To the rear of the commercial unit is a terrace of six residential units accessed via a walkway which runs along the rear (northern) boundary of the site. This would be a gated pedestrian route accessed from the northern end of Dumpton Place. It will include well-designed paving, and landscaping with a wall to the railway planted as a green wall and planted pergolas across the path to mark the entrances to each house.
- 3.16 The proposed dwellings comprise a range of four 2 x bedroom houses and two 3 bedroom houses. The two 3 bedroom houses (houses 5 & 6) have 3 floors and include basement playroom and storage area with gardens at the lower level. Two 2 x bedroom houses (houses 3 & 4) have two floors and include a basement playroom and storage area with garden at the lower level. The other two 2 x bedroom houses (houses 1 & 2) are of 2-storeys with no basement. The gardens of these houses are at ground floor level.
- 3.17 Residential car parking for 6 cars is provided at basement level accessed from a car lift off Dumpton Place. This area was a medium PTAL level of 3 (manually calculated by the Traffic Consultants, Russell Giles Partnership and agreed by Steve Cardno, Transport Planner. The Council's arrangement car parking policies allow for a maximum of 1 space per dwelling.

3.18 Secure cycle parking for the employment space is provided at the rear of the commercial unit. Seven spaces are shown on the proposed ground floor plan in accordance with the Council's cycle parking standards for Class B1 use. Residential cycle parking spaces will be accommodated within each house. A dedicated cycle store is shown in the basement of four of the houses. For the two houses without basements space will be provided in their rear gardens.

3.19 Refuse storage for the commercial unit is shown to the rear of the car lift at ground floor level. Separate refuse stores are shown at the front of each dwelling. Private refuse management arrangements will be made for refuse collection.

Section 106 Contributions and Requirements

3.20 The proposals include an offer by the applicants to provide an area of communal open space in front of the site on land which forms part of the public highway. The principles of this landscaping scheme have previously been discussed with the Council's Planning and Transport Divisions in association with the proposed development at No. 2 Dumpton Place. The proposed street improvement scheme will be implemented following the completion of both the schemes for Nos. 1 and 2 Dumpton Place.

3.21 The applicants are also willing to enter into an agreement to prevent future residents of the new dwellings being entitled to obtain residents parking permits.

3.22 In addition the applicants have agreed to prepare a Construction Management Plan to minimise any potential impact on or disturbance to the surrounding environment and highway network during the construction of the proposed development.

3.23 Finally, the applicants include with this application a Sustainability Plan and Renewable Energy Plan. Implementation of these could be by way of condition or as part of a Section 106 Agreement.

4.0 POLICY CONTEXT

4.1 Section 38(6) of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 requires applications to be determined in accordance with the development plan unless material considerations indicate otherwise.

4.2 At the time of writing this report the statutory development plan for this area comprised the London Plan adopted in July 2011, the Local Development Framework Camden Core Strategy and Development Policies, both adopted in November 2010 and the Land Use Proposals Section of the Camden Unitary Development Plan (UDP) adopted 2006. All other policies of the UDP have been superseded by the policies of the Core Strategy and LDF Development Policies. The Site Allocations Preferred Approach Document which also forms part of the new Local Development Framework was published in November 2009 and the Submission Draft is expected to be published soon. The policies of this emerging document are a material consideration but until adopted will not have the same weight as the UDP Land Use Proposals. We have examined the relevant policies of the above documents in our Appraisal.

4.3 In addition the Council have published Supplementary Planning Guidance Documents. The most relevant of these are:

- Camden Planning Guidance 2011 as follows:
 - CPG1: Design
 - CPG2: Housing
 - CPG3: Sustainability
 - CPG4: Basement and Lightwells
 - CPG5: Town Centres, retail and employment
 - CPG6: Amenity
 - CPG7: Transport
 - CPG8 Planning Obligations
- Primrose Hill Conservation Area Statement

- 4.4 National guidance relevant to the consideration of this application comprises the following Planning Policy Statements and Guidance Notes:

PPS1: Delivering Sustainable Development (2005) and the Supplementary Statement on Climate Change

PPS3: Housing (2011)

PPS4: Planning for Sustainable Economic Growth (2009)

PPS5: Planning for the Historic Environment (2010)

PPS9: Biodiversity and Geological Conservation (2005)

PPG17: Planning for Open Space, Sport and Recreation (2002)

PPS23: Planning and Pollution Control (2004)

PPG24: Planning and Noise (1994)

PPS22: Renewable Energy (2004)

- 4.5 We have not set out the detailed guidance in all of these documents but would point out that as a general principle there is now a strong emphasis on the need for sustainable development and high quality design. Housing is a priority use but mixed use development is encouraged in certain locations.

London Plan (2011)

- 4.6 The London Plan adopted in July 2011 provides the strategic guidance for the considerations of planning applications and also sets the policy framework for the emerging Local Development Framework.

4.7 The plan sets out the Mayor's Vision for the sustainable development of London over the period of the plan as follows:

- A city that meets the challenges of economic and population growth.
- An internationally competitive and successful city.
- A city of diverse, strong, secure and accessible neighbourhoods.
- A city that delights the senses.
- A city that becomes a world leader in improving the environment.
- A city where its easy, safe and convenient for everyone to access jobs, opportunities and facilities.

4.8 Strategic policies that are particularly relevant to this proposal are as follows:

Policy 1.1 Delivering the Strategic Vision and Objectives for London.

