

Address:	John Kirk House 31 - 32 John Street London WC1N 2AT	
Application Number:	2011/4196/P	Officer: Jennifer Walsh
Ward:	Holborn & Covent Garden	
Date Received:	21/08/2011	
Proposal: Change of use of commercial (Class B1) building to residential (Class C3) to create 15 new residential units (4 x 1 beds, 6 x 2 bed market units and 2 x 2 bed social rented units and 3 x 3 beds) as well as additions and alterations to include demolition of existing rear facade for proposed new rear facade with inset balconies, demolition of existing plant enclosure at roof level for replacement with new structure, and minor alterations to front railings to street plus the installation of a new refuse lift from basement lightwell to the street level to existing Listed Building.		
Drawing Numbers: Site Location Plan; P_01 Rev A; P_02 Rev C; P_03 Rev A; P_04 Rev E; P_05 Rev B; P_06 Rev C; P_07 Rev B; P_08 Rev B; P_09 Rev B; P_10 Rev B; P_11 Rev B; P_12 Rev B; P_13 Rev A; P_14 Rev C; P_15 Rev B; P_16 Rev A; P_17 Rev C; P_17a Rev B; P_18 Rev B; P_19 Rev A; P_20 Rev B; P_21 Rev B; P_22 Rev A; P_23; P_24 Rev A; P_25 Rev C; P_26 Rev A; P_27 Rev A; P_28 Rev B; P_29 Rev A; Design and Access Statement Rev E; Preliminary Structural Engineering Report L11.738 – RP – 01; Noise Impact Assessment 5366.NIA.01 Prepared on 12 August 2011; Energy Assessment dated 7 th November 2011 prepared by Eight Associates; Ecohomes Planning Statement dated 07.11.2011 prepared by Eight Associates; Loss of Employment Supporting Statement prepared by Montagu Evans September 2011;		
RECOMMENDATION SUMMARY: Grant Planning Permission subject to section 106 agreement		
Related Application?	07/09/2011	
Date of Application:		
Application Number:	2011/4343/L	
Proposal: Internal and external alterations associated with the change of use of commercial (Class B1) building to residential (Class C3) to create 15 new residential units as well as additions and alterations to include demolition of existing rear facade for proposed new rear facade with inset balconies, demolition of existing plant enclosure at roof level for replacement with new structure, and minor alterations to front railings to street plus the installation of a new refuse lift from basement lightwell to the street level to existing Listed Building.		
Site Location Plan; P_01 Rev A; P_02 Rev C; P_03 Rev A; P_04 Rev E; P_05 Rev B; P_06 Rev A; P_07 Rev B; P_08 Rev B; P_09 Rev B; P_10 Rev B; P_11 Rev B; P_12 Rev B; P_13 Rev A; P_14 Rev C; P_15 Rev B; P_16 Rev A; P_17 Rev C; P_17a Rev B; P_18 Rev B; P_19 Rev A; P_20 Rev B; P_21 Rev B; P_22 Rev A; P_23; P_24 Rev A; P_25 Rev C; P_26 Rev A; P_27 Rev A; P_28 Rev B; P_29 Rev A;		
RECOMMENDATION SUMMARY: Grant Listed Building Consent		

Applicant:	Agent:
Mr Maurice Leonard GFZ Developments Ltd 4 Lower Addison Gardens London W14 8BQ	Cousins Wojciechowski Architects Ltd. 28 Margaret St London W1W 8RZ

ANALYSIS INFORMATION

Land Use Details:			
	Use Class	Use Description	Floorspace
Existing	<i>B1 Business</i>		1116 m ²
Proposed	<i>C3 Residential</i>		1363m ²

Residential Use Details:										
	Residential Type	No. of Bedrooms per Unit								
		1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9+
Existing	<i>B1 Office Space</i>									
Proposed	<i>Flat/Maisonette</i>	4	8	3						

Parking Details:		
	Parking Spaces (General)	Parking Spaces (Disabled)
Existing	8	
Proposed	2	2

OFFICERS' REPORT

Reason for Referral to Committee:

The proposal constitutes a Major Development which involves the construction of more than ten new residential dwellings [Clause 3(i)]. Furthermore, it also involves the making of a planning obligation under Section 106 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 [Clause 3(vi)] in relation to matters outside the scheme of delegation.

1. SITE

- 1.1 The subject property is a Grade II listed terrace (numbers 29-36 consecutive) located in the Bloomsbury Conservation Area. It was completely rebuilt in the 1960's and then refurbished in the 1980's.

- 1.2 From the street the building appears as a mid terrace house of six storeys (including basement and mansard) but internally it is a modern office building divided into numerous spaces. It has no historical or architectural merit internally, at rear or at roof level, but the character and architectural features of its front façade are in keeping with the overall terrace of eight dwelling houses, which date from 1754-59. As such, its special interest is its front façade as part of the group value of the terrace.
- 1.3 There is an existing mews building to the rear of the site which is split into flats and accessed from John's Mews. There are single aspect properties located within this existing residential units which need to be fully considered and appreciated. A mix of office and residential properties surround the application site.

