Delegated Report		Analysis sheet		Expiry	Date:	Date: 08/12/2010		
(Members Briefing)		N/A		Consult Expiry [)10	
Officer			Application Nu	mber				
Jennifer Walsh			2010/5353/P	2010/5353/P				
Application Address			Drawing Numb	Drawing Numbers				
14-15 Mandela Street London NW1 0DU			Please refer to drat	Please refer to draft decision notice				
PO 3/4 Area Team Signature C&UD			Authorised Off	Authorised Officer Signature				
Proposal								
Amendments to roof terraces at second floor front elevation, new rear basement lightwell and associated internal alterations to planning permissions 2010/0109/P dated 01/09/2010 to offices (Class B1).								
Recommendation:	n: Grant Planning Permission subject to a Deed of Variation							
Application Type: Full Planning Pern			on					
Conditions or Reasons for Refusal:	Refer to Draft Decision Notice							
Informatives:								
Consultations								
Adjoining Occupiers:	No. notified	35	No. of responses	00	No. of ot	ojections	00	
			No. Electronic nts on the application a					
Summary of consultation responses:	 Until the scaffold screens are taken down it is hard to see what they will be looking at. They ask for an elevation from their back window looking at the new development and that would be a lot clearer (<i>Officers Response:</i> Proposed elevations were submitted with the application) Their garden has been completely disarrayed – they would like to ask that consideration is paid from their point of view with such things fixed such as a security camera in their garden looking out (<i>Officers Response:</i> If the neighbours garden has been impacted by construction works then this is a private matter between the applicant and their neighbours and is not a planning matter). Ground floor 73 College Place objects to the proposals on the following grounds: The proposed works would result in a decrease in privacy and they see no reason for this amendment, given that the current plans seem adequate for a commercial property. (<i>Officers Response:</i> The proposal alterations to the windows to the rear elevation have been removed from this application) 73b College Place objects to the proposals on the following grounds: Oppose proposed plans to enlarge and alter the design and layout of the fenestrations in the Mandela Street commercial development. The intended increase in size and alteration to the external appearance of the windows will result in a considerable loss of privacy. This proposal would have a detrimental impact on residential privacy and amenity as a neighbour. 							

 bathroom, lavatory and living room windows. The originally approved drawings show traditional casement windows which would retain their size and grid appearance. The proposed changes replace them with a larger singular pane – which will further reduce privacy. The current size of the windows seems proportionate and in keeping with the character of the building. (Officers Response: The proposed alterations to the windows to the rear elevation have been removed from this application).
 73c College Place objects to the proposals on the following grounds: The proposals will have a negative effect on privacy. Their bathroom window and living area face the rear of the building. The proposed increase in window area would decrease the amenity. The current window area in the property should be more than adequate. There is no positive reason why this proposal should be approved given the negative effect that it will have on the property. (Officer response: The proposed alterations to the windows on the rear elevation have been removed from this application)
 Flat C, 79 College Place objects to the proposal on the following grounds: It is unclear if the rear elevation of the roof will be higher in the proposal, which will then impact daylight through their rear window. The proposed plans state the rear roof elevation will be retained, but we know that this is to be demolished. The extensions of the rear lightwell will impact their privacy. (Officer response: The height of the rear wall is not proposed to be altered from the proposed to the existing drawings. There is no proposal to increase the height of the rear elevation included within this application, nor previous applications. Please refer to paragraph 4.1 in response to amenity concerns).
N/A
a two-storey studio-warehouse (Class B8) building located on the west side of Mandela commercial properties of similar heights to either side and opposite. To the rear lies a terrace site is not located within a conservation area nor is it listed building.
07: Planning permission refused 19/11/2007 for the change of use and works of conversion units (Class B8) to create 6 one bedroom and 1 two bedroom "live/work" units (sui generis), garages, plus erection of a 2nd floor front roof extension and front elevational alterations. permission was granted 18/05/2009 for the conversion of existing studio warehouse units to ive-work units; the erection of a front roof extension incorporating terraces at front and d facade alterations to the front elevation permission was granted on 11/12/2009 for Alterations to and reconfiguration of the front and ction of roof extension with front roof terraces and solar panels and installation of roofflights to tch of existing two storey building (Class B1). permission was granted subject to a section 106 agreement on 01/09/2010 for Excavation in addition to previously approved development ref 2009/4873/P for 'Alterations to the front ction of roof extension with front roof terraces to existing two storey building (Class B1)' as

2010/4372/P: Approval of details granted 03/11/2010 for discharge of conditions 3, 4, (Contaminated Land), 7 (Cycle Storage) and 8 (Work to the Public Highway) pursuant to planning permission reference 2010/0109/P (dated 03/03/2010) for an amendment to planning permission ref 2009/4873/P (dated 11/12/2009) for alterations to the front and rear elevations, erection of roof extension with front terraces to existing two storey building (Class B1) to include a basement level and amend the number and location of rooflights (Class B1).