Policy 3.3 Increasing housing supply

Policy 3.4 Optimising housing potential

Policy 3.5 Quality and design of housing developments

Policy 3.6 Children and young people's play and informal recreation facilities

Policy 3.8 Housing choice

Policy 4.1 Developing London's Economy

Policy 4.2	Offices
Policy 4.3	Mixed use development and offices
Policy 5.1	Climate change mitigation
Policy 5.2	Minimising carbon dioxide emissions
Policy 5.3	Sustainable design and construction
Policy 5.7	Renewable energy
Policy 5.9	Overheating and cooling
Policy 5.10	Urban greening
Policy 5.11	Green roofs and development site environs
Policy 5.13	Sustainable drainage
Policy 5.14	Water quality and waste water infrastructure
Policy 5.15	Water use and supplies
Policy 6.1	Strategic approach to integrated transport and development
Policy 6.3	Assessing effects of development on transport capacity
Policy 6.9	Cycling
Policy 6.10	Walking

Policy 6.13	Parking
Policy 7.1	Building London's neighbourhoods and communities
Policy 7.2	An inclusive environment
Policy 7.3	Designing out crime
Policy 7.4	Local character
Policy 7.5	Public realm
Policy 7.6	Architecture
Policy 7.8	Heritage Assets and Archaeology
Policy 7.9	Heritage-led regeneration
Policy 7.15	Reducing noise and enhancing soundscapes
Policy 7.19	Biodiversity and access to nature
Policy 8.2	Planning obligations

Camden Unitary Development Plan (2006)

- 4.9 Apart from the Land Use Proposals Section of the UDP the policies of the Unitary Development Plan have now been superseded by the LDF Core Strategy and Development Policies.
- 4.10 Within the UDP the site is shown as being within Land Use Proposals Site No. 16. This states that the preferred use for land to the rear of 90-108 Gloucester Avenue and 1 Dumpton Place is "mixed use including residential and B1". It also refers to the planning permission granted in November 2004 for mixed (B1/C3) scheme (Ref: PEX0200634) subject to S106.

Camden Core Strategy (2010)

- 4.11 The Camden Core Strategy was adopted by the Council on 8 November 2010. The following policies are relevant to the consideration of the applications.
- 4.12 **Policy CS1 - Distribution of growth:** This policy states that the Council expects that in the order of 12,250 additional homes will be provided in Camden between 2010/11 and 2024/25. The Council will promote the most efficient use of land and buildings expecting high density development in Central London, town centres and other locations well served by public transport and expecting the provision of a mix of uses in suitable schemes, in particular in the most accessible parts of the borough, including an element of housing where possible. The main development opportunity sites are to be identified in the Site Allocation LDF Document. The Site Allocation Preferred Approach Document (still at consultation stage) identifies the site to the rear of Nos. 52-88 and Nos. 90-108 Gloucester Avenue as a site suitable for mixed use development.

Comment: The proposal accords with Policy CS1 in terms of providing additional housing and making efficient use of a vacant site.

- 4.13 **Policy CS6 - Providing quality homes:** This policy seeks to maximise the supply of additional housing over the entire plan period to meet or exceed a target of 8,925 homes from 2010 - 2025, including 6,550 additional self-

contained homes. Housing is regarded as the priority land use of Camden's Local Development Framework. The Council also aims to secure high quality affordable housing and to ensure that 50% of the borough-wide target for additional self-contained homes is provided as affordable housing. The Council will seek to negotiate a contribution from specific proposals on the basis of the maximum reasonable amount of affordable housing under the specific circumstances of the site, including the financial viability of the development. The policy also seeks a range of self-contained homes of different sizes to meet the Council's identified dwelling size priorities.

- 4.14 The Camden Development Policies give more guidance on how the affordable target will be achieved with a sliding scale of 10% to 50% for housing developments of 10 to 50 units (Policy DP3).

Comment: The proposal is to provide four x 2 bedroom and two x 3 bedroom high quality houses in accordance with this policy.

- 4.15 **Policy CS8 - Promoting a successful and inclusive Camden economy:** This policy seeks to safeguard existing employment sites and premises in the borough that meet the needs of modern industry and other employers and to expect a mix of employment facilities and types, including the provision of facilities suitable for small and medium sized enterprises such as managed affordable workspaces.

- 4.16 **Comment:** The existing Class B2 car repair service centre and workshop is of poor quality and unsuitable for flexible employment purposes. The premises were used for Class B2 which are unsuitable for residential areas and the previous use caused significant noise and disturbance as well as a large number of traffic movements and parking congestion. The proposal provides a modern flexible business unit suitable for a wide range of Class B1 (a – c) uses in accordance with this policy. The Employment Report prepared by Pater Goodman Merriman provides further information regarding the existing premises and advantages in terms of the provision of modern business space as part of the proposed scheme. The proposed development would be suitable for up to seven small or one or two medium sized enterprises as required in the policy. Revisions have been made to the scheme to make the proposed commercial unit

particularly suitable for subdivision and/or light industrial purposes. This includes a dedicated loading bay adjacent to the premises, wide double doors suitable for servicing, high ground to ceiling floor heights, a lift between all levels and a stairway, lift and refuse store close to the main entrance.

- 4.17 **Policy CS13 - Tackling climate change through promoting higher environmental standards:** This policy requires all development to take measures to minimise the effects of, and adapt to, climate changes and to encourage all developments to meet the highest feasible environmental standards that are financially viable during construction and occupation. This includes the need to minimise the need to travel by car, promote the efficient use of land and buildings, minimise carbon emissions by ensuring developments use less energy making use of energy from efficient sources and generating renewable energy on site. The policy encourages the use of CHP to reduce carbon emissions and requires all developments to achieve a reduction in carbon dioxide emissions of 20% from on-site renewable energy generation.

Comment: An Energy Statement prepared by AJ Energy is included with the application. This states that the combination of heat pumps and photovoltaic panels proposed would reduce the annual carbon dioxide emissions of the whole scheme by 16,243kg CO₂ which equates to a reduction of 24.7%. The resultant carbon dioxide emissions, following the implementation of the measures proposed are 42.1% lower than Part L 2010 compliance, thereby exceeding the 25% improvement required under the London Plan 2011 and the Code Level 3 energy target under the Code for Sustainable Homes assessment.

- 4.18 **Policy CS14 - Promoting high quality places and conserving our heritage:** This policy refers to the need for the highest standard of design that respects local context and character and preserves and enhances Camden's rich and diverse heritage assets and their settings. High quality landscaping and works to streets and public spaces is also required. Access to buildings and places should be inclusive and accessible. Reference is made to the Council's Conservation Area Statements.

Comment: The scheme has been designed to a high quality respecting its local context and location within the Primrose Hill Conservation Area. The Architect's

Design and Access Statement and CgMs Heritage Statement refer to the design approach. In addition Colvin and Moggridge, Landscape Consultants have been appointed to carry out a high quality landscaping scheme. Access to the site will be inclusive and accessible.

- 4.19 **Policy CS15 - Protecting and improving our parks and open spaces and encouraging biodiversity:** This policy also refers to the possibilities of providing new areas of open sites for nature conservation and biodiversity.