2. THE PROPOSAL

Original

- 2.1 The application seeks planning permission and listed building consent for the and demolition of the rear elevation and associated refurbishment to convert the existing building from the existing office use into residential use for 15 units (class C3). To the front of the property a new refuse platform lift is proposed to be located at basement level with access to the street level.
- 2.2 To the rear of the application site it is proposed to demolish the existing rear façade and rebuild to the same height with recessed balconies and full height windows. Such elements are proposed to be included to reduce the perceived bulk of the existing flat rear elevation. As such, it is proposed to deepen the existing rear elevation by 0.3m. The existing external fire escape is also to be removed within the proposal. Brick slips, hardwood sliding vertical louvers and stainless steel balustrades are to be incorporated into the design for the rear elevation.
- 2.3 To the rear of the existing building is a single storey element which extends the whole depth of the site, adjoining the property which fronts John's Mews. This single storey element is to be retained within the proposal and converted into residential use, with access being maintained from the main entrance. 5 fins projecting out by 0.4m are proposed to allow some privacy to be created into this unit as all windows face onto the existing courtyard area. A green roof and two conservation roof lights are also proposed to be incorporated into this element of the building.
- 2.4 There is an existing basement level to the site which serves office accommodation to the front of the site and to the rear, car parking and plant is facilitated within the space. Vehicular access is obtained through a ramp which comes in off John's Mews. 4 car parking spaces are proposed as well as 17 cycle spaces within the basement. It is also proposed to create a lightwell from the courtyard amenity space to allow light into the proposed basement residential units. The lightwell will cut into the roof of the basement, lowering the height of the basement to 2.1m (existing height of 3.1m) in that location.

- 2.5 To the roof of the property there is an existing plant room which is to be demolished and rebuilt to form the bedroom element of the sixth floor duplex apartment. Both the fourth and fifth floor are proposed to be pushed back from the existing rear elevation, with the fourth floor being located 0.6m in from the existing rear elevation building line, and the fifth floor being located 1.3m from the existing building line of the plant room.
- 2.6 Associated internal alterations are also included within the application. The existing concrete staircase is proposed to be removed and a new staircase which correctly aligns with the front elevation windows is proposed to be inserted.

Revisions

- 2.7 Revisions to the scheme have been received throughout the application process. Such amendments include retaining the existing single glazed windows to the front elevation, removing fins to the rear single storey element closest to John's Mews property, a new stair layout is proposed to alleviate concerns about the landings crossing the front elevation windows, alterations to the room sizes have been submitted and a water butt has been proposed at roof level within the existing lift overrun.
- 2.8 Revisions have also been received in relation to the internal layout and the affordable housing units. Two social rented units are now proposed at basement level with the previously proposed duplex open market unit being proposed as a three bed unit on the ground floor.

3. RELEVANT HISTORY

- 3.1 **8401080:** The formation of a central courtyard between 31/32 John Street and 29/31 Johns Mews and associated elevational alterations together with internal works of conversion and the replacement of the windows on the rear elevation. **GRANTED 29/08/1984**
- 3.2 **2009/4341/P and 2009/4355/L:** Change of use from office (Class B1A) to 2 no. one bedroom flats, 9 no. two bedroom flats and 1 no. three bedroom flat (Class C3) and various external alterations including; new air-conditioning units, solar panels, terrace and associated balustrade on roof, new stairs and basement doors to front light well, replacement windows to front elevation, reconfiguration of windows and alterations on rear elevation and single storey rear extension. **WITHDRAWN APPLICATION 15/03/2010**

4. CONSULTATIONS

Statutory Consultees

- 4.1 English Heritage has been consulted and has advised that the application should be determined in accordance with national and local policy guidance, and on the basis of the Councils conservation advice.

Conservation Area Advisory Committee

- 4.2 **Bloomsbury CAAC** made the following comments on the application:
- They welcome the change of use and the fact that both front doors will continue to be used.
 - They feel that the cladding to the concrete frame of the rear façade would be better in reclaimed London Stock Bricks.

Local Groups

- 4.3 **LAMAS - Historic Buildings & Conservation Committee** commented on the application as follows:
- The Committee strongly objected to the double glazed windows to the front elevation. Whilst appreciating that the windows have been carefully designed and that the existing windows are not original this could set an undesirable precedent for other Bloomsbury houses. Given that the rest of the building had been so altered however, the Committee did not object to any of the other proposals and were of the opinion that the modern rear elevation might well be improved if these proposals were implemented.

The Georgian Group have no comments in relation to the proposals.

Adjoining Occupiers

<i>Number of letters sent</i>	30
<i>Total number of responses received</i>	13
<i>Number of electronic responses</i>	0
<i>Number in support</i>	0
<i>Number of objections</i>	8

- 4.4 **The following neighbouring properties objected to the application:**

Flat 1, 29-31 John's Mews
Flat 3, 29 – 31 John's Mews
Flat 4, 29-31 John's Mews
Flat 5, 29-31 John's Mews
Flat 8, 29-31 John's Mews
Flat 10, 29-31 John's Mews
Flat 1, 33 John's Mews
39 John's Mews
13C Northington Street

The following concerns were raised from the neighbouring properties:

- loss of light to bedroom window due to the proposed fin extending out from the single storey element;
- a robust construction management should be in place with no working allowed at weekends and holidays;
- Proposals will reduce the daylight and sunlight to the neighbouring Mews property;
- The rear façade will be 1m closer to the building;

- The façade is proposed to be darker with more windows and a increase in overlooking;
- The proposed courtyard will be open to residents at any time of the day and night;
- A great deal of light intrusion will be created;
- The proposed plant will generate additional noise;
- The design does not fit in with the other listed buildings;
- The removal of the external fire escape will affect the neighbouring properties;
- A lot of dust, disturbance and nuisance will be generated;
- The construction will making the lives of neighbours very difficult;
- It is unnecessary demolition of the rear elevation;
- The whole courtyard will be dug up and the noise and mess will be horrible;
- The balconies will create a loss of privacy and noise;
- The proposal is a very dark elevation over the existing white bright elevation.