Relevant policies

LDF Core Strategy and Development Policies 2010

CS1 - Distribution of growth

CS5 - Managing the impact of growth and development

CS16 - Improving Camden's health and well-being

CS17 - Making Camden a safer place

DP24 - Securing high quality design

DP26 - Managing the impact of development on occupiers and neighbours

Camden Planning Guidance 2006

Assessment

1.0 Proposal

1.1 This application seeks permission for the following amendments to the design previously approved under application 2010/0109/P

- Proposed lightwell to the rear of the property at the new basement level;
- Decrease the size of the previously approved roof terraces at second floor level to the front elevation facing Mandela Street and therefore to reduce the set back of the second floor at these points. The roof terraces are now proposed to be 0.6m in depth when measured from the front elevation, as opposed to 0.9m as previously approved.

2.0 Revisions

2.1 The **following revisions** have been received in relation to the proposed amendments:

- Alterations to the ground and first floor rear elevation (increasing the size and design of the ground and first floor windows) have been omitted and this elevation has reverted to the previously approved planning permission;
- Proposed railings to the second floor terrace have been omitted and the front elevation has reverted back to the previously approved brick parapet wall;
- The proposed removal of the terraces and bringing forward the second floor in line with the floors below has been omitted

3.0 Design

3.1 The general design of the building is to remain broadly in line with the approved scheme (2010/0109/P). To allow light into the basement accommodation a new lightwell at the rear of the property is proposed with a basement level floor to ceiling height window. The lightwell is proposed to be covered with a metal grille. As the lightwell and window is proposed at basement level, not visible from the street or from neighbouring gardens or properties the proposals lightwell and basement window is are not considered to be of an acceptable design.

3.2 To the front elevation the second floor terraces are proposed to be a depth of 0.6m from the front elevation rather than the 0.9m which was previously approved. This means that the second floor will be bought forward at these points. Due to the presence of the parapet wall and the fact that the second floor remains set back from the lower floors and is still read as being a subservient addition to the building. The minor alterations to the depth of the terraces are therefore considered acceptable in terms of design

3.3 No further alterations to the front or rear elevations or the roofslope are proposed or included within this application.

4.0 Amenity

4.1 Due to the windows to the rear elevation being the same size and design to those which were previously granted permission, it is not considered that any additional amenity concerns will arise from the recommended approval. The proposed alterations to form a basement lightwell are located behind an existing party wall and are at basement level. Therefore it is not considered that the proposals to the rear elevation would have a detrimental impact on the neighbouring properties in terms of loss of outlook, overlooking or sunlight and daylight. The proposals are therefore considered to be acceptable.

4.2 Due to the minimal alterations proposed to the depth of the roof terraces to the front alterations it is considered that the additional internal floorspace and repositioned windows at second floor will not have a detrimental impact on the amenity of neighbours.

5.0 cycle parking

5.1 A condition added to the previous permission in relation to cycle parking was discharged in November 2010. Within the internal alterations proposed, the cycle storage is sought to be relocated into the basement instead of being location at ground floor level. The Council's transport officer has looked at the application and as the internal circulation space is sufficient to get cycles down to the basement, no objection is raised to this element and the condition is not proposed again.

5.2 Further internal amendments are not subject to planning control, as this property is not a listed building.

6.0 A section 106 legal agreement was signed in relation to the previous planning permission 2010/0109/P. Therefore a Deed of Variation is required in relation to this application to secure the heads of terms associated to the previous permission including:

- Construction Management Plan
- Post Construction BREEAM report
- Highways contribution of £3,500 to repave the highway

Recommendation: Grant Planning Permission subject to a Deed of Variation Agreement

Decision route to be decided by nominated members on Monday 6th December 2010. For further information see

http://www.camden.gov.uk/ccm/navigation/environment/planning-and-builtenvironment/planning-applications/development-control-members-briefing/