Comment: The scheme includes private gardens and green roofs in accordance with this policy.

Camden's Development Policies

- 4.20 We examine below the relevant policies of the Camden Development Policies which form part of the Local Development Framework. These were adopted on 8 November 2010.

- 4.21 **Policy DP5 - Homes of different sizes:** The Council expect a mix of large and small homes in all residential developments depending on consideration of site size and any other site constraints and the economic and financial viability of the site including the demand for homes of different sizes.

Comment: The scheme has been designed to provide a mix of four 2 x bedroom and two 3 x bedroom houses to meet the requirements of this policy and the demand for houses of this size.

- 4.22 **Policy DP6 - Lifetime homes and wheelchair homes:** This policy requires all housing development to meet Lifetime Homes standards with 10% to meet wheelchair housing standards or be easily adopted to meet them.

Comment: The proposed dwellings do meet Lifetime Homes standard and are all capable of being adapted to meet wheelchair standards if required.

- 4.23 **Policy DP13 - Employment premises and sites:** This policy states that the Council will retain land and buildings that are suitable for continued business use and will resist a change to non-business unless it can be demonstrated that the site is no longer suitable for its existing business use; and there is evidence that the possibility of reusing or redeveloping the site for alternative business use is not viable.

Comment: The existing former (Class B2) car repair workshop building on site is of poor quality and unsuitable for continued employment use. The development proposes a modern business unit capable of flexible use including flexible space, adequate floor to ceiling heights, a dedicated loading bay outside the premises, wide doors to ground floor and a lift to all floors. The siting in Dumpton Place allows adequate space for servicing and visitor parking. An Employment Report prepared by Pater Goodman Merriman examines the problems relating to the existing commercial premises and reasons why the proposed scheme would provide employment premises which are more suitable in terms of existing demand, will offer more employment opportunities and will provide a use which unlike the previous Class B2 use does not cause nuisance to adjoining residential properties.

- 4.24 **Policy DP21 - Provision of, and Improvements to, Open Space and Outdoor Sport and Recreation Facilities:** This policy states that the Council will only grant planning permission for development that is likely to lead to an increased use of public open space where an appropriate contribution to the supply of open space is made.

Comment: A meeting to discuss a scheme for the improvement of Dumpton Place took place on 4 August 2011 with John Sheehy, Planning and Tim Long, Street Improvement Officer. Agreement to pay the costs of these improvements is part of the Section 106 Agreement in relation to the approved scheme for No. 2 Dumpton Place.

Policy DP22 - Promoting Sustainable Design and Construction: This policy requires development to incorporate sustainable design and construction measures and to incorporate green or brown roofs and green walls wherever suitable. The Council expect new build housing to meet Code for Sustainable

Homes Level 3 by 2010 and for non-domestic development of 500m² to achieve a "very good" in BREEAM assessment. The Council also require development to be resistant to climate change by ensuring schemes include appropriate climate change adoption measures.

Comment: A Preliminary Code for Sustainable Homes Report has been prepared by AJ Energy demonstrating that the proposed development will achieve Code Level 3. A BREEAM Assessment has also been prepared for the commercial premises and this shows that the scheme will achieve a "very good" rating in accordance with Policy DP22.

- 4.25 **Policy DP23 - Water:** This policy requires developments to reduce their water consumption to include incorporating water efficient features and equipment and capturing, retaining and re-using surface water and grey water on site.

Comment: The scheme has been designed to meet these requirements.

- 4.26 **Policy DP24 - Securing High Quality Design:** This policy requires all developments to be of the highest standard of design and will expect developments to consider:

- a) character, setting, context and the form and scale of neighbouring buildings;
- b) the character and proportions of the existing building, where alterations and extensions are proposed;
- c) the quality of materials to be used;
- d) the provision of visually interesting frontages at street level;
- e) the appropriate location for building services equipment;
- f) existing natural features, such as topography and trees;

- g) the provision of appropriate hard and soft landscaping including boundary treatments;
- h) the provision of appropriate amenity space; and
- i) accessibility.

Comment: The proposed development is of the highest standard and takes account of the requirements set out in this policy. A Design and Access Statement is included with this application.

- 4.27 **Policy DP25 - Conserving Camden's Heritage:** This policy seeks to maintain the character of Camden's conservation areas and states that only development that preserves and enhances the character and appearance of the area will be allowed.

Comment: The proposal involves the demolition of a building which is in poor condition and has a negative impact on the conservation area. The proposed development has been designed to a high standard and to fit in with the conservation area and will enhance the appearance and character of the area. A Heritage Statement prepared by CgMs Heritage is included with this application.

- 4.28 **Policy DP26 - Managing the Impact of Development on Occupiers and Neighbours:** This policy seeks to protect the quality of life of occupiers and neighbours by only granting permission for development that does not cause harm to amenity. The factors to be considered include:

- a) visual privacy and overlooking;
- b) overshadowing and outlook;
- c) sunlight, daylight and artificial light levels;
- d) noise and vibration levels;

- e) odour, fumes and dust;
- f) microclimate;
- g) the inclusion of appropriate attenuation measures.

4.29 The Council also require developments to provide:

- h) an acceptable standard of accommodation in terms of internal arrangements, dwelling and room sizes and amenity space;
- i) facilities for the storage and recycling and disposal of waste;
- j) facilities for bicycle storage; and
- k) outdoor space for private or communal amenity space, wherever practical.

Comment: The scheme has been designed taking all the above facilities into account with careful attention given to protect the privacy, outlook, sunlight and daylight, and avoidance of light spillage to residents of the adjoining terraced properties at Nos. 90-108 Gloucester Avenue.

4.30 A Sunlight/Daylight report has been prepared by Rights of Light Consulting to demonstrate that occupiers of the new dwellings will not suffer undue levels of noise and vibration and the microclimate of the site will be improved with the loss of the former B2 use and introduction of a mixed B1/C3 development to include areas of green space, green walls and green roofs.

4.31 The new dwellings have been designed to meet the Council's Planning Guidance SPD and Lifetime Homes Standard. Facilities are provided for the storage, recycling and disposal of waste, bicycle storage and outdoor amenity space.