5. **POLICIES**

5.1 **LDF Core Strategy and Development Policies**

CS1	Distribution of growth
CS3	Other highly accessible areas
CS5	Managing the impact of growth and development
CS6	Providing quality homes
CS8	Promoting a successful and inclusive Camden economy
CS11	Promoting sustainable and efficient travel
CS13	Tackling climate change through promoting higher environmental standards
CS14	Promoting high quality places and conserving our heritage
CS15	Protecting and improving our parks and open spaces & encouraging biodiversity
CS16	Improving Camden's health and well-being
CS17	Making Camden a safer place
CS18	Dealing with our waste and encouraging recycling
CS19	Delivering and monitoring the Core Strategy
DP1	Mixed use development
DP2	Making full use of Camden's capacity for housing
DP5	Homes of different sizes
DP6	Lifetime homes and wheelchair homes
DP13	Employment sites and premises
DP16	The transport implications of development
DP17	Walking, cycling and public transport
DP18	Parking standards and the availability of car parking
DP19	Managing the impact of parking
DP20	Movement of goods and materials
DP21	Development connecting to the highway network
DP22	Promoting sustainable design and construction
DP23	Water
DP24	Securing high quality design
DP25	Conserving Camden's heritage
DP26	Managing the impact of development on occupiers and neighbours
DP28	Noise and vibration

DP29	Improving access
DP31	Provision of, and improvements to public open space and outdoor sport and recreation facilities
DP32	Air quality and Camden's Clear Zone
Appendix 2	Parking standards

5.2 **Supplementary Planning Policies**

Camden Planning Guidance 2011

Bloomsbury Conservation Area Appraisal

6. **ASSESSMENT**

6.1 The principal considerations material to the determination of this application are summarised as follows:

- Principle of development
- Affordable housing
- Design
- Amenity for occupiers and neighbours
- Sustainability and biodiversity
- Trees and Landscaping
- Lifetime Homes and Access
- Provision of open space
- Educational contributions from residential developments
- Community facilities contribution
- Training and employment contribution
- Transport;

Principle of development

6.2 The proposal involves the loss of floorspace from the established office (Class B1) to residential (Class C3) use.

6.3 Considering the loss of employment space first, policy CS8 at paragraph 8.8 indicates that the Council are promoting sufficient office space to meet projected demand. CS8 also indicates the Council will safeguard premises that meet the needs of modern industry/ employers and seek provision of facilities for SMEs such as managed affordable workspaces. DP13 indicates circumstances under which the Council may not resist a change to non-business use. More specifically one clause within the policy indicates that where premises are not suitable for any purpose other than B1(a) offices, change to residential or community uses may be allowed.

6.4 In support of the application a detailed Marketing Report, produced by local agents Montagu Evans. The report examines whether or not the loss of 31/32 John Street as an employment site would prejudice the council's ability to ensure a continued supply of a range of employment floorspace to meet its economic development objectives from an employment perspective. The property was previously occupied by the newspaper 'Loot' as office accommodation. 'Loot' vacated the premises in February 2011. The property remains vacant. The report goes on to states that

given that the property was last refurbished in the 1980s it would require significant and costly alterations to bring it up to modern requirements. Even with these upgrades the building would still fall short of the standards expected by modern day occupiers, due to the buildings listed status.

- 6.5 The submitted change of use report, successfully notes that the office stock is not suitable for conversion to alternative employment uses. Therefore, it is considered that through the information submitted the loss of the employment premises can be supported in these circumstances.
- 6.6 Given the loss of employment space at the site is considered to be justified, the principle of providing residential accommodation at the site can be considered. Housing is regarded as the priority land-use of the LDF, as outlined by policies CS6 and DP2, and seeks to maximise the supply of additional homes in the borough. Therefore such a proposal in this location is considered to be inline with policy and is in principle acceptable.

Affordable Housing

- 6.7 Policy DP3 provides a clear rationale for seeking affordable housing in schemes of 10 or more additional dwellings or 1000m² of floorspace GEA (Gross External Area). The threshold is capacity for 10 additional homes. The percentage target is 10% where there is capacity for 10 additional homes, and an additional 1% per additional home capacity.
- 6.8 The capacity is assessed as 1 home per 100 sq m GEA (rounded to the nearest 100 sq m/ whole home), or the actual number of additional homes where each one is under 100 sqm GEA. In relation to this application, the proposal is for 15 homes in 1,479sqm and it has been accepted that a 14% affordable housing provision is provided. As there are currently two entrances to the site it is considered that such units could be provided on site.
- 6.9 The proposed development includes two 2 bed units, with their own independent entrance at basement level. Revisions have been received through the process of the application and both units are now proposed to be located at basement level accessed from the front lightwell. Policy DP3 outlines a clear approach that affordable housing is expected on-site and therefore the two onsite units are acceptable and in line with policy in this instance.
- 6.10 The information which has been assessed through the process of the application has stated that the two units are to be secured by One Housing Group as social rented units. The onsite contribution of affordable housing offers the best prospect for mixed and inclusive communities in line with policy DP3. The physical constraints of the development is considered to make the affordable units practical for management purposes and therefore maximise the overall delivery of housing and affordable housing on the site. The units are considered to benefit from good natural ventilation and circulation space with internal cycle stands and as they are located on site will be inline with the planning policy. The two units are recommended to be secured as affordable units through the use of a section 106 agreement.

