

Address:	Coram Community Campus 49 Mecklenburgh Square London WC1N 2NY	
Application Number:	2010/4408/P	Officer: Elizabeth Beaumont
Ward:	Kings Cross	
Date Received:	12/08/2010	
Proposal: Redevelopment of the site by the erection of a three storey building for the provision of flexible Class D1 and office (Class B1) floor space with ancillary residential (Class C3) for purposes related to the provision of children and family care and associated landscaping following demolition of existing mortuary, swimming pool and Gregory House buildings.		
Drawing Numbers: Site location plan; 0903E_001; 0903E_002; 0903E_010; 0903E_030; 0903E_031; 0903E_32; 0903E_33; 0903E_500; 0903E_501; 0903E_502; 0903E_510; 0903E_520; 0903E_530; 0903E_531; 0903E_532; 0903E_533; 0903E_534; 0903E_SK108 Rev A; 12493/A0/01; 12493/A0/03; 12493/A0/04; Daylight/Sunlight dated 27 July 2010 18110685_1; Transport Assessment dated July 2010; Full Interim Travel Plan Report dated July 2010; Condition Statement dated March 2010; Sustainability Report dated July 2010; Energy integration feasibility report dated July 2010.		
RECOMMENDATION SUMMARY: Grant planning permission		
Related Application Date of Application:	12/08/2010	
Application Number:	2010/4411/C	
Proposal: Demolition of existing mortuary, swimming pool and Gregory House buildings.		
Drawing Numbers: Site location plan; 0903E_011; 0903E_040; 0903E_041; 0903E_042; 0903E_043.		
RECOMMENDATION SUMMARY: Grant Conservation Area Consent		
Applicant:	Agent:	
Coram Coram Community Campus 49 Mecklenburgh Square London, WC1N 2NY	Gerald Eve FAO. Stephenie Thourgood 7 Vere Street LONDON, W1G 0JB	

ANALYSIS INFORMATION

Land Use Details:			
	Use Class	Use Description	Floorspace
Existing	D1 Non-Residential Institution		110.25m ²
	Ancillary Residential		110.9 m ²
	B1 Office		141.9 m ²
Proposed	Flexible B1/D1 Childcare related facilities		3585m ²
	Ancillary residential		85 m ²

Parking Details:

	Parking Spaces (General)	Parking Spaces (Disabled)
Existing	11	
Proposed	4	2

OFFICERS' REPORT

Reason for Referral to Committee: this is a Major Development (Clause 3i), involves demolition in a conservation area (Clause 3v) and requires a S106 legal agreement (Clause 3vi).

1. SITE

- 1.1 The site forms part of the Coram Community Campus, delineated by the Grade II listed wall with St Georges Gardens (itself Grade II* listed on the English Heritage Register of Historic Parks and Gardens). The site is located between Brunswick Square to the west and Mecklenburgh Square to the east. There is a terrace of grade II listed houses located at nos. 43-47 Mecklenburgh Square.
- 1.2 Coram Campus is occupied by Coram and a number of related children's/family services including charitable, educational and local authority ones. The majority of the existing accommodation is located at 49 Mecklenburgh Square.
- 1.3 The site comprises a number of buildings including Gregory House, The Old Swimming Pool and a single storey mortuary building. Gregory house is a two storey 1950s building which abuts the side elevation of William Goodenough College and is currently in use an office with ancillary caretaker flat. There is a south facing balcony at first floor level located on the south east elevation of the building and windows on the north east elevation which overlook the gardens. The Old Swimming Pool building is a Victorian two storey building with a tower and pitched roof. The swimming pool abuts the mortuary, currently used as storage space. The buildings are all located to the north of the site adjacent to the listed building wall that separates the site from St. George's Gardens.
- 1.4 The neighbouring William Goodenough House is a hall of residence specialising in accommodation for overseas students, aimed at both single and married students with their families; most of whom study at various higher education institutions within Camden. It currently comprises a range of accommodation in the form of various single rooms with and without ensuite facilities, and self-contained flats with their own bathrooms and kitchens.
- 1.5 St. George's Gardens, located to the north of the site is designated as a private open space. The gardens are an early 18th century burial ground laid out as public gardens in the 19th century. The site is originally formed part of the former burial grounds, but probably during the 19th century became a separate open but walled space. The garden is enclosed from the gardens by a Grade II Listed brick boundary wall. The site is also designated a local Site of Nature Conservation Importance by English Nature and of more than local significance in the Register of Parks and Gardens of Special Historical Interest in Greater London.

- 1.6 The site is located within the Bloomsbury Conservation Area which is characterised by a number of architectural set pieces with designed and interrelated spaces, terraces and squares.

2. THE PROPOSAL

Original

- 2.1 This application seeks conservation area consent for the demolition of three buildings on site comprising Gregory House, The Old Swimming pool and mortuary building and full planning permission for the erection of a three storey building.
- 2.2 The footprint of the proposed building is approximately 1317sqm. The new building will be located 2.5m away from the listed boundary wall with St. George's Gardens. The bulk of the new building would measure 11.7m high, 64m wide and 19m deep with a ground floor side extension measuring 10m wide, 8.4m deep and 3.3m high adjacent to the boundary with William Goodenough House.
- 2.3 The new building would provide flexible B1/D1 office space for the provision of children and family care with an ancillary residential flat. The new building would create a flexible facility in order to support the development of Coram's administration, training, outreach and research programmes. The building will provide space to attract other complementary organisations to aid in the continuation of Coram's aim to meet the needs of vulnerable children and families.
- 2.4 The design replicates the previously approved scheme in terms of regular window spacing. The proposed materials include brick along the south east elevation and brick with timber slats on the north-west elevation. The proposal includes alternative areas of vertical green planting along the north-west and side elevations of the building. The proposed building has a recessed timber third storey on the north-west elevation.

Revision

- 2.2 The proposed access into the site was revised to include a separate pedestrian access and entrance gate on the Mecklenburgh Square entrance.

3. RELEVANT HISTORY

- 3.1 **09/03/2005 – p.p. and CAC (2003/1960/P & 2003/1961/C)** were refused for the redevelopment of the site by the erection of a new building comprising semi - basement, ground, first and second floors for the provision of child care facilities following the demolition of the mortuary, swimming pool and Gregory House within the Coram Community Campus.

Planning permission was refused for the following reasons - The proposed building by virtue of size, scale, height, bulk, design and location would be harmful, in particular to the setting of the adjoining open space of St. Georges Gardens and the character and appearance of this part of the Bloomsbury Conservation Area, contrary to the requirements of policies EN31 (character and appearance of

conservation areas) and EN52 (development bordering designated open space) of the London Borough of Camden Unitary Development Plan 2000.