- 4.32 **Policy DP27 - Basements and Lightwells:** This policy requires proposals for basements to include an assessment of the scheme impact on drainage, flooding, groundwater conditions and structural stability where appropriate. The Council will only permit basements and other underground development that does not cause harm to the built and natural environment.

Comment: A Basement Impact Assessment has been prepared by Knapp Hicks & Partners Ltd and is submitted with this application. This addresses the matters raised in this policy.

- 4.33 **Policy DP28 - Noise and Vibration:** This policy seeks to ensure that noise and vibration is controlled and managed and states that development sensitive to noise in locations with noise pollution will not be permitted unless appropriate attenuation measures are provided.

Comment: A Noise Report prepared by WSP is enclosed with this application.

- 4.34 **Policy DP29 - Improving Access:** This policy seeks to promote fair access and remove the barriers that prevent people from accessing facilities and opportunities.

Comment: The proposed development has been designed to address this policy with the commercial unit being designed to accommodate wheelchair access and the dwellings designed to Lifetime Homes Standard and readily adaptable to wheelchair use.

Camden Site Allocations - Preferred Approach (November 2009 - January 2010)

- 4.35 The site rear of Nos. 52 - 88 and Nos. 90 - 108 Gloucester Avenue is designated as a site for mixed use redevelopment in the Camden Site Allocations - Preferred Approach Document (Site 41). Although this document has not yet been submitted to the Secretary of State this document is relevant material in the consideration of the application. This site is shown as two separate Land Use Proposal Sites (Nos. 15 and 16) in the Unitary Development Plan (UDP).

4.36 The Site Allocations Document describes the planning history of the combined site with reference made to the November 2004 and March 2009 planning permissions.

4.37 The policy document states that the site was reviewed in the Camden Employment Land Review (June 2008) and identified as a site which should be protected for employment (paragraph 6.78). The document states as follows:

"Given the limited number of larger employment sites over 1000m² in the borough, replacement employment floorspace should constitute the principle use as part of a mixed use redevelopment scheme, in line with Policy DP13.

The Employment Land Review indicates that there is potential for new office development at Camden Town. This site may therefore provide a suitable location for small office or studio units near Camden Town Centre without detracting from the special character of the centre. B1(b) and (c) would also be appropriate as part of a range of uses on site.

Residential uses are a priority land use in the borough and housing should form part of or mix of uses in any redevelopment scheme. Previous successful schemes on the site have demonstrated through a noise assessment that the site is a suitable location for residential uses."

4.38 The suggested approach for this site as set out in the document is as follows:

"A mixed use development incorporating replacement employment floorspace and residential uses.

Development will be expected to:

- Provide B1 (or appropriate B2) floorspace as a key element of a mixed use scheme*
- Accommodate residential uses, including affordable housing if triggered, subject to a PPG24 noise assessment*
- Be designed to a high standard that preserves or enhances the character of Primrose Hill Conservation Area*
- Safeguard the amenities of nearby residential occupiers."*

4.39 The main considerations for this site are as follows:

"Mixed use redevelopment will be expected to incorporate replacement employment uses (Policy CS8) and new residential use (Policy CS6) designed in a manner to preserve and enhance the character of the Primrose Hill Conservation Area (Policy CS14)."

Comment: The proposal accords with this document in terms of providing a mixed use Class B1/C3 redevelopment. The proposed business unit would be suitable for a range of Class B1 uses and a Noise Assessment has been carried out to demonstrate that the proposed residential would provide acceptable living conditions. The Employment Report prepared by Pater Johnson Merriman shows that the existing workshop is not suitable for re-use and that the new business unit would be more appropriate in this location and provide higher levels of employment.

Primrose Hill Conservation Area Statement

4.40 The Council have prepared a Conservation Area Statement for Primrose Hill. The proposal site falls within Sub Area Two Central Area. The Statement describes the area and lists those properties which are listed or considered to make a positive contribution to the area. The Gloucester Avenue terraced properties are shown as making a positive contribution and No. 1 Dumpton Place is considered to detract from the character and appearance of the area.

Comment: Demolition of the existing building was approved as part of the previous planning permission. The building is now vacant and could be demolished as part of the previous consent. We have, however, applied for separate Conservation Area Consent as part of this proposal.

The proposed scheme has been designed to fit in with the character of the conservation area and proposes a high quality mixed use development which will enhance the appearance and character of the site. A Heritage Statement prepared by CgMs Heritage is submitted with this application.

5.0 PLANNING APPRAISAL

Principle of Mixed-Use Development

- 5.1 The application proposing demolition of the existing Class B2 former car repair workshop building and replacement by a mix of Class B1 and C3 is consistent with the Council's adopted and emerging policies. The Land Use Proposals section of the adopted Unitary Development Plan shows the site of No. 1 Dumpton Place and land to the rear of Nos. 90-108 Gloucester Avenue is allocated for mixed use (Class B1 and C3) and makes reference to the 2004 approved scheme for the site. Although most of the development plan policies of the UDP have now been replaced by policies set out in the Core Strategy and Development Policies which were adopted in November 2011, Section 11 of the Unitary Development Plan setting out the Schedule of Land Use Proposal still remains as a saved section of the UDP until replaced by the Local Development Framework Site Allocations. The Site Allocations Preferred Approach Document which forms part of the Local Development Framework also shows this site for mixed use development. Whilst the proposals of this document are not yet adopted they are a material consideration. The proposed scheme is consistent with the proposals of the adopted and emerging site allocation policies and with the advice given to the applicants during pre-application discussions with the Council's officers.
- 5.2 As part of the Council's pre-application advice attention was drawn to the requirements of Core Strategy Policy CS8 which seeks to safeguard existing employment sites that meet the needs of modern industry and other employers and to expect a mix of employment facilities suitable for small and medium sized enterprises. Development Plan Policy DP13 also seeks to retain land and buildings that are suitable for continued business use unless it can be demonstrated that the site is no longer suitable for its existing business use and there is evidence that the possibility of reusing or redeveloping the site for alternative business use is not viable.
- 5.3 The applicants have sought advice from Pater Johnson Merriman on the potential for reuse of the existing workshop building.