Design

- 6.11 As previously stated the existing building is considered to benefit from being a listed building in relation to forming a distinct character and appearance within the listed terrace and surrounded by other listed buildings, which it is important to preserve throughout any alterations and additions. The proposed works to the building are as follows:
- Demolishing the existing rear elevation and rebuilding it with insert balconies;
 - Pushing the fourth and fifth floor back wards to create a balcony at fourth floor level and reducing the perceived bulk at fifth floor level;
 - Converting the existing plant room at roof level into residential use accessed from the fifth floor duplex apartment;
 - Rebuilding the front elevation of the existing single storey element to match that of the proposed elevation of the host property and the inclusion of brick fins to project 0.4m to create additional privacy for the unit fronting onto the courtyard;
 - Creating a rear lightwell to allow light into the basement units;
 - Insertion of 17 cycle racks at basement level;
 - Insertion of a green roof to the courtyard area and a brown roof to the single storey rear element and at fifth floor level;
 - Removal of existing concrete stairs to the front elevation and replacing them with cast iron railings and metal staircase;
 - Installation of platform lift to the front elevation;
- 6.12 To the front elevation, it was proposed to change the existing windows to double glazed units. However, as the front elevation contributes to the wider character of the listed terrace and due to the property being a listed building such alterations were not considered appropriate and have therefore been removed from the proposal.
- 6.13 The proposed additions to the front entrance of the building, to incorporate the residential steps to the basement level and the platform lift are considered acceptable in design terms. Whilst the alterations would be visible from the public realm of John Street, there are many other examples of metal stairs and therefore this element is considered appropriate. In relation to the platform lift, it is considered that as the platform lift has been reduced in size and is now in glass material, the lift would be read as a modern addition and would not harm the setting of the listed building. Whilst the platform lift is not located in the ideal location, all other measures have been fully explored and as the ramp to the rear of the basement level is too steep, the refuse has to be taken out via the front. Therefore, it is considered that in this instance the proposal is considered acceptable.
- 6.14 The majority of the works are proposed to the rear elevation of the property. The existing rear elevation is flat faced 1970s design with short windows which extend across the whole rear elevation. The rear elevation is white painted brick with brown windows and a large white metal external fire escape serving all levels to provide access to the rear courtyard. The existing rear elevation is at odds within the urban grain of existing development along John Street. The proposal seeks to remove the whole rear elevation and provide a design which complements and

reflects the wider built form whilst integrating traditional and contemporary materials. It is proposed to recess the windows and the balconies within the proposal to reinforce the original urban pattern.

- 6.15 In terms of the overall bulk and massing, the new façade offers significant improvements over the existing arrangement. The existing building stands out from the adjoining properties, not just in terms of its design, but also because of its significantly greater bulk and height.
- 6.16 The rear elevation at ground to third floor would be brought out by approximately 300mm (this is just for the outer face of the façade, the majority of the glazing is actually set back considerably which will relieve the perception of bulk). When measured on site this was found to be approximately twice the depth of the existing downpipes on the rear elevation. This is a small increase when compared with the overall scale of the building and needs to be considered in conjunction with the alterations at the upper levels.
- 6.17 As the site is surrounded by buildings at the rear it is only the upper floors of the building which have a wider impact on the public realm. Views are possible of the upper floors of the rear from Northington Street where it is seen in conjunction with the historic rear elevations of the adjoining properties on John Street. As such, it is not considered that the sustainable measures proposed, including photovoltaic panels and air source heat pumps would not have a detrimental impact on the wider property, as they are located at roof level and are set in from the rear elevation. Whilst it is accepted that the photovoltaic's will be slightly visible from the wider area, it is considered that they would be read in conjunction with the use of the building and form an integral part of the sustainable agenda for the property. The installations of both structures are therefore considered acceptable in this instance.
- 6.18 Presently the building rises two sheer storeys above the parapet line of the neighbouring buildings and consequently dominates them. A better relationship has been created in the proposed scheme by setting back the fourth floor approximately 900mm behind the line of the proposed rear elevation (and 600mm behind the existing). This works in breaking up the perceived bulk of the building by creating a strong brick parapet line which relates better to its neighbours and also means that the levels above this are seen as more lightweight and subservient. A vertical shadow gap is provided which breaks the façade into two vertically proportioned halves which relate to the overall rhythm of the terrace.
- 6.19 By virtue of its materials (white painted brick) and strong horizontal emphasis the existing building jars with the neighbouring buildings in the terrace. In contrast the proposed rear elevation provides a contemporary, high quality design which sits far more harmoniously within its context.
- 6.20 The proposed windows have been given a strong vertical emphasis which again reflects the overall characteristics of the terrace. Although the window openings are full height this is considered acceptable as the building will always be seen as a modern intervention within the terrace and the design should reflect this. A much greater degree of solidity has been introduced to the façade through the

introduction of solid, openable panels (to provide ventilation) which will cut down on the amount of glazing.