Conservation area consent was refused for the following reason - The proposed demolition of existing buildings would be harmful to the character and appearance of the area in the absence of a suitable replacement scheme and therefore would be contrary to the requirements of policy EN32 of the London Borough of Camden Unitary Development Plan 2000.

- 3.2 **23/06/06** - An appeal was dismissed following the above refusals. The inspector considered that the main issues were 'the effect on the character and appearance of the Bloomsbury Conservation Area...and the effect on light and outlook from window in the extension to William Goodenough House'. The Inspector found that 'overall concept and realisation of the design admirable. But the design of the eastern [end] of the building requires revision'. The Inspector concluded that 'it is regrettable to have to dismiss the appeal because of a relatively small defect in design'. Therefore the main concern was the impact of the development on the sunlight/daylight of four windows at ground and first floor level in the side elevation of William Goodenough House.
- 3.3 **27/10/06 & 09/11/2007** - planning permission and conservation area consent (2006/2951/P & 2006/2952/P) approved for the redevelopment of the site by the erection of a new building comprising semi - basement, ground, first and second floors for the provision of child care facilities (Class D1), ancillary residential (Class C3) and office (Class B1) floor space and associated landscaping subject to a S106 Legal at a Development Control Committee on the 27th October 2006. The legal agreement was signed on the 9th November 2007. The planning permission is due to expire on the 09th November 2010, all the planning obligations and conditions pursuant to this condition have been completed. Conservation Area Consent expired on the 27th October 2009.
- 3.4 **22/07/2010** – Approval of details (2010/2950/P) for condition 8 (ground investigation), parts A and B and 9 (survey of listed wall), parts A and B of planning permission 2006/2951/P dated 9th November 2006 for: The redevelopment of the site by the erection of a new building comprising semi - basement, ground, first and second floors for the provision of child care facilities (Class D1), ancillary residential (Class C3) and office (Class B1) floor space and associated landscaping.
- 3.5 **10/09/2010** – Certificate of Lawful Development application received (2010/4914/P) for the implementation of extant planning permission 2006/2951/P for the redevelopment of the site by the erection of a new building comprising semi - basement, ground, first and second floors for the provision of child care facilities (Class D1), ancillary residential (Class C3) and office (Class B1) floor space and associated landscaping. [Currently being determined]

4. **CONSULTATIONS**

- 4.1 Prior to the submission of the current application Coram have undertaken their own consultation with the Friends of St. George's Gardens, Bloomsbury Conservation

Area Committee, Kings Cross Ward Councillors and a briefing meeting with Goodenough College.

- 4.2 The Council carried out its own consultation comprising 185 consultation letters and the erection of 5 site notices on the 22/09/2010 to the 13/10/2010 on both entrances to the Coram's site and all entrances to St. George's Gardens. A press notice was also printed in the Ham&High on the 02/09/2010.

Statutory Consultees

- 4.3 English Heritage – comment as follows;

- We understand that the scheme is similar to that previously approved in 2006 and acknowledge that the bulk and design of the building is an improvement over that scheme. Within this context we feel that it would be difficult to object to the current proposal, but are of the view that the proposal could be further improved in respect to the setting of the adjacent heritage assets those being St. George's Gardens and associated listed tombs and boundary wall. The proposed building would form the backdrop to views from other heritage assets and in our opinion, would be likely to appear as a dominant element due to its location, height and bulk.
- We would recommend that the scheme be amended in order to reduce the dominance of the proposed building by further breaking it up into 'pavilions' and by setting back the northern elevation of the building from the gardens or by setting back the topmost storey.
- The grant of planning permission should be subject to a S106 planning agreement which should harness the benefits of the local area.
- We also understand that the wooded area immediately to the south of the proposed new building is within the applicant's control and would urge any grant of planning permission be subject to an undertaking by the applicant to remove the portacabin and return that space to open space.

Other bodies

- 4.3 Thames Water – comments as follows:

- Surface Water Drainage - With regard to surface water drainage it is the responsibility of a developer to make proper provision for drainage to ground, water courses or a suitable sewer. In respect of surface water it is recommended that the applicant should ensure that storm flows are attenuated or regulated into the receiving public network through on or off site storage. When it is proposed to connect to a combined public sewer, the site drainage should be separate and combined at the final manhole nearest the boundary. Connections are not permitted for the removal of Ground Water. Where the developer proposes to discharge to a public sewer, prior approval from Thames Water Developer Services will be required. They can be contacted on 0845 850 2777. Reason - to ensure that the surface water discharge from the site shall not be detrimental to the existing sewerage system.
- Thames Water would advise that with regard to sewerage infrastructure we would not have any objection to the above planning application.

- Water Comments - On the basis of information provided, Thames Water would advise that with regard to water infrastructure we would not have any objection to the above planning application.

4.4 Save Britain's Heritage – object for the following reasons;

- Although unlisted these structures are two rare surviving elements of the Foundling Hospital, demolished in 1926. The pool was constructed in 1900 and the mortuary dates from 1880. Both buildings are situated within, and make a positive contribution to, the Bloomsbury Conservation Area.
- Although converted to office use, the exterior of the single-storey pool building survives little altered - retaining its entrance, windows and chimney. There are also attractive details including stone quoins which make a pleasing contrast to the yellow brickwork. Inside, the pool basin, now covered, extends beneath a raised glazed clerestory visible behind the central pedimented façade. The mortuary is a simpler building of red brick, but it is clearly of interest and, again, is relatively little altered.
- In light of the contribution these two buildings make to the conservation area, particularly in terms of their historic significance, the substantial harm that their loss would cause, and their obvious capacity for reuse as part of a new development scheme, we urge you to **refuse** this application.

4.5 Victorian Society – object for the following reasons;

- We understand that there is an extant permission for the demolition of these buildings and Gregory House and that this was decided at appeal. However we feel that under the new guidance for planning and the historic environment (contained in PPS5) requires that the potential demolition needs to be reassessed. The Victorian Society feels strongly that the two Victorian buildings make a positive contribution to the conservation area and are an important physical reminder of the history of this area of London. The Foundling Hospital is important in the social history of this country, established by Captain Thomas Coram as one of the great philanthropic institutions known as 'hospitals', its mission was to deal with the vast numbers of orphaned children in London in the eighteenth-century. Architecturally the hospital was simple, elegant and practical with a large cloistered chapel at its centre. The main buildings contained some fine interiors which were recognised as being sufficiently valuable as to be salvaged and reconstructed in what is now the Foundling Museum, many fittings from the chapel were also salvaged and relocated. The demolition of the hospital in 1926 has long been recognised as a great loss for this area of London.
- The Foundling Museum and the architectural layout of Coram's Fields is an important reminder and legacy of the Foundling Hospital. It is therefore inconsistent that the Thomas Coram Foundation for Children is applying to demolish two of the few remaining Hospital buildings.
- The swimming pool and mortuary date from the late nineteenth century and remain surprisingly intact both externally and internally. The swimming pool building has charming if simple entrance elevation and an attractive profile with its lantern roof. The mortuary is a poignant reminder of the high rates of childhood mortality in London. It retains its glazed tiles internally and externally is simply dressed in stock and red brick. Both these buildings are testaments to the move towards an increased understanding about sanitation and health in the nineteenth century. The

two have a low profile and form an ensemble with the listed wall to the gardens behind.