- 5.4 The advice given by Pater Johnson Merriman is set out in the Employment Report submitted with this application.
- 5.5 Hedley Merriman author of this report has advised that the existing workshop building is not suitable for continued occupation due to its poor condition. He states in the report that there is little demand for commercial units of this type and size in this area and that the main demand is for modern small to medium sized modern business units particularly in the size range of 100m² to 230m². The proposed business use which is 839m² could be used for up to seven small units of this size or as a single or two or three medium sized units in accordance with Policies CS8 and DP13. The proposed unit is designed with maximum flexibility in terms of being suitable for a light industrial use or the premises could be used for research, studio or office use. The proposed scheme would offer more employment opportunities than the existing workshop. We have been advised that the workshop previously provided employment for 6 office staff and 2 technicians. The loss of this workshop has not therefore resulted in any significant loss of employment. In contrast the new building could provide employment for 40 - 50 people.
- 5.6 The site is considered by the Council to be suitable for a mix of Class B1/C3 development having been identified as an opportunity site in the adopted UDP and emerging LDF Site Allocations Preferred Approach. The proposal seeks to provide a mixed use development in accordance with the Council's preferred uses for this site.
- 5.7 The scheme is also consistent with Core Strategy Policy CS1 which seeks to promote the most efficient use of land with a mix of uses in suitable locations. The site is allocated for mixed Class B1/C3 uses in the Site Allocations Preferred Approach Document.

Housing Quality/Mix

- 5.8 The scheme includes the provision of six high quality residential units comprising a mix of four 2 x bedroom and two 3 x bedroom houses in accordance with Core Strategy Policy CS6 and Development Plan Policy DP5.

- 5.9 All rooms meet the Council's internal space standards and have been designed to provide good levels of light, be energy efficient and have adequate private amenity space provision. The scheme is of high design quality including a high quality landscaping scheme.
- 5.10 The housing mix accords with the recommendations set out in the text of Policy DP5 in accordance with the particular demand for two and three bedroom dwellings.

Lifetime Homes/Wheelchair Housing

- 5.11 The proposed dwellings are designed to Lifetime Homes standards with all dwellings being readily convertible to wheelchair standards if required.

Sustainability

- 5.12 The scheme has been designed to be highly sustainable in terms of sustainable construction and design, energy efficiency, use of renewable energy and taking opportunities to provide for a scheme which provides for future biodiversity in accordance with Core Strategy Policy CS13 and Development Policies DP22.
- 5.13 A Sustainability Statement is included with the application. This also includes a Code for Sustainable Homes Assessment with the proposed homes able to reach Code Level 3 standard and the commercial unit reach a BREEAM "very good" rating.
- 5.14 An Energy Report has also been prepared by AJ Energy. AJ Energy have recommended the use of roof mounted photo voltaic panels for the residential dwellings and commercial building together with air source heat pumps for the residential properties. This would give a total carbon dioxide reduction of 24.7% across the site. This demonstrates that the scheme does accord with the Mayor's Energy Strategy and the Council's Development Plan Policies. The scheme has also been designed for water run off attenuation in accordance with Policy DP23.

Amenity for Occupiers and Neighbours

- 5.15 The scheme has been carefully designed to provide good levels of amenity for the future occupiers of the residential properties and to protect the amenity of residents of the adjoining residential properties in accordance with Policy DP26.
- 5.16 A Sunlight/Daylight Report by Rights of Light Consulting is included with this application. This shows that good levels of natural lighting to the new buildings will be achieved and that there will be no harm to the daylight to existing properties. The proposed development lies north of the properties in Gloucester Avenue so there will be no loss of sunlight to the properties or the gardens.
- 5.17 There will be no problems of loss of privacy or overlooking. The scheme retains the existing 4.85m high rear boundary wall of the Gloucester Avenue and this forms the rear wall of the new development. The proposed buildings are stepped back behind this wall to avoid any harm to the outlook from these properties.
- 5.18 There are no new habitable room windows facing directly towards properties in Gloucester Avenue. The area of glazing to the rear second floor landing areas are of opaque panels to retain privacy and avoid any light pollution.
- 5.19 A Noise and Vibration Assessment has been prepared by WSP with mitigation measures against potential noise nuisance to protect future residents incorporated into the scheme.

Conservation and Urban Design

- 5.20 The scheme has been designed to a very high quality respecting its local context within the Primrose Hill Conservation Area.

- 5.21 The existing car repair workshop building is of very poor quality in terms of design and construction. This building currently has a negative impact on the conservation area as recognised in the Council's Conservation Area Statement. Its previous use as a car repair and service centre is also a use which is not compatible with the primarily residential character of the conservation area resulting in problems of noise and disturbance to the adjoining residents.
- 5.22 The proposed development in contrast will provide a positive enhancement to the character and appearance of the conservation area with the scale, layout and design of the buildings carefully considered to respect the character, setting, context and the form and scale of the neighbouring mid-Victorian terraced properties.
- 5.23 Materials have also been carefully chosen to match those of the surrounding properties with the use of yellow stock brick and white stucco render for the commercial unit fronting Dumpton Place and coloured render, brick and glazed elevations for the new houses which border onto the railway. These new houses will not be viewed directly in relation to the Gloucester Avenue houses apart from long distance and oblique views of the rear of these properties. This new terrace, does, however respect the traditional layout of properties in the area and has regard to the layout and design of the proposed terrace of houses at No.2 Dumpton Place.
- 5.24 Further details of the design approach and the relationship of the scheme to the conservation area are set out in the Architect's Design and Access Statement and the Heritage Statement prepared by CgMs Heritage.

Community Safety

- 5.25 The scheme has been designed to avoid opportunity for crime and to create a safe and secure environment. The Architects sought advice from the Metropolitan Police Crime Prevention Design Advisor at Camden Borough Police Headquarters at Holborn at an early stage in the design process and the notes of this meeting and design considerations that have been taken into account in ensuring safety for future residents and their visitors is set out in the Design and Access Statement.

Transport/Public Realm

- 5.26 The proposal includes 6 car parking spaces for the residential development in accordance with the Council's parking policies. The applicants have agreed to enter into a Section 106 Agreement to prevent future occupiers being able to obtain car parking permits so that the proposed development does not result in further parking stress in this area. A Transport Assessment prepared by the Russell Giles Partnership is included with this application.
- 5.27 The applicants have agreed as part of the approved scheme for No. 2 Dumpton Place to paying a contribution to improve the use and appearance of Dumpton Place in front of the premises. A draft scheme has been discussed with Tim Long, Street Improvement Officer and payment for the cost of these works agreed as part of a Section 106 Agreement for No. 2 Dumpton Place. It is proposed to implement this development following the completion of both developments.
- 5.28 Separate refuse and recycling storage facilities are provided for the residential and commercial uses. The refuse store for the commercial uses is located within the building close to the entrance. The arrangements for servicing are explained in the Design and Access Statement and the Transport Assessment.
- 5.29 A cycle store for the employment uses has been provided to the rear of the proposed commercial unit. Separate cycle stores are also provided for each house.