- 6.21 The option of introducing an element of hierarchy into the façade was considered (e.g. reducing window sizes on the upper levels). However this building differs from its neighbours in that the floor levels are uniform in height and do not line through with neighbouring properties. In this context it was therefore not considered necessary. It is also noted that a contemporary spin has been put on the hierarchy of the façade by defining the bedrooms with smaller windows whilst the reception areas have larger windows. This works in a similar manner to historic town houses where the reception spaces were found on the ground and first floors, whilst the upper floors (with smaller windows and head heights were reserved for bedrooms).
- 6.22 As was mentioned above, the set back glazed fourth floor gives a greater emphasis to the brick clad element below and slightly reduces the bulk and greatly reduces the building's perceived bulk. On a contemporary design the glazed set back storey acts in a similar manner as the slated mansard roofs on the neighbouring buildings in providing a subservient element which terminates the façade. It is considered that within the design, the slender brick framing for the windows gives the building an elegant and high quality appearance.
- 6.23 As previously mentioned, to the rear of the site is a single storey element which used to link the application site to the John's Mews property to the rear. Within the application, it is proposed to redesign the front elevation of this element (fronting the courtyard) so to link in with the detailed design of the main building, whilst creating additional privacy measures through the use of brick fins projecting out from the elevation by 0.4m. A brown roof is to be added to this element as well as two conservation style rooflights to allow more light into the unit. Two pivoting ventilation panels are to be inserted to echo those on the host building and allow indirect views out onto the courtyard. It is considered that the detailed design is to align with the main building and therefore no objection is raised to this element.
- 6.24 Moving to the top floor of the building, the existing rooftop plant enclosure is to be taken down and rebuilt to almost identical dimensions. It will be pushed further back from the rear elevation by 1.3m which will reduce its impact slightly. Although it will be pushed further towards the front it will not be visible in views from directly opposite on John Street. It is also considered that in longer views from the northern end of John Street/Doughty Street the structure would not have an appreciably greater impact (in terms of bulk) than the existing. The side and rear elevation would be glazed with a vertical louvre system in front. Concerns were previously raised in relation to the glazing on the side would give a greater prominence to the structure in longer views from the north, especially at night. Therefore, the amount of glazing has been reduced on the side elevation towards the front of the property so to overcome such concerns.
- 6.25 Further to this, the glazed balustrade to the roof level which was to surround the brown roof has been reduced in size and only encloses the terrace. A fall arrest system with a rail is now proposed to surround the brown roof element. As such, the system is considered to be more appropriate in this location.

- 6.26 The proposed scheme is considered to offer a high quality redevelopment of the site which enhances both the special interest of the listed terrace and the character and appearance of the conservation area and therefore is considered acceptable in design terms.

Amenity for occupiers and neighbours

- 6.27 There is an existing residential property (which is currently split into flats) directly facing the application site to the rear. 29-31 John's Mews are located 12.1m from the proposed rear elevation. Therefore the amenity of these particular neighbours needs to be considered.
- 6.28 The pattern of development along John Street follows a similar rhythm along the terrace, with large properties fronting John Street and smaller Mews housing fronting John's Mews but with some single aspect units facing the rear of the properties to John Street. It is proposed to pull the rear elevation out slightly and this would reduce the separation distance to 11.8m. Therefore it is considered that the perception of a building being located 11.8m away would remain the same as the existing situation, yet the use of the building is proposed to change. The existing building is in office use, with a flat rear elevation. The proposal seeks to minimise the perceived overlooking through adding hardwood fins, recessed windows and pivoting ventilation panels within the design. The proposed balconies are to be 0.7m in depth. It is considered that whilst the proposed 11.8m distance is below the 18m guidelines in this instance the proposal is deemed acceptable. Through the architectural concept, reducing amenity issues has been considered and the distance between the properties is only reduced by 0.4m, yet this is taken from the true rear elevation line. The proposed windows are to be located 0.8m in from the rear building line therefore reducing the perceived overlooking.
- 6.29 Moving to the top of the building, at the fourth floor level a full width balcony of 0.7m is proposed. Through the balconies at the lower level, as well as the existing situation, it is not considered that the installation of the small balcony extending across the whole width of the building would have a detrimental impact on the neighbouring property. The balcony is not deep enough to be used for seating and dining and therefore it is not considered that it would benefit from an increase in overlooking to the neighbouring properties to a detrimental effect.
- 6.30 In relation to the top unit, this has been pushing back from the rear elevation by 1.4m. Whilst a terrace is proposed at this level, it is to be set back 2.2m in from the proposed rear elevation which is considered to alleviate perceived overlooking from this addition. The glass balustrade has also been reduced in size through the application process and therefore, it is to be 3m in depth x 3.9m in length from the edge of the roof to the middle of the roof. Due to the height of the roof and the existing situation, it is not considered that the installation of a balcony nor roof terrace would increase the amount of overlooking from the application site to the neighbouring properties.
- 6.31 Concern has been raised from the neighbouring ground floor flat of John's Mews in relation to the proposed fins which are sought to be added to the front elevation of the single storey addition fronting the courtyard. On a site visit conducted by the

Case Officer, it was seen that the existing bedroom window of Flat 1, 29-31 John Street was located in the south eastern corner of the boundary of their property and the application site. Whilst previously it was proposed to locate a fin, which was to project 0.4m from the existing side elevation 1m away from this window.