- Due to their historical associations, the rarity of remaining Foundling Hospital buildings and their aesthetic values these buildings are heritage assets and they should not be demolished (PPS 5, HE7). The Society has received enquiries from concerned members of the public, illustrating that they are still valued by the community.
- Both the mortuary and swimming pool are currently used largely for storage, and in the case of the swimming pool, partly as offices. For well-constructed buildings they are underused; the swimming pool would adapt to a range of uses easily; its internal space being well-lit and large. To demolish them would be highly wasteful and is an unsustainable approach to the historic environment (PPS5, HE1).
- The remit for the proposed building is that it should provide for a wide-range of needs in a flexible manner. This could be achieved by retaining the nineteenth-century buildings, demolishing Gregory House and extending the swimming pool. The result would be a far more interesting, sustainable and sensitive scheme. The proposed building is bland and too bulky for this part of the conservation area.

Conservation Area Advisory Committee

4.6 Bloomsbury CAAC – Comment as follows;

- This is an improvement on the previous permitted scheme. We would like to see samples of the brick and the timber cladding.

Local Groups

4.7 Friends of St Georges Gardens – Support the application and comment as follows;

- We are of course sad at the prospect of losing the existing, Victorian brick buildings which form an unobtrusive, and not unpleasing, backdrop to the south-eastern boundary of the Gardens (not so regarding Gregory House, which has never laid claim either to unobtrusiveness nor beauty!). However we appreciate that permission for their demolition is already in place, and that Coram's need for a modern building to meet 21st Century standards is becoming urgent.
- We are of the view that the proposals now under consideration offer material improvements to Coram's previous plans. The new building would, we believe, be a more sympathetic background to the Gardens than that approved in 2007, and its impact would, to some extent, be ameliorated by the perspective offered to the Coram site through the gap between the new building and Goodenough House. This would emphasise the historical linkages between the two sites.
- We do have some concerns regarding possible impact to the listed boundary wall and would ask that sufficient safeguards are put in place to minimise the risk of damage.
- We would also ask that great care is taken before approving the colouration of the north-facing elevation of the new building.
- The proposed Coram building will be very much closer to the Gardens, and the effect of the contrast with the brick boundary wall will therefore be all the greater. We appreciate it's impossible to "match" the brick and recreate the effect of the current Victorian buildings, which blend in so well; but we hope the final finish will be unobtrusive and will weather over the years to a suitably

mellow finish. Having said this, although the preferred finish at first sight looks very blue, it may well be the best choice to blend in.

Adjoining Occupiers

	Original
<i>Number of letters sent</i>	185
<i>Total number of responses received</i>	22
<i>Number of electronic responses</i>	16
<i>Number in support</i>	0
<i>Number of objections</i>	22

- 4.8 The following letters of objection were submitted from - Flat 007, 623, 718, 737, 5623, 5707, 5727 (x2), 5728, 5833, 5842 William Goodenough House, 2 St Ann's House, Margery Street, 61 O'Donnell Court, The Brunswick Centre, 16 Laystall Court, Mount Pleasant, 47 Mecklenburgh Square (x3), Flat 6, Thackeray House (x 2), Herbrand Street (x 2), 14 Rugby Street, Flat 5 Churchill Court - 40 Laystall Street, 11 Ampton Street, and 18a Heriot Rd, Hendon. The main issues are as follows:

4.9 Amenity

- Loss of sunlight/daylight to residential windows due to the distance and orientation of the new building.
- Proposal will overshadow the gardens
- Loss of privacy/outlook from windows on the side elevation of new building.
- The new buildings will overlook the nursery school and may intrude on the privacy of the children.
- Loss of public and private space
- Smell nuisance and fire hazard due to the bin stores
- Noise nuisance due to the proposed plant and electricity substation, from number of potential office workers and from construction.
- Concerns with the hours of operation of the new use
- Loss of natural light and creation of lightspill.

Consultation

- Lack of thorough and detailed consultation with residents of William Goodenough House and parents of the nursery.

Bulk/scale

- Inappropriate scale and bulk, proposed building is much larger than the existing buildings on the site and those to be demolished and the building previously approved.
- New building will remove much of the open space and courtyard.

Occupancy

- Building would house an inappropriate large number of employees.
- The traffic study concludes that no extra traffic would be generated. However there are a lot less staff currently on site.

Masterplan

- The current application is only for part of the campus, there should be coordinate coherent approach to planning.

Use of the building

- References to the 'Coram campus' are hard to envision given the lack of information as to the relation of this new building with the rest of the campus, or plans of development or rebuilding of the rest of the campus.
- The applicant states that the proposal does not involve the gain or loss, this is not true.
- As the proposal is for flexible D1/B1 use the applicant would be able to let the building for any business use. Potentially it could become a call centre, light industrial or commercial office.
- This development would adversely affect the functioning, access, space and safety of the nursery at Thomas Coram Children's Centre.

Transport

- Inconsistency between the proposed number of spaces
- The proposed building will restrict access to the nursery and Parents' Centre and to fire engines getting close to the nursery buildings.
- Impact of parking as the site already lacks adequate parking.
- The proposed access via Mecklenburgh Square is a peaceful residential street, as are the surrounding streets. The new building will generate a vast increase to the traffic from employees, visitors, taxis, deliveries and so on.
- An increase in traffic is likely to be particularly problematic given the large numbers of very young children who use this route to access the nursery.

Design

- Object to the proposal to create a monolithic, three-storey structure
- The proposed building will be too close to the existing nursery-school building on the site, and to the adjacent buildings in Mecklenburgh Square.
- historic buildings would be demolished
- Large swathes of West Central London are of historic significance (nationally and internationally) and much of the local architecture reflects this history. This development would precipitate a wilful demise of an important part of London.

Loss of trees - loss of trees with no replacements proposed

Cycle parking

- The applicant states there are no parking spaces and that 20 will be created. This is not true. Actually 12 spaces exist.

Impact on the nursery

- The services for children in the area will be detrimentally affected.
- The plan includes building on the nursery's current outdoor space and giving the children a much smaller, darker space, enclosed by a high wall which is listed and therefore cannot be removed.