6.0 CONCLUSIONS

- 6.1 The proposed mixed use redevelopment scheme accords with the Council's policies which seek to promote a successful economy whilst providing opportunities for new housing and accommodation suitable for small to medium sized business entrepreneurs as part of mixed use redevelopment schemes.
- 6.2 The site is identified as an opportunity for a new Class B1/C3 development in the adopted UDP and the emerging LDF Site Allocations Preferred Approach.
- 6.3 The scheme has been designed to take account of the Council's policies for high quality sustainable development respecting its site context and the amenities for the existing and future occupants.
- 6.4 The proposal provides for six car parking spaces for the residential element but the applicants are willing to enter into an Agreement to prevent the owners and occupiers of the new dwellings from being able to purchase car permits. A Section 106 Agreement will also provide for improvements to the public realm and contributions to infrastructure including education.
- 6.5 The site is within the Primrose Hill Conservation Area and has been carefully designed to respect the character and appearance of the site and surrounding area and to enhance its heritage assets.

Appendix 1

Meeting Notes with Adrian Malcolm, Case Officer and
other officers

NOTE OF MEETING

Re: 1 Dumpton Place Pre-Application Meeting

Job No: 12993

Date: 29 September 2011

Venue: Camden Council Offices

Attendance:

Adrian Malcolm	-	Planning Case Office, Camden Council
Rob Farnsworth	-	Policy Officer, Camden Council
Katherine Bond	-	Conservation /Design Officer, Camden Council
Tim Lang	-	Highways Officer, Camden Council
Nainesh Patel	-	PM Architects
Baljit Panesar	-	PM Architects
Kevin Markey	-	Russell Giles Partnership
Valerie Scott	-	CgMs Ltd

The meeting was arranged to discuss the pre-application planning submission.

Adrian Malcolm introduced himself as the case officer for this proposed development and advised that there were a number of issues to discuss as follows: employment (size and type), residential (mix, size and tenure), principle of basement, design, daylight, car parking and transport, sustainability and crime prevention.

Valerie Scott referred to the recent permission for 2 Dumpton Place and advised that following the success of this scheme the Architects had been asked to improve on the design of mix of uses at No. 1 Dumpton Place and had produced a scheme of similar type. She said that she had been encouraged by the support of officers and Members of the Council who had liked the principle of providing more housing, including affordable housing, had liked the design and the improvement in terms of sustainability.

Nainesh Patel said that the development had been due to start on site at the end of July 2011 but the owner had been persuaded to put this on hold to enable an alternative scheme to be considered.

Employment

Rob Farnsworth said that a major concern of the Council in respect of the new scheme would be the loss of employment floorspace having regard to the fact that the original 2004 permission for the combined site showed the majority of employment space on this site. He said that the 2009 permission allowed for a reduction in the employment floorspace from the original 2,000m² to 883m². However, the pre-submission scheme reduced this to about 200m². The recent permission for 2 Dumpton Place had also resulted in a reduction to the employment floorspace being provided on the combined site.

Adrian Malcolm said that there would need to be justification provided for this significant reduction with reference to marketing and demand for this size of unit but pointed out that recent studies in respect of the Council's LDF showed that there was demand for commercial floorspace in this area. Any floorspace provided would also need to be suitable for a range of Class B1 uses including Class B1(c) – light industry in particular. The scheme as shown did not appear suitable for this use.

Nainesh Patel advised that the premises had previously been used by Volvo as a car maintenance workshop. The building had been specially designed for this purpose and included a lift to a car parking area on the roof. He said that there had been difficulties in letting the existing building since it became vacant and that the advice given by the agents was that the proposed development would also be difficult to let. The scheme proposed was for a smaller Class B1 unit for which there would be greater demand.

Valerie Scott said that she understood that Pater Goodman Merriman had been involved in the marketing of the building and would be able to advise on the demand for business units in this area. She understood the Council's concern in respect of the employment policy but pointed out that the reduction in employment floorspace would allow for the provision of more housing and this could include an element of affordable housing not previously proposed. She also pointed out that the approved scheme was a Class B1 office scheme and did not provide for flexibility of use. The revised scheme would take on board this requirement.

Adrian Malcolm said that the revised scheme did have the benefit of including affordable housing and that without this benefit the Council would not allow any reduction in employment floorspace. However, the balance needed to be right and any loss of employment floorspace would need to be justified.

Residential

Adrian Malcolm said that although the mix of 6 x 4 bedroom and 3 x 2 bedroom appeared to be a suitable mix of small and family houses, if the smaller units were for affordable use this would result in only large units being available for private sale. He said that he would like to see a better mix for the private units.

Robert Farnsworth said that the residential context of the scheme in terms of floorspace triggered a requirement for affordable housing. The policy was based on a capacity of 100m² gross external per house which would require 17% of the space to be affordable based on the current scheme.

Valerie Scott said that the 3 2xbed units currently shown were for affordable housing. These were likely to be shared ownership units. The RSL used for the 2 Dumpton Place site had not wanted to provide social rented houses on such a small site.

Robert Farnsworth advised that social rented housing was the Council's preferred option but the requirement would be for larger units (3 or 4 bedroom units) for this type of tenure. He agreed that only 1 or 2-bed units were likely to be more appropriate for shared ownership housing. Adrian Malcolm recommended that discussions be held with Mike Cox, the Council's Housing Manager.

Nainesh Patel said that larger units would require more amenity space that could be difficult to provide on such a narrow site.

Adrian Malcolm said that the Council were reasonably flexible on amenity space provision having regard to the problems of providing this within the urban area. This would not be a reason for restricting the size of units.

