

# **PLANNING and ACCESS CONSIDERATIONS STATEMENT**

4TH FLOOR, AUDREY HOUSE,  
16 – 20 ELY PLACE  
EC1N 6SN

PROPOSAL

Reversion from D1 to B1

(D1 use granted November 2010 under reference  
2010/4528/P)



**CLIFFORD RANCE**  
**A S S O C I A T E S**  
*Town Planning Consultants*

## **1.0 Preamble**

1.1 This statement accompanies a planning application proposing the change of use of part of the 4<sup>th</sup> floor of Audrey House, Ely Place from the current use as a D1 medical facility back to B1 office.

1.2 The former medical facility was a hair transplant and liposuction clinic. It occupied former B1 office premises in the building for a short period but the clinic have vacated. The building, Audrey House, is otherwise an office building.

1.3 The application does not involve any changes to the external appearance of the building

1.4 Section 42 of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 introduced a new section 62 to the Planning Act 1990 which requires that a statement covering design concepts and access issues is submitted with all applications for planning permissions except those proposing engineering, works to dwellings (outside of conservation areas) or change of use.

1.5 A design and access statement is therefore not statutorily required for this application.

1.6 The statement also reviews the relevant planning history and planning policies.

## **2.0 The location**

2.1 Ely Place runs roughly north-south off Charterhouse Street close to the boundary with the City of London.

2.2 It is a private road with gates at the south end. It is a no through road.

2.3 The properties facing the street are predominantly offices and the street does not have any retail function.

2.4 The application premises are towards the north end of the street on the west side. The building was rebuilt behind a retained façade and comprises modern offices.

2.5 The application relates only to the front part of the 4<sup>th</sup> floor of the premises.

2.6 Ely Place is the Hatton Garden conservation area. The building is not listed.

2.7 The site is designated part of the Central London area on the local planning authority proposals map.

### **3.0 Previous use**

3.1 The premises are currently vacant.

3.2 The previous occupiers were a private clinic – trading as the Cosmetic Medical Group - who specialised in minor cosmetic procedures such as hair transplants and liposuction. They were only in occupation from mid 2009 and have now vacated.

3.3 The occupiers sought planning permission for their use of the 4<sup>th</sup> floor retrospectively in August 2010. Planning permission was granted in the 29 November 2010 under reference 2010/4528/P

### **4.0 The proposal**

4.1 The proposal is to revert the premises to B1 office

### **5.0 Accessibility by public transport.**

5.1 Accessibility is unchanged by this proposal. The building is reasonably accessible with ramped access and internal lifts.

5.2 The site is about 380 metres from Farringdon Station which offers services on Thameslink and London Underground Circle, Metropolitan and Hammersmith and City Line services.

5.3 It is a similar distance to the City Thameslink Station at Holborn Viaduct.

5.4 It is just over 400 metres from Chancery Lane London Underground station on the Central Line.

5.5 Bus routes 17, 45 and 46 pass the bottom end of Ely Place with a stop within 125 metres. . Routes 8, 25 and 242 pass along Holborn Viaduct with a stop within 150 metres. Route 63 passes along Farringdon Road with a stop within 260 metres. Route 341 stops in Holborn about 260 metres from the site.

5.6 There is car parking in Ely Place.

5.7 The site is therefore accessible by means other than the private car.

## **6.0 Planning policy considerations**

6.1 The Planning Acts requires that applications for planning permission be decided in accordance with the development plan unless the development plan is outweighed by other material considerations.

6.2 The Camden Core Strategy was adopted in November 2010 alongside the Development Policies Development Plan Document.

6.3 As noted above, the site is shown as within 'Central London' but otherwise undesignated.

6.4 Core Strategy policy CS8 advises that the council will secure a strong economy in Camden. It advises it will achieve this through, inter alia, encouraging a mix of employment facilities.

6.5 Core Strategy para 8.5 states

'The Camden Employment Land Review 2008 forecasts that the demand for offices will increase by 615,000 sq m between 2006 and 2026. To meet this demand, the Council will direct new business development to the growth areas of King's Cross, Euston, Holborn and Tottenham Court Road, elsewhere in Central London, the town centres (except Hampstead) and other accessible established office locations (see policy CS3).

6.6 Development Policies DPD policy DP13 advises that the Council Will retain land and buildings that are suitable for continued business use and will resist a change to non-business uses.

6.7 The officer's report on the previous application for medical use noted that policies CS8 and DP13 'generally seek to protect existing employment uses' but commented that in this case it involved only 'the loss of a small amount of B1a office accommodation' and stated that .

'Whilst these proposals would result in the loss of existing B1 floor space, the flexible nature of the application in relation to the partitions which have been added to the unit means that the option to return the premises back to office (Class B1) use could be available at a later date.'

6.8 The floor areas referred to in the officer's report were wrong. The applicants put the area down as 455m<sup>2</sup> of which they were changing 86.3m<sup>2</sup> and this latter figure was referred to in the officers report. However, the 86.3m<sup>2</sup> referred to the actual clinic space within their unit of occupation. As the primary purpose of the use was clinic the whole unit should have been referred to

6.9 The area recorded for the purposes of the lease is 244m<sup>2</sup>

## **7.0 Approach to inclusion**

7.1 Circular 01/2006 makes clear that internal accessibility is not normally a consideration in the determination of planning applications.

7.2 In addition, changes of use such as this do not require a formal access statement.

7.3 Nevertheless the applicants are aware of their responsibility to provide access and are also aware that design for disability benefits customers and employees. The building is wheelchair accessible.

## **8.0 Design principles.**

8.1 The application does not propose any changes to the exterior of the building.

8.2 The issues specified in the Order to be addressed in a design statement - amount, layout, scale, landscaping and appearance – do not apply.

## **9.0 Considerations and conclusion**

9.1 This is a very minor application.

9.2 The site is in an area recognised as being suitable for offices.

9.3 There was no public or community use of the former D1 premises and the freeholder would not allow such use.

9.4 The previous occupiers traded by appointment only and the use did not appear to have succeeded.

9.5 When permission was granted for the use of the accommodation for D1 the case officer commented that there was the option 'to return the premises back to office (Class B1) use could be available at a later date.'

9.6 That later date has now arrived.

9.7 The owners of the building wish therefore to revert to the former use.

9.8 The proposal would seem to accord with the local development framework and with the previous decision