- The 'Construction' section of the 'Transport Assessment' does not explain how access to the Coram Nursery and Kindergarten are to be maintained during construction

A report was also submitted on behalf of Goodenough College by Colliers International. The issues are as follows -

- Consultation was brief and did not include the Sunlight/Daylight Report.
- Certain tests were not undertaken internal layouts were unavailable. Internal layouts were however easily available. Both the VSC and ADF should be undertaken. The ADF was not undertaken.
- The proposals will not safeguard the amenities of the existing occupiers or the guidance in the CPG.
- Sunlight – it is considered that, although the applicant advises that a number of the windows would receive 4% annual probable winter sunlight, it should be noted that this situation is worse than the previous approved scheme in which all the tested windows were fully compliant with the BRE guidance.
- A number of windows will see their winter sunlight reduced by up to half their current level.
- Loss of privacy – there should be a distance of 18m. There is only 12m with the proposed scheme.
- Outlook – the width of the three storey building would be wider than the current buildings and the approved scheme. The gap between the buildings is not considered to be sufficient to compensate for the larger width and the lack of a setback of the top storey.
- The electric cupboard would be positioned right on the boundary with William Goodenough House and bin storage would be on the boundary with residential windows at basement level.
- Nuisance from noise, light spillage, air conditioning.

5. POLICIES

5.1 Replacement Unitary Development Plan 2006

SD3 (Mixed Use Development)
SD6 (Amenity for Occupiers and Neighbours)
SD7 (Light, Noise and Vibration Pollution)
SD8 (Disturbance)
SD9 (Resources and Energy)
B1 (General design principles)
B3 (Alterations and extensions)
B7 (Conservation Areas)
C1 (New Community Uses)
C2 (Protecting Community Uses)
E2 (Retention of Existing Business Uses)
N2 (Protecting Open Space)
N5 (Biodiversity)
N8 (Ancient Woodlands and Trees)
T1 (Sustainable transport development)
T2 (Capacity of transport provision)
T3 (Pedestrian and Cycling)

T7 (Off-street parking)
T8 (Car-free housing and car capped housing)
T9 (Impact of Parking)
T12 (Works Affecting Highways)

5.2 **Supplementary Planning Policies**

Camden Planning Guidance 2006
Bloomsbury Conservation Area Statement

5.3 **LDF Core Strategy and Development Policies**

The Inspector's Report into the Camden Local Development Framework Core Strategy and Development Policies Development Plan documents ("DPD"s) was published on 13th September and found the policies in the DPDs to be sound.

This means "considerable weight" can now be given to these LDF policies even though at this stage they have yet to be formally adopted by the Council. Where there is a conflict between UDP policies and these LDF policies the planning Inspectorate would consider it reasonable to follow the latter .

Core Strategies

CS1 (Distribution of growth)
CS5 (Managing the impact of growth and development)
CS8 (Promoting a successful and inclusive Camden economy)
CS10 (Supporting community facilities and services)
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)

Development Policies

DP1 (Mixed use development)
DP13 (Employment sites and premises)
DP15 (Community and leisure uses)
DP16 (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)
DP21 (Development connecting to the highway network)
DP22 (Promoting sustainable design and construction)
DP24 (Securing high quality design)
DP25 (Conserving Camden's heritage)
DP26 (Managing the impact of development on occupiers and neighbours)
DP28 (Noise and vibration)
DP31 (Provision of, and improvements to, open space, sport and recreation)

However prior to formal adoption UDP policies should still be taken into account as the Council's adopted Development Plan

6. **ASSESSMENT**

6.1 The principal consideration material to the determination of this application and summarised as follows:

- Principle of demolition
- Bulk/height/position and detailed design
- Impact on St. George's Gardens and the listed wall
- Amenity of neighbouring occupiers
- Sustainability/Biodiversity
- Transport issues
- Trees/landscaping

6.2 The main differences between the previously approved scheme (2006/2951/P) and the current scheme are as follows;

- The previously approved building measured approximately 77m (length) x 15m (width). The proposed building would measure 64m (length) and between 10m and 19m (width). The bulk of the new building would be 0.3m lower than the previously approved scheme.
- The proposed position of the building would be similar to the previous scheme with 44sqm less floorspace.
- The previously approved scheme was a three storey building with lower ground floor level. The new building would be three storeys in height with the omission of the lower ground floor level.
- The top storey is set further back than the approved scheme.
- Revised design of the new building incorporating brick, timber panels and vertical green walls.
- Recessed sections or 'breaks' are introduced at second and third floor level
- The proposed building would be set back at first and second floor level to create a gap between the new building and the neighbouring William Goodenough House.
- In place of dedicated B1/D1 space the proposed use of the building would be flexible B1/D1 space to attract complementary uses for the purposes related to children's services, education and research.
- The new scheme proposes the installation of an EDF substation and transformer box.

6.3 Permission is sought for a new scheme as the future needs of Coram are changing and a more flexible building would be better suited to their requirements.

Principle of demolition

6.2 The principle of demolition of the three buildings was allowed in 2006 (2006/2951/P) following the Inspector's decision in 2006.

6.3 In the original assessment of the refused scheme (2003/1960/P) it was considered that Gregory House was a bland and utilitarian post war building. The Victorian

swimming pool was considered to be of some interest, yet its lack of visibility from the public realm and blank elevation to St Georges Gardens resulted in it only making a relatively neutral contribution to the character and appearance of the Bloomsbury conservation area. The mortuary chapel was considered to be a simple brick box of no architectural interest whatsoever.

- 6.4 In the 2006 appeal decision the Inspector considered the contribution of the existing buildings in some detail and generally reinforced officer's views. The Inspector outlined that the swimming pool had an interesting and detailed elevation to the south and that the tall chimney added a visual focus to the site. Furthermore, the use of the swimming pool and mortuary reflected the Victorian phase of the Foundling Hospital. However, the Inspector concluded that the elevation presented by these buildings to St Georges Gardens was dull, and detracted from the overall appearance of the area. The contribution that they made, both in architectural and historic terms was "neutral at best."

Gregory House

- 6.5 It is considered that this is an unattractive post war block, which detracts from the appearance and ambience of St George's Gardens. It has no discernible architectural or historic interest and is considered to make a negative contribution to the character and appearance of the Bloomsbury Conservation Area.

Mortuary building

- 6.6 This is a single storey stock brick building with red dressings to the doors. Whilst it does have some historic interest and significance as part of the wider Coram campus, its intrinsic architectural merit is extremely limited. It is considered that it makes a neutral contribution to the character and appearance of the Bloomsbury Conservation Area.