Basements

Adrian Malcolm said that Members had particular concern about the provision of basements as part of new developments. The site had experienced flooding in the past and it would be necessary to demonstrate that the scheme would not have a harmful impact on local hydrology. The structural issues relating to basements also needed to be considered. He noted that the proposed basement extended to the site boundary which was also a concern.

Nainesh Patel said that the scheme for No. 2 Dumpton Place included a full basement and he was confident that Knapp & Hicks would be able to prepare a report to justify the basement now proposed.

Adrian Malcolm referred to the Council's SPG on basements and advised that the report should cover all the matters referred to in the SPG as it would be closely scrutinised. This was a major concern of Members and they would need to be satisfied that the basement caused no harm.

Design

Katherine Bond said that she had not been able to consider issues relating to overlooking of the neighbouring properties but pointed out that this would need to be addressed in the detailed design. She asked if the colour shown for the elevations were figurative or the intended colours and asked if this was intended for both the front and rear elevations.

Nainesh Patel said that the coloured render was figurative and was intended to be used for the front elevations only. He said that the introduction of colour had been welcomed by the Design Officer in respect of the scheme for No. 2 Dumpton Place but was not essential. The rear elevation would be of white render.

Katherine Bond said that consideration would need to be given to the setting of the new building in relation to the older properties in the conservation area as well as considering the views from the northern side of the railway.

Nainesh Patel said that the proposed development would have no effect on views from the other side of the railway due to the distance apart.

Katherine Bond questioned whether the proposed scheme was higher than that approved. Nainesh Patel produced some sections of the existing, approved and proposed schemes to demonstrate that the height of the proposed development was no greater than that approved.

Adrian Malcolm asked whether a section had been done through the part of the scheme where housing was now replacing the approved commercial building.

Nainesh Patel said that he did not have this section but agreed to provide this.

Adrian Malcolm said that any change to the height of the development and outlook from neighbouring properties would be critical.

Nainesh Patel advised that there was no intention to raise the height from that which was approved.

In terms of architectural treatment Katherine Bond was concerned that the scheme as shown had the appearance of a series of blocks of flats. She was particularly concerned about the tall glazed elements and suggested that the elevation be broken down to provide a more domestic and subservient appearance having regard to the location of the site which required a mews development. She was particularly concerned about the height and scale of development.

She then compared the scheme to the approved scheme for No. 2 Dumpton Place. She said that if something similar in terms of height, massing and design could be achieved at No. 1 Dumpton Place this would overcome her concerns.

Katherine Bond was also initially concerned about the appearance of the front elevation onto Dumpton Place. She felt that the proposed elevational treatment did not fit in well with the conservation area. Nainesh Patel said that the scheme proposed mirrored that approved for

No. 1 Dumpton Place and officers had asked in particular for the elevations to be of stock brick and white render to match the materials of the existing buildings. He did not therefore want to change the details. Katherine Bond said that she had not realised that the colour shown on the plan indicated the use of brickwork and said that having had this now explained she had no objection to the proposed elevational treatment. She said, however, that she would prefer to see modern steel windows rather than the powder coated aluminium shown for No. 2 Dumpton Place.

Daylight/Outlook

Adrian Malcolm said that the gardens to the rear of the site were very short 5m to 8m and that any loss of daylight or outlook would be critical. It was therefore necessary to carefully consider the approved and the proposed schemes.

Nainesh Patel said that the scheme would be compliant with BRE standards and would not impact further on outlook than the approved scheme. A Sunlight/Daylighting Report would be sent to the Council within the next few days.

Sustainability

Adrian Malcolm said that the scheme would need to meet the relevant Code for Sustainable Homes Level and BREEAM standards and meet the Council's energy requirements.

He said that green roofs would be encouraged and that the Architects should contact the Council's Nature Conservation Officer (name to be supplied).

Crime Prevention

The Architects should discuss the scheme with Alex Lindsay, Crime Prevention Officer.

Accessibility/Needs of Disabled Persons

Karen Ross should be consulted on issues relating to accessibility.

Transport

Tim Long said that the Council would prefer to see a car free scheme and that this was now the Council's default position.

Kevin Markey referred to the Transport Statement and pointed out that the Council's adopted car parking policies did allow a maximum of 1 space per dwelling for areas outside low provision areas. The Transport for London Planning Information Database showed this site to have a PTAL of 1a but they had not taken account of the bridge link over the railway. RGP's own manual assessment resulted in a PTAL of 3, indicating a medium level of accessibility. This medium level of accessibility combined with the maximum level of 1 parking space per dwelling allowed under the Council's parking standards supports the proposals for an average of 0.66 spaces per dwelling and should therefore be acceptable.

Kevin Markey also referred to the levels of traffic movement associated with the previous use and pointed out that the levels of traffic generated by the proposals would be much reduced.

Tim Long said that he had not had a chance to read the Transport Statement prepared by RGP and also advised that in terms of policy this would be a matter for other officers in his department. He would look at the policy issue further but he did emphasise that a car free scheme would be preferred.

The discussion then moved on to issues relating to turning space and servicing of the development as well as servicing the public house. It was agreed that the details of the car parking servicing and landscaping for the area in front of the site should be considered together with the proposals for No. 2 Dumpton Place and the works carried out once both schemes had been completed.

Kevin Markey confirmed that cycle storage was in line with the Council's standards.

Kevin Markey also referred to the car lift. He said that he could not find any Council guidance on this but understood that it had been accepted in other parts of the borough.

Adrian Malcolm confirmed that a car lift had been considered acceptable for other schemes. The main issue would be in terms of ensuring that there was adequate space to work if another car was using the lift.

Kevin Markey said that a traffic light system would be used that there was space to wait on the road and that the number of vehicles using the lift would be low with little chance of there being any conflict.

Timetable

Nainesh Patel said that he would like to have further pre-application discussions with officers prior to submission to ensure that the scheme was acceptable and would be supported. He would, however, like to be able to submit the application by mid-November.

Adrian Malcolm will prepare a pre-application submission report summarising the issues raised at the meeting.

NOTE OF MEETING

Re: 1 Dumpton Place Pre-Application Meeting

Job No: 12993

Date: 14 December 2011

Venue: Camden Council Offices

Attendance: Adrian Malcolm - Planning Case Office, Camden Council
Steve Cardno - Transport Officer, Camden Council
Nainesh Patel - PM Architects
Baljit Panesar - PM Architects
Valerie Scott - CgMs Ltd

This was the second pre-application meeting with Camden Council to discuss revisions to the scheme seeking to address the Council's concerns revised at the first pre-application meeting.