Throughout the process of the application, the proposals have been amended in order to fully accommodate this window. As such, the proposal seeks permission for a brick fin to project 0.4m from the existing side elevation 5.1m from the neighbouring window. Having fully examined the application, it is considered that the fin would not significantly harm the amenity of this window as the existing bulk of the single storey extension as well as the height of the main building already compromises the outlook and amount of sunlight received to the property and it is not considered that the proposed fin would be of any further detriment to that of the existing situation. Whilst evidence from the neighbouring property has been provided in relation to the 25 degree line from the centre of the window, it is considered that the existing building already contradicts this line and due to the proposed fin being located 5m away, the proposal would not harm the daylight and sunlight received into the bedroom window any more than that of the existing situation.

- 6.32 Therefore, due to their existing relationship in the streetscene as well as the architectural measures which have been included within the design of the building, it would be unreasonable to enforce the 18m guidelines in this instance. Overall the development is acceptable in terms of ensuring the amenity of neighbours is preserved in accordance with policy DP26.
- 6.33 Concern has also been raised in relation to the use of the proposed courtyard by future residents. As this is a communal outside space, of limited size, it is not considered reasonable to put a planning condition on the space to ensure that residents do not use the space after a certain time.
- 6.34 The proposed units are adequate in size and they are in line with the standards for residential units outlined in Camden Planning Guidance (2001). However, some fall short of space standards of the London Plan 2011 yet they are considered to all benefit from large bathrooms, adequate circulation space, outlook and are well ventilated and are considered to be considered acceptable. All of the proposed bedrooms within each unit meet the Council's expectation of 11m² for a first or double bedroom. The proposed rooms will all receive adequate natural light and ventilation, and the rooms are stacked in line with the floors below to minimise noise transmission (with living space below existing living space, bedrooms below proposed bedrooms).
- 6.35 As previously identified, 15 self contained residential units are proposed to be incorporated into the scheme. The proposed mix (of 4 x 1 bed units, 8 x 2 bed units and 3 x 3 bed units) is considered to be suitable in this location and is also considered to be inline with DP5 which states that the priority for market housing is 2 bed units. Revisions have been received which remove the previously proposed duplex apartment (over basement and ground floor level) and a three bed ground floor apartment is now proposed. Such changes were developed through moving the two affordable units to the basement. The ground floor unit has its own private

entrance off John Street, yet also benefits from a second entrance through the communal lobby area.

- 6.36 An acoustic report has been submitted in support of the application in relation to the proposed air source heat pumps to be added to the roof of the main building. They are to be in a similar position to the existing air conditioning units which are to be removed. Whilst the units will not be visible from the public realm, the units need to meet the Council's noise standards in relation to the occupiers and neighbours of the proposed building. An acoustic report prepared by Practical Acoustics has been provided in support of the application. The report and attachments theoretically demonstrate that Camden's planning noise standard will be met. The report goes on to suggest that due to the proximity of the nearest residential window being located close to the proposed plan, it is recommended that an acoustically treated barrier to cover the units is proposed. A condition is recommended to ensure acoustic isolation and sound attenuation details are submitted to the council and approved prior to occupation of the site.
- 6.37 The model noise conditions are advised to be added to the permission to ensure that the background noise level is not compromised in any way.

Sustainability and biodiversity

- 6.38 The development has indicated how the energy hierarchy has been applied to its design. The pre-assessment details indicate that the development is expected to meet 'Very Good' rating for EcoHomes. Policy CS13 expects all development to address the potential for renewable energy with a view to reducing on-site CO² emissions by 20% but without a strict requirement to meet the standard. However the London Plan 2011 goes one step further and seeks to secure a reduction of on-site CO² levels by 25% above Part L building regulation. An Energy Statement has been provided in support of the application. The scheme would incorporate air source heat pumps and photovoltaic system within the development which would provide approx 34.13% reduction in CO² emissions from the site.
- 6.39 The Energy Statement has outlined the Energy Hierarchy and seeks reductions through the 'Be Lean, Be Clean and Be Green criteria'. A gas CHP accompanied by renewables has been the favoured option on this scheme. The lead CHP boiler system would provide hot water and heating with a gas boiler to provide the remaining heating load. Photovoltaic's are proposed to supply LZC electricity with remaining electricity demand sourced from the grid. Very Good EcoHomes standards and the proposed renewable measures are acceptable and would be secured by S106 legal agreement.

Trees and Landscaping

- 6.40 The existing site has no areas of soft landscaping and provides little benefit in terms of support for biodiversity. The proposals include a brown roof on the flat roof of the single storey rear extension, a green roof on the existing courtyard area as well as a brown roof to the roof of the main building. This is considered an appropriate roof for this roof type in terms of function, roof design parameters and maintenance.