Swimming pool

- 6.7 This is the most interesting building within the group. It is accessed from within the Coram campus and it is here that it has the most aesthetic and architectural impact, with interesting massing and stone dressings to its pedimented entrance porch. However, its public elevation to St Georges Gardens is blank, with only the tall chimney adding any visual interest. Internally the building is plain and has been crudely converted to office and storage use. There are some vestiges of its former use, such as panels of plain glazed tiles and the rooflights that run the length of the building. It is considered that the building has some architectural and historic significance, mostly within the context of the wider Coram campus. However, the parts of the building that make the most contribution to the character and appearance of the Bloomsbury Conservation Area are only visible from within the Coram site, with the public face of the building making a neutral contribution. This conclusion is broadly in line with the assessment of the refused scheme in 2003 and the Inspectors decision in 2006.
- 6.8 Since the assessment of the most recent decision by the Council in 2006, PPG 15 has been superseded by PPS 5. Policy HE9.5 is clear that *"When considering proposals, local planning authorities should take into account the relative significance of the element affected and its contribution to the significance of the*

World Heritage Site or Conservation Area as a whole.” Whilst there is a presumption in favour of the conservation of designated heritage assets, this presumption is proportionate to significance (HE9.1). Given the limited contribution of the group of existing buildings, particularly in key views from St Georges Gardens, their redevelopment is considered to satisfy the statutory requirement to preserve or enhance the character or appearance of the Conservation Area (see below for an assessment of the design merits of the new building).

- 6.9 With regard to Gregory House, which is considered to make a negative contribution, policy HE9.5 outlines that “Where an element does not positively contribute to its significance, local planning authorities should take into account the desirability of enhancing or better revealing the significance of the World Heritage Site or Conservation Area, including, where appropriate, through development of that element.” It is considered that the proposed building on the site will represent such an enhancement.

Bulk/height/position

- 6.10 The proposal follows the northern building line and height of the previously approved 2006 scheme when viewed from St Georges Gardens. The upper storey is also setback to the same degree. However, the permitted basement and raised ground floor have now been omitted in favour of level access at ground floor so as to facilitate ‘run out play’. The overall height of the building is slightly set down from but essentially the same. The floor plan of the building is deeper than the permitted scheme, however this does allow for a shorter frontage to St Georges and the incorporation of a large gap adjacent to Goodenough House.
- 6.11 The deeper footprint is not considered to unduly encroach into the Coram campus and the gap does allow for significant views from St Georges Gardens to the mature trees within the site. This creates a sense of spaciousness around the eastern end of the building and reduces its bulk and massing. Furthermore, the gap reinforces the green setting of the building and re-creates the visual link between the Coram site and the Gardens which had been lost through the construction of Gregory House.
- 6.12 The proposed rooftop plant for the building is to be set back approximately 2.5m from the north elevation of the building and screened with timber so as to minimise its visual impact from St Georges Gardens during the winter months.

Detailed design

- 6.13 The previously approved scheme was a four storey building, including lower ground floor level with a shallow pitched butterfly roof with cantilevered eaves. The approved materials comprised red cedar louvres and cladding and red brick.
- 6.14 The design of the new building has sought to achieve a clear ‘front’ and ‘back’, with the ‘back’ facing onto St Georges Gardens. This is consistent with the character of development around the Gardens, for example the extensive rear elevation of the Georgian terrace on Regents Square which bounds the northern edge of the Gardens. The building is of a simple brick design with elements of timber cladding,

notably to the attic storey. The applicants have proposed the use of 'mid tone' brick with a neutral greyish colour. During pre-application discussions the surrounding context of red and darkened stock brick buildings was raised and concerns expressed about the use of a brick that was not sufficiently responsive to the existing built environment. A condition securing a sample of the proposed brickwork (along with other materials) is recommended.

- 6.15 Trellises and climbing plants have been used to add visual interest to the Gardens elevation and soften its contours. The horizontality of the building has also been moderated, with two recesses lined with climbing plants, one shallow and one deep, and thought given to the breaking down of the massing on the end elevations (particular the east). The southern elevation facing into the campus presents a more regular and rhythmic pattern of fenestration set within brickwork bays, reminiscent of the Georgian terraces that are a key contributor to the character and appearance of the surrounding conservation area.
- 6.16 It is considered that the proposed building will present an interesting, varied and sophisticated elevation in key views from St Georges Gardens. The replacement of Gregory House will enhance the appearance of the open space, particularly given the newly created gap through to the Coram campus. The loss of the marginal contribution made by the existing swimming pool and mortuary buildings is considered balanced by the overall quality of the replacement building.

Impact on St. George's Gardens

- 6.17 The neighbouring garden is designated as public open space. Policy N2 states that the Council will not grant planning permission for development bordering public or private open space that it considers would cause harm to its wholeness, appearance and setting, or is likely to intrude on the public enjoyment of the open space. It was considered that the replacement building, approved in 2006, would not have an adverse impact on the open space.
- 6.18 This permission followed the Planning Inspector assessment of the 2003 scheme describing the atmosphere of the Gardens as one of intimacy, peace, mystery and perhaps slightly eerie in winter. The Inspector concluded that the new building, that would only be slightly taller than the existing buildings, would have a formal yet modest appearance, and would reflect and respect the formal character of the wider area, the low buildings on site and the contemplative atmosphere of the Gardens.
- 6.19 The 2006 scheme was considered acceptable due to the existing levels of overlooking on this section of the gardens from both the existing buildings on site and the neighbouring student flats. The current scheme is marginally lower than the approved scheme and introduces a gap to allow additional light into the gardens. In relation to the refused scheme the Inspector considered that there would be *'ample space for the Gardens to receive sufficient sunlight for them to remain attractive and that there is little evidence to the slight overshadowing would be harmful to wildlife or the status of the site as a Site of Nature Conservation Interest'*.

Listed Wall

- 6.20 A condition survey relating to the listed wall has been submitted with this application which appears to contain almost identical information to that used in the application ref 2010/2950/P to discharge conditions of the permitted scheme (2006/2951/P). The survey does indicate that the contractor will submit a method statement regarding measures for the protection of the listed wall during the demolition and redevelopment works and a condition to this effect should be added. Any actual works to the listed wall may require a separate application for Listed Building Consent. An informative is recommended to advise the applicant that Listed Building Consent may be required.