Mixed Uses

AM said that the balance of the uses was now much better with the Class B1 unit having been increased in size with a consequent reduction in the proposed number of dwellings – now six. AM said that having regard to the size of the residential element affordable housing would no longer be required. However he wished to ensure that the proposed Class B1 unit offered flexible space for the full range of Class B1 units and would be capable of sub-division if necessary.

AM said that the Council had a report which showed a particular need for light industrial uses in this area. He said that the scheme needed to be improved to provide more suitable accommodation for a possible light industrial use. This should include an on-site service bay and a more generously sized entrance and high floor to ceiling heights. He also suggested bringing the staircase forward closer to the entrance to allow different uses on each floor.

AM said that the existing building offered good space for industrial/warehouse use and although the Council encouraged better quality accommodation it did need to be flexible in terms of use. He referred to the Camden Planning Guidance (CPG) on design of light industrial uses and said that this should be followed as far as possible.

NP disagreed and said that the existing building on site offered very poor accommodation. It had been built for the purpose of car servicing and was not suitable for a range of other uses. VS agreed and suggested that AM may wish to visit the site to see the inside of the existing building.

NP said that he could amend the existing scheme to include the necessary design changes including moving the staircase but was concerned about providing an on site service bay which would eat into the available floorspace and in his opinion was wholly unnecessary. He saw no reason why a service vehicle the size of a transit van could not park outside the premises. There was space to do a three point turn in this area and as it was in a cul-de-sac, a service vehicle would not cause an interruption with other traffic.

SC considered that on-street servicing would be acceptable from a highways point of view but AM said that he would prefer to see space provided on site.

AM referred to the details of the scheme for 2 Dumpton Place which did include a service bay.

Basement Car Parking

AM said that the Council would prefer to see no car parking on site and said that the space could be used to increase the B1 space with ancillary uses such as storage. This would also give more frontage and ground floor B1 space if the car lift was removed.

VS said that the client did want to provide car parking for the residential development and this did have a significant affect on residential values. She said that it was her understanding that the Council's policy allowed a maximum of one car per dwelling.

SC said that the Council's policy was to encourage car free developments with no more than 0.5 spaces per dwelling in areas of low parking provisions where parking stress is high. Elsewhere the max. standard was 1 space per dwelling but the Council would normally seek 0.5 spaces per dwelling.

AM thought that the PTAL was quite high in this area but VS said that she thought that the TfL PTAL was only 2. The normal PTAL provided by RGP had brought this up to 3 but this was still not high. On this basis the Council's car parking would allow 1 space per dwelling.

AM said that the 9 spaces proposed (6 for residential and 3 for B1) was too high. He said that if car parking was provided it should be restricted to 3 spaces. He did, however, advise that any car parking would make the scheme needlessly controversial.

NP said that Russell Giles Partnership, Transport Consultants had concluded that the site specific PTAL allowed car parking on this scheme.

Basement

AM said that Members were concerned about basements and pointed to the fact that what was being proposed was full site coverage and that the Council would need to be convinced through a structural and hydrological report that this was not likely to have a significant impact on the structure or hydrology of the surrounding area. He referred to the Council's CPG on basements and said that the consultants would need to follow this guidance and demonstrate that the impact was only slight or preferably very slight.

AM said that a SUDS scheme would also be required. VS said that she was not sure how that would be achieved with a full basement and asked what size of scheme triggered the need for SUDs. AM was not sure but said that a scheme of this size would require it particularly when a basement was proposed.

AM said that he understood that the site may be in an area of potential flooding and said that the CPG listed streets liable to flooding. If it was in such an area then the policy prevented habitable rooms at basement level.

VS said that she would discuss this with the consultants who were dealing with the basement issues.

Cycle Storage

SC asked what provision was being provided for cycle storage and NP described the proposed arrangements. SC agreed that the provision proposed would be adequate.

AM referred to CPG7 which gave examples of different types of stands. The Sheffield stand took up the least amount of space. The Joster stand was more secure but took up more space. There was also the option for wall mounted cycle storage.

Refuse Collection

AM advised that the proposed refuse store for the B1 should be closer to the street frontage. NP suggested that this could be in the basement to avoid loss of vital street frontage to B1 space at ground floor level. SC agreed that this should be acceptable but AM thought that it was better at ground floor level. AM advised that if private collections were proposed the location of the refuse store was not so important.

Roof Terrace

AM said that he was concerned about the location of the roof terrace and whether this might result in problems of overlooking.

NP said that similar roof terraces had been provided for the 2 Dumpton Place scheme. The terraces were at least 15m from the adjoining houses and screens would be provided. He was happy to change the details of the screen if required. Then could include green walls.

Landscape

AM asked whether any landscaping was proposed and suggested that landscaping along the residential access route would be desirable.

NP said that the green walls along the access were proposed. The scheme also included planted pergolas at the entrances to each house.

Construction Management Plan

This can be dealt with by way of condition but a summary of the proposed method of construction would be helpful. This could be included in the Design and Access Statement.

Sunlight/Daylight

AM said that the living rooms at ground floor would not receive good levels of sunlight and asked if consideration had been given to putting these at first floor.

NP said that he would prefer to have the living room at ground floor. VS thought that they were better at that level as well in terms of access to the rear garden and catering for disabled visitors.

VS said she would contact the Lighting Consultants about the fails of BRE standards in respect of sunlight but advised would probably not be able to be improved having regard to the location.

Accessibility

Karen Ross or Michelle Daley to be contacted for advice on accessibility issues.

Design

Catherine Bond had reported back that she was happy with the proposed revisions although had some concerns about window sizes. AM said that he would ask CB to telephone NP to discuss.

Sustainability

AM said that he was happy with the Sustainability Statement but said that the energy sub-target was low and asked whether this could be improved.

VS to contact the energy consultants.

Summary

AM said that the main areas of concern were in respect of the car parking, the need for more flexibility of the B1 unit, servicing for the B1 unit and need to improve energy rating.

Timetable for Submission

NP said that he was happy to be able to submit the application in early February 2012.

AM suggested a list of documents be sent to him in advance of submission.

Cgms

www.cgms.co.uk