- 6.41 The proposed renovation of the existing amenity space within the courtyard has been welcomed. Due to the basement projecting underneath the whole plot and the courtyard, this limits the extent of the landscaping. However, the scheme has been detailed and designed to achieve a 150mm minimum sedum soil depth. Planting types and species have also been considered that will allow mature trees to be implemented without the need for deep soils. The green roof is to be seeded lawn tuft on a 200mm soil bed. It is considered that the detailed design of the proposal will enhance the existing situation in both ecology and overall design terms and is considered acceptable in this instance.

Access and lifetime homes

- 6.42 The applicant has submitted a lifetime homes statement in support of the application. It states that the development would meet the majority of all standards. As the development is larger than 10 units there is a requirement for provision of a wheelchair unit. Provision has been made for disabled users, with all houses (except Flat 2) having disabled and ambient disabled access. Wheelchair access to the development has been considered by way of wheelchair access lifts located to the front lightwell stair and, basement car park steps. The proposed units exceed the requirement for 10% of residential units comply and therefore, the proposals are considered acceptable in terms of policy DP6.

Provision of open space

- 6.43 Policy CS15 of the LDF Core Strategy and DP31 of the LDF Development Policies require that the existing public open space deficiency within the Borough is not created or made worse by development. If development is likely to lead to increased use of public open space then Camden Planning Guidance (CPG) recommends that 9sqm of open space should be sought per person. The sequential approach to provision is on-site, then off-site but within 400m from the development and as a final option a financial contribution to open space will be sought. In this case no communal open space would be provided on site. In line with the Camden Planning Guidance 6 Amenity, the public open space contribution has been worked out as follows:

	Capital Cost	Maintenance	Design & admin	Total contribution
One bed flats	£385	£386	£46	£3,268
Two bed flats	£663	£561	£80	£10,432
Three bed flats	£1,326	£832	£159	£6,951
TOTAL				£20,651

Educational contributions from residential developments

- 6.44 In line with Policy CS19 and guidance within the CPG a contribution towards educational infrastructure in the area should be sought. This is based on all private housing of 2 or more bedrooms (excluding the affordable housing elements of a scheme). Based on the current unit numbers and mix (6 x 2 bed units and 3 x 3 bed

units) and using updated figures for education contributions (2011) at £2,213 per 2 bed unit and £6,322 per 3 bed unit a contribution of **£32,244** is sought.

Community facilities contribution

- 6.45 LDF development policy DP15 (Community and Leisure Uses) states that the Council will expect “developments that result in any additional need for community or leisure facilities to contribute towards supporting existing facilities or providing for new facilities”.
- 6.46 Community facilities contributions are calculated in accordance with the guidance in CPG8 (Planning Obligations) which states contributions will not be required in the case of developments including 10 or fewer residential units but in the case of other schemes the Council will require a contribution of £980 per bedroom. This development includes 29 bedrooms (4 x 1 bedroom, 8 x 2 beds, 3 x 3 beds), so the contribution required is $29 \times £980 = \textbf{£28,420}$.

Training and employment contribution

- 6.47 Within paragraph 8.8 of CPG 8 Planning Obligations, it states that, in cases where the Council agrees that a change of use is acceptable but there the loss of an employment use can be expected to result in a reduction of job opportunities for Camden residents, developers may be required to contribute towards training and employment measures to enable Camden residents to access alternative employment.
- 6.48 It is considered appropriate to request a contribution in this case as the existing building was in employment use up until early 2011 (when it was used by Loot as their London office) and could provide employment to around 60 people if it remained in office use. Therefore, the calculated contribution required is **£37,317**. Such a contribution was calculated in line with the formula in the 2011 Camden Planning Guidance, CPG 8:
- 6.49 $1,116 \text{ sqm existing B1a space} \div 19 \text{ sqm (space requirement per full time employee)} = \text{number of FT jobs lost (14)} \times 23\% \text{ (% of Camden residents in the workforce)} \times £2,750 \text{ (cost per head of providing training and employment advice)} = \textbf{£37,317}$

Transport

- 6.50 The site is located on John Street within the Clear Zone Region and north of Theobald's Road. There is existing vehicular access to the basement of this site from a ramp on John's Mews to the rear and it is proposed to retain this access.
- 6.51 DP18 requires development to sufficiently provide for the needs of cyclists, which are contained in Appendix 2 of the Development Policies document. The London Plan also provides guidance on cycle parking standards. Camden's Parking Standards for cycles states that one storage or parking space is required per residential unit, however for larger residential units (3+ beds); the London Plan requires two cycle parking spaces per unit. The proposal is for 15 residential units

consisting of 3 one-bedroom, 9 two-bedroom, and 2 three-bedroom units; therefore 16 cycle storage/parking spaces are required. The applicant has included provision for 17 cycle parking spaces on a Josta two-tier height cycle stands in the basement. Three cycle spaces are to be included within the internal flat layout for the two affordable units, therefore bringing the total numbers of cycle spaces to 20 which are above the required amount of cycle storage/parking, and this is to be commended.