Principle of development

- 6.21 In the assessment of the previously approved scheme (2006/2951/P) in 2006, consideration was given to policy SD3. This policy states that any increased commercial floor space should be matched by an appropriate contribution to housing. It was considered that in this instance, given the specific nature of the applicants, requiring a housing contribution would jeopardise the viability of the scheme. It was therefore not thought necessary to seek a housing contribution and accordingly an exception to this policy was made.
- 6.22 These considerations were made after the current UDP 2006 was adopted hence they are material considerations in determining this application. However new LDF policies need to be given considerable weight (see paragraph 5.3 above). Policy DP1 of the LDF is broadly similar to SD3 in seeking to secure a mix of uses within developments. It does not represent a significant departure from the requirements of SD3, and as such it is reasonable to consider these proposals in a similar manner to that in 2007.
- 6.23 Again CS10 of the LDF identifies that the Council will seek to secure a range of services and facilities that meet community needs. In light of the above, the Council's position in terms of seeking to encourage new community facilities has not changed significantly since the original approval, and it is conceivable that in some circumstances the Council may come to a similar view as it did previously, namely that the provision of community facilities outweighs the need to secure residential accommodation under SD3/DP1.
- 6.24 In the case of the new application, the key issue is the proposed alteration to the approved scheme involving the provision of flexible B1/D1 space in place of dedicated D1 and B1 space. The applicants confirm a flexible space is required in order to provide Coram flexibility in terms of use and potential occupiers. It is recommended that, to ensure that the space remains dedicated purely to Coram as a community facility, a condition to restrict the use of the building should be attached to any decision notice. It is considered that this would be sufficient to ensure the new building could not be sub-let to private office occupiers in the future.

Daylight/Sunlight

- 6.25 In comparison to the previously approved scheme in 2006, the new building is deeper (4m) but is also set away further from the boundary with William Goodenough House and introduces a gap at first and second floor level. The existing 1950s building (Gregory House) is 7.4m in high and 13m to 16.6m deep. Part of the first floor side addition of this building is attached to the projecting side elevation of the neighbouring William Goodenough House. The remainder of the addition is only 3.4m from the western elevation of the college.
- 6.26 The previously approved building (2006/2951/P) was 15m deep and was attached to the projecting side elevation of the college at ground floor and first floor and was set away from the boundary at second floor level. The position of the new building would be similar to the previously approved scheme but would be located 10m away from the projecting side elevation and 14m from the western elevation of the neighbouring building. The new building would be between 10m and 19.2m deep. The proposed ground floor side extension (3.3m high) would be 2m from the west elevation of the college. The proposed development would be 2.9m higher than the existing Old Swimming Pool and the bulk of the building would be marginally lower than the previously approved building.
- 6.27 A simple test to assess the impact of the new development on daylight was initially undertaken. This involved drawing a 25° line projecting from the centre of the windows on the side elevation of William Goodenough House. The extension would be below this line on the windows at second floor level and above. It is therefore considered unlikely that the new building would have a substantial effect on the daylight enjoyed by the rooms on these levels of the neighbouring building.
- 6.28 A Sunlight and Daylight Report was submitted as part of the application to assess the likely impact of the development on the surrounding neighbours and occupiers. The Report assesses the impact of the development under the BRE's "Site layout planning for daylight and sunlight: A Guide to Good practice". The report takes into consideration the neighbouring building William Goodenough College, a building in use as student accommodation.
- 6.29 This report shows that daylight levels to all the windows of the adjoining property remain in accordance with BRE recommendations using the VSC analysis, either in absolute terms or in ratio of reduction (in that a 20% difference between existing and proposed daylight levels is not considered significant). In some cases the proposed VSC is higher than the existing situation.
- 6.30 Sunlight levels also generally meet the BRE criteria for all surrounding properties, either in absolute terms or in ratio of reduction (in that a 20% difference between existing and proposed sunlight levels is not considered significant). There are only two windows on the ground floor (including 1 bathroom window) and one on the first floor that would receive less than the recommended guidance. However in both cases the windows would actually receive more sunlight than at present. Furthermore the amount of winter sunlight received by these windows, again although below the minimum, would represent an overall gain compared to the existing situation. Two other windows on the ground floor (including 1 bathroom window) would both receive sufficient annual probable sunlight hours but lower

than the minimum levels of winter sunlight. However in comparison to the existing situation, the sunlight received would be increased.

- 6.31 The Report concludes that 8 windows on the ground and first floor windows on the side elevation of William Goodenough College would receive higher levels of winter sunlight in comparison to the existing levels. Furthermore in comparison to the existing levels 10 windows on the ground and first floor windows would result in an increase in annual probable sunlight hours following the development.
- 6.32 Concerns were raised with regards to windows on the side elevation of no. 47 Mecklenburgh Square at basement and ground floor level and the potential loss of sunlight/daylight. The proposed substation and bin store would not be positioned directly outside these windows. Therefore it is considered that the proposal would not have a detrimental impact on the level of sunlight or daylight in comparison to the existing situation.

Privacy/overlooking

- 6.33 As the previously approved scheme partially adjoined and was in close proximity to the neighbouring William Goodenough House, there were no windows proposed on the north east elevation. As the new scheme would be set back from the boundary with the adjoining property, windows have been introduced on the north east elevation. Concerns have been raised regarding the possible loss of privacy and increased overlooking from these windows to occupiers of William Goodenough House. The bulk of the new building would be between 10m and 14m from the side elevation of this building. Normally as recommended by CPG there should be a minimum distance of 18m between the windows of habitable rooms of different units that directly face each other.
- 6.34 The windows on the side elevation of the new building fronting William Goodenough House would be non-openable on the first and second floor levels. It is considered that to protect the amenity of neighbouring occupiers the windows on the first and second floor level to the rear of the vertical green wall should be obscured. A condition is recommended to require details of how the windows would be obscure to be submitted to and approved by the Council.
- 6.35 It is considered that the windows on the south east elevation of the proposed building would be in a similar position to the existing building. Furthermore due to the angle of the building any views into the windows on the side elevation would be oblique. It is considered that the proposal would not have a detrimental impact on the levels of privacy and overlooking for neighbouring occupiers in comparison to the existing situation.

Outlook/sense of enclosure

- 6.36 In comparison to the previously approved scheme the new building would be located further away from the side elevation of the neighbouring Goodenough College but would be deeper. Concerns have thus been raised regarding the impact of the new building extending further south in terms of creating a sense of enclosure and having an overbearing appearance on neighbouring occupiers.

- 6.37 The existing two storey 1950's building is partly adjoined to the flank wall of the college. The existing outlook from the windows along the western elevation of the building at ground and first floor level is towards the flank wall of Gregory House. The existing outlook at second, third and fourth floor level would be across the roof of the existing buildings towards the neighbouring garden and the remainder of the campus. The proposed building would be higher and wider than the existing building but the bulk of the building would be set further back and would not be attached to the college.
- 6.38 In comparison to the approved scheme the new building would be wider but would slightly lower than the approved building. The ground floor side extension would not be adjoined as with the approved scheme, but rather would be set back from the boundary with the neighbouring building and a gap is introduced between the buildings. It is therefore considered that in comparison to the approved scheme the increased width would not be sufficient to detrimentally alter the outlook or sense of enclosure for the neighbouring residents. The proposed gap would create views across towards St. George's Gardens. It is therefore considered that the development would not have a detrimental impact on the outlook or sense of enclosure for neighbouring occupiers in comparison to the existing and previously approved situation.

Hours of operation

- 6.39 The proposed hours of operation are not currently known. It is unlikely that the opening hours would be more than the existing opening hours of the office buildings. It is considered that the proposed use is unlikely to detrimentally affect the amenity of neighbouring occupiers. However it is considered that given the proximity to residential accommodation a condition is recommended to ensure no noise should be audible from the adjoining premises. A condition is also recommended to restrict the D1 use class element as there are other uses within this use class that may have different and possibly more harmful amenity impacts.

Lightspill

- 6.40 Concerns have been raised regarding lightspill from the new development. It is considered that the condition to obscure glaze the windows on the north-east elevation would lessen any potential lightspill issues and possible disturbance from the new building to the neighbouring occupiers. Furthermore it is considered that the new development would not be significantly different from the previous approved situation.

Plant/Substation

- 6.41 The proposal includes the installation of plant at rooftop level and a new EDF transformer house adjacent to William Goodenough House. An Acoustic Report was submitted with the application. In relation to the transformer house the report concludes that background levels at the west façade of the neighbouring property will not be affected. The proposed plant will be screened and attenuated in order to ensure that Camden's Noise Criterion will be met.

- 6.42 It is therefore considered that subject to conditions to ensure that the proposed screening and attenuation are installed the proposed plant and transformer house would not have a detrimental impact on the amenity of any neighbouring occupiers or residents.

Sustainability/Biodiversity

- 6.43 This scheme requires a BREEAM assessment to meet a minimum very good rating. Camden's Camden Planning Guidance also goes beyond the minimum very good score in requiring a minimum 60% score in the energy and water categories, and a minimum 40% score in the materials category. In this case the applicants' pre-assessment suggests that the minimum 'very good' score can be achieved, as can the minimum scores in the water and materials sub-categories. There is a shortfall within the energy category of the assessment, but given the overall provisions for sustainable design and construction, it would be unreasonable to refuse the application on this issue alone. A "best endeavours" exercise is recommended to be secured via a S106 Legal Agreement to seek to secure the highest targets possible within the full BREEAM submission.
- 6.44 Developments over 1,000sqm must also include provision for renewable energy on site. In line with the requirements of the London Plan, this policy has specified that new developments should aspire to meet a 20% target. If any renewable energy technology is proposed the applicant should make sure they have followed the Mayors energy hierarchy (1. use less energy, 2. use renewable energy and 3. supply energy efficiently) to show that renewable energy is not just an 'add-on'. The applicants' energy assessment follows the Mayors energy hierarchy and states that it can achieve a 20% reduction in the overall carbon emissions of the building. A number of renewable energy technologies have been assessed to meet this requirement, and the conclusion from the submitted report is that ground source heat pumps are most suited to the site to meet the necessary requirements. This is welcomed in the context of Camden LDF policy and London Plan policy

Transport

- 6.45 Vehicular access is taken to the north east of the site only from Mecklenburgh Square and this access will be retained as part of the redevelopment proposals. The site has a Public Transport Accessibility Level (PTAL) of 6a (excellent).

Access

- 6.46 The previously approved scheme retained the shared vehicular and pedestrian access into the campus from Mecklenburgh Square. The current scheme originally proposed to also retain this access. Concerns were raised regarding potential conflicts likely to be created between pedestrians and traffic. In order to address this issue a number of suggestions were proposed including setting the bin store and EDF substation further back to create a waiting area for vehicles to stop when delivery/servicing lorries are exiting the site. It was also suggested that separate pedestrian access should be provided from Mecklenburgh Square to the proposed new building.

- 6.47 The scheme was revised to incorporate a separate access for pedestrians and vehicles. The pedestrian entrance would create a direct link from the pavement to an existing pedestrian footpath in the campus. The new footpath link would link to an existing fenced pedestrian route through the campus via a crossing. The option to relocate the bin store/substation was not possible without restricting outlook/sunlight from windows on the side elevation of no. 47 Mecklenburgh Square. The campus road would then be gated off with restricted access into the Campus. The road would only be used for occasional deliveries and the small number of parking spaces. It is considered this would be sufficient to allow control of the number of vehicles entering and exiting the site and would prevent the possibility of vehicles meeting and needing to reverse in/out of the site.

Cycle Parking

- 6.45 Camden's Parking Standards for cycles states that 1 storage or parking space is required per 250 sqm for staff and 1 space per 250 sqm for visitors. On this basis for 3,585sqm of B1/D1, this equates to 29 spaces. The proposed ancillary residential unit also requires 1 cycle parking space giving a total of 30 cycle spaces. The applicant has not included provision for the required amount of cycle storage/parking in the proposed design.
- 6.46 However, there is sufficient space within the proposed layout to adequately include the required cycle parking, therefore a condition is recommended to be placed on any decision notice to ensure the provision of a minimum of 30 cycle storage/parking spaces designed to Council specifications.

Parking

- 6.47 The area for which this application has been submitted, currently has 11 car parking spaces, although within the entire site owned by the applicant there are around 31 car parking spaces overall. In relation to this application the 11 spaces within the application area are to be reduced to 6 spaces including 2 designated disabled bays. Although the Council is supportive of the proposals due to the loss of car parking in line with policy, the loss of parking off street should not have any impacts on on-street parking in the area because the site is in an area which suffers from parking stress. Therefore the B1/D1 aspects of the development should be car capped which would be secured via a S106 legal agreement.

Construction Management Plan (CMP)

- 6.48 For some developments the Council may require control over how the development is implemented (including demolition and construction) through a Construction Management Plan (CMP) secured via S106. Due to the scale of the development and the narrow access from Mecklenburgh Square, a CMP will be required which sets out how the site will operate with construction trips to and from the development etc. The CMP would be secured by S106 and should be approved before works start on site.

Servicing Management Plan

- 6.49 For some development the Council may require control over how a site is serviced through a Servicing Management Plan (SMP). Due the scale and kind of this development, the servicing vehicle trips that it is likely to generate are such that a Servicing Management Plan is required in order to mitigate any adverse impacts. The SMP should include details of the restricted gate access and how this would be managed to prevent issues of the limited and restricted access to the site. This would also be secured via a S106 legal agreement.

Travel Plan

- 6.50 A Travel Plan was secured via a S106 obligation for the previously approved scheme. The applicant has submitted an interim Travel Plan report as part of this application. It is considered that although this document is acceptable overall, it would be useful to have within the document, an intention to amend facilities for cyclists based on future demand (analysis collected through the travel surveys) in the Travel Plan Strategy section of the report. The Travel Plan is considered to be an evolving document which will change and be monitored as an on-going process. As such a Travel Plan should be secured via a S106 legal agreement.