- 6.52 As outlined in CPG7, 'cycle parking needs to be accessible (in that everyone that uses a bike can easily store and remove a bike from the cycle parking) and secure. The route from cycle parking to street level should be step free. Cycle parking inside buildings should be at the entrance level of the building or accessible by a ramp or lift from street level that can accommodate a bike'. Therefore, it has been recommended through the process of the application that the refuse lift should also be available for cyclists. A revised internal design has been submitted which identifies that step free access can be made between the refuse lift and cycle storage area.
- 6.53 The existing basement car park currently has space for 8 private vehicles, with this being reduced to four spaces being available to the development and the remaining spaces being retained for John's Mews. Of the retained four spaces, provision for two disabled parking bays has been made. The identified disabled spaces are shown to meet the dimensions required for a disabled space of 3.3m x 4.8m as outlined in CPG7.
- 6.54 The proposal includes formalising the existing situation on site. Therefore, whilst the parking rights of the on site occupiers can not be removed, it is recommended that the applicant should be required to enter into a Section 106 Agreement in respect of designating the properties as being car capped, i.e. the occupants will be unable to obtain on-street parking permits from the Council. As no cars would be adding to the on street parking demand, the council would seek to ensure that the proposals would not benefit from excessive on street parking. This is therefore recommended to be a head of term in the proposed section 106 legal agreement which accompanies this recommendation.
- 6.55 DP21 seeks to protect the safety and operation of the highway network. For some development this may require control over how the development is implemented (including demolition and construction) through a Construction Management Plan (CMP) secured via S106. Although there are limited changes proposed to the footprint of the site, the proposal includes significant alterations to all five storeys of the building to convert it from the largely open plan office layout to create 15 flats, including the reconfiguration and demolition of the rear elevation. This will result in a large number of construction vehicle movements to and from the site, which may have an impact on the local transport network. This is of concern as the site is located within the Clear Zone Region which is a highly constrained area in regard to transport.
- 6.56 Due to the scale and kind of this development and the likely method of construction a CMP will be required in order to mitigate any adverse impacts. Any occupation of the highway, such as for hoarding, skips or storage of materials, will require a

licence from Highways Management and this, along with the existing on-street waiting and loading controls, should be sufficient to ensure the work is carried out in such a way as to not adversely affect the safety or operation of the public highway.

- 6.57 DP21 and DP26 seek to protect the safety and operation of the highway network and the surrounding area. For some developments this may require control over how a site is serviced through a Servicing Management Plan (SMP) secured via S106. In this application the refuse collection presents an area of concern for transport in that the refuse storage facilities will be located within the basement level. Waste will be transferred from the basement level to John Street via a refuse scissor lift, and transferred out on the pavement for collection. The applicant identifies that waste collection was considered from John Mews but the vehicle ramp gradient presented a barrier for collection from this location. Transport raise this as a concern as the bins associated with this development will need careful management to avoid them being simply left out on John Street, leading to potential street clutter contrary to DP21.
- 6.58 In addition, given that the site is within the Clear Zone Region which is highly constrained, this application presents an opportunity for the site to minimise its impact on transport and improve the situation in regard to servicing, especially through reducing obstructions and the occurrence of possibly dangerous situations. Outline details for refuse collection have been provided by the applicant that states bins will be moved by a waste management company from the basement level via the scissor lift twice a week and then returned the same day. Given the nature of the refuse collection proposals outlined it is recommend that a SMP is secured for this site in order to control the servicing agreement and ensure that the proposal does not have a detrimental impact on the wider area.
- 6.59 In order to tie the development into the surrounding urban environment, and to mitigate the impact of increased cycle trips to the basement car park, as well as any construction damage caused, a financial contribution is required to repave the footway adjoining the site on John's Mews and to repave the existing vehicular crossover leading to the car park from John's Mews. This is in line with DP21. An added benefit of the highways works is that damage caused to the highway in the area of the proposed highways works during construction can be repaired.
- 6.60 This work and any other work that needs to be undertaken within the highway reservation will need to be secured through a Section 106 (Town and Country Planning Act 1990) Agreement with the Council. The Council will undertake all works within the highway reservation, at the cost to the developer. The proposed works have been costed and a sum of £2,879 is required in this instance.
- 6.61 This S106 obligation should also require plans demonstrating interface levels between development thresholds and the Public Highway to be submitted to and approved by the Highway Authority prior to implementation. The Highway Authority reserves the right to construct the adjoining Public Highway (carriageway, footway and/or verge) to levels it considers appropriate.

7. CONCLUSION

- 7.1 In overall terms it is considered that the proposed scheme represents a high quality refurbishment and sensitive additions and alterations to an existing building, and a good standard of accommodation with 15 residential units at the site, including a suitable allocation of 2 units (social rented) to affordable housing in the borough. The proposed alterations and extensions to the building are considered to respect the host listed building whilst preserving the character and appearance of the wider listed terrace and conservation area. The new uses are not considered to harm neighbour amenity or traffic conditions in terms of outlook, light, privacy, noise, traffic or parking. The new building will be fully accessible and sustainable in its design and will meet ecohomes target of Very Good standard. The proposal is therefore considered acceptable and in line with planning policy in this instance.
- 7.2 The proposals are acceptable in all other respects subject to conditions and a S.106 legal agreement to secure the following Heads of Terms:
- Car capped housing
 - Two social rented affordable housing units
 - Training and employment contributions of £37,317
 - Education Contribution of £32,244
 - Community facilities contribution £28,420
 - Open Space Contribution of £20,651
 - Highways works contribution £2,879
 - Sustainability Plan (Eco Homes 'very good')
 - Energy Plan
 - Service Management Plan
 - Construction Management Plan

8. LEGAL COMMENTS

- 8.1 Members are referred to the note from the Legal Division at the start of the Agenda.