Transport improvements in the wider area

- 6.51 It is considered that given the scale and kind of the scheme, the applicant should pay a financial contribution for additional pedestrian, cyclist and environmental improvements in the wider area in order to help mitigate the impact of the increased trips to and from this site as a result of the development. The total contribution is currently being negotiated with the applicant and will be reported to the Committee with the intention of securing it via a S106.

Waste/recycling

- 6.52 A new bin store is proposed comprising a number of waste/recycling bins. The Council's Street Environmental Services have commented that a minimum of one steel container measuring 1.7m high, 1.26m wide and 0.9m deep is required for mixed paper & cardboard, mixed glass bottles/jars, cans & plastic bottles. For residual waste an 1100 or 660 litre euro bin would be required. As the exact use of the building is unknown the number of containers required cannot be defined. It is therefore considered that there are sufficient facilities and a condition recommending the submission of detail of waste/recycling prior to the occupation of the building is not necessary.
- 6.53 Concerns have been raised regarding the impact of the bin store on the neighbouring properties. However the bin store would replace an existing bin store in the same location. The bins will comprise steel containers surrounded by a timber fence therefore it is considered that the proposal would not detrimentally affect neighbouring occupiers in comparison to the existing situation.

Trees/landscaping

- 6.54 Most of the larger Plane trees in the western portion of the campus site are the subject of a TPO. The planning permission (2006/2951/P) granted in 2006 for this site allows for the removal of 4 trees to facilitate the proposals; T010 Plane, T013A Purple Plum, T013 Beech, 014A Fig. The Inspector in 2003 in response to the loss of the large plane considered that in the context of the numerous trees in the area the loss of the tree would not be significant.
- 6.55 In addition to these trees, it is now proposed to remove a Holly (T016A) to facilitate the construction of a substation. This tree is a small specimen and its removal will not have a significant impact on the character and amenities of the site. Also 2 Sycamores are identified for removal on the grounds of good arboricultural management. T004 is a semi mature specimen causing damage to a wall. T033 is a single stem growing in conflict with a better specimen, a Field Maple. The removal of both of these trees is considered to be acceptable.
- 6.56 An arboricultural report was submitted as part of the application. This report satisfactorily demonstrates that the remaining trees on the site will not be adversely affected by the proposals.
- 6.57 It is considered that the design of the new building incorporating elements of green wall and areas of green roof will aid in the reduction of impact of the building in views from St Georges Gardens. A condition is recommended requiring the submission of details of the full landscaping strategy for the site to be approved by the Council.

Contaminated land

- 6.58 The site is located on land designated as having the potential of being contaminated. As part of the previous approval (2006/2951/P) a condition was added requesting the submission of details of ground investigation for the presence of soil and groundwater contamination and landfill gas for approval by the Council. Details were submitted (2010/2950/P) pursuant to this condition in the form of a Ground Investigation Report and were discharged on 22/07/2010.
- 6.59 It is considered that the Ground Investigation Report) which outlines the remediation scheme is sufficient for the current scheme to ensure the protection of future occupiers of the development from the possible presence of ground contamination arising in connection with the previous industrial/storage use of the site. A condition is recommended requiring that the remediation scheme should be implemented in accordance with the report and that soft landscaping must be carried out as specified unless otherwise agreed.

Crime prevention

- 6.60 The main concerns with the proposal relate to visibility and sight lines through the campus. It is considered that this has been assisted in the creation of a separate pedestrian and vehicular access improving the entrance in to the site. However it is considered that given the scale of the site and the wider campus, a Strategic Crime Prevention Plan is necessary to ensure details of proposed measures are submitted to the Council. The Crime Prevention Plan is considered to be an

evolving document which will change and be monitored as an on-going process. As such the plan should be secured via a S106 legal agreement.

Planning Obligations

- 6.61 The proposals for the Coram Community Campus include approximately 3,600 sqm new build B1/D1 space, so construction costs are likely to be between £7 and £9 million, which is above the threshold for S106 local employment and local procurement obligations. Given Coram's commitment to improving the life chances of children and young people in the borough it is considered appropriate to employ measures which will help young people gain skills and improve their chances of securing employment.
- 6.62 The UDP and the LDF both support the use of planning obligations to strengthen local communities through measures which ensure local people are able to benefit from training and job opportunities arising from major developments. Currently, in the case of all major developments where construction costs are £2m+ or where the construction phase is likely to be 52 weeks or above, the Council seeks an agreement with the developer to employ apprentices and recruit local labour during the construction phase.
- 6.63 The applicant has signed up to the following employment and local procurement obligations include the following;
- The provision of two work placements for construction trade apprentices to be recruited via the Kings Cross Construction Skills Centre, the Council's construction training centre in York Way.
 - The main contractor to liaise with staff at the Kings Cross Construction Skills Centre (KCCSC) in relation to the apprentice agreement. KCCSC are willing to assist with the recruitment of the apprentice, provision of initial training at the Centre, to provide assistance to the apprentice to find a college placement and to provide one to one mentoring and support to the apprentice during his/her on site placement.
 - An agreement to use reasonable endeavours to work with the Kings Cross Construction Skills Centre to provide opportunities to Camden residents to apply for construction vacancies on the site with a target of 15% of the construction workforce to comprise Camden residents.
 - An agreement to liaise with i-CAM2, the Council's local procurement service, in relation to the tendering of contracts and to use reasonable endeavours to provide opportunities for local businesses to tender for the supply of goods and services during the construction of the development.

7. CONCLUSION

- 7.1 The demolition of the existing buildings is considered acceptable. The replacement building is considered to be appropriate in terms of bulk, height, form and footprint, and detailed design. The building will preserve the character and appearance of this part of the conservation and the character of St. George's gardens. The new building will not harm neighbour amenity in terms of outlook, light and privacy. The proposal is not considered to detract from the public enjoyment of St. George's

Gardens. The proposed new building would not have a detrimental impact on the local transport network. The proposed use of the building for flexible D1/B1 use for the provision of children and family care is considered to be acceptable. The proposed new structure would meet sustainability and renewable energy targets.

7.2 Planning Permission is recommended subject to a S106 Legal Agreement covering the following Heads of Terms:-

- Car capped B1/D1 use
- Car free for the ancillary residential accommodation
- Travel Plan
- Construction Management Plan,
- Service Management Plan
- Contribution for pedestrian/environmental improvements in the wider area (final amount of currently under discussion)
- BREEAM Assessment
- Crime Prevention Plan
- Local employment and local procurement obligations

8. **LEGAL COMMENTS**

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

Disclaimer

This is an internet copy for information purposes. If you require a copy of the signed original please contact the Culture and Environment Department on (020) 7974 5613