

APPENDIX 1 - CONSULTATION

08 SEP 09

From: Iain Clavadetscher [mailto:IainC@clavadetscherhoffmann.com]
Sent: 08 September 2009 17:05
To: Quigley, Elaine
Cc: Soma Hajnal
Subject: 26 West Street

Dear Elaine

Further to our meeting on site at 26 West Street 4 sept 2009 I confirm the following:

Traffic raised concerns about ground floor doors opening out onto pavement.
IC explained this was for fire escape purposes only and the ironmongery would only allow this by way of a fire escape paddle. In normal day to day use the door will open inwards.
EQ explained this would be subject to a planning condition.

Overlooking/daylight concerns - no change from current situation

It was clarified that there are no internal details of architectural merit within the existing flats.

EQ stated there had been some letters of concern regarding the third floor roof terrace from neighbouring flats at the back of 26 West Street. IC explained that these flats would not be affected as the terrace was behind the elevation parapet and on the street side of the building.

EQ explained that the additional 2No flats would be zero rated for parking permits and that this would be included in a section 106 agreement. The existing quantity (2No) of flats would remain entitled to a parking permit.

EQ explained that due to the constrained nature of the site a Construction Management Plan would be required as part of the Section 106 agreement. (We note that the current construction work at 11 West Street does not appear to have such a plan.) This in turn means the application cannot now be determined under delegated powers and will be put forward to the next planning Committee. Please confirm the Committee date?

Due to the delays in determination now incurred EQ confirmed that the Heads of Terms for the Section 106 can be prepared and issued in parallel to the run up to the Committee date. Please confirm when we can have the s106 HoT's?

Any queries please call.

Kind regards
Iain

Iain Clavadetscher SIA RIBA

CH ARCHITECTS LLP
CLERKENWELL HOUSE
45-47 CLERKENWELL GREEN
LONDON
EC1R 0EB

11 SEP 09

From: Quigley, Elaine [mailto:Elaine.Quigley@camden.gov.uk]
Sent: 11 September 2009 16:31
To: Iain Clavadetscher
Cc: Soma Hajnal
Subject: RE: 26 West Street

Dear Ian

Further to our meeting on 04/09/2009 I have now received comments from the conservation and urban design team regarding the proposal. The following issues have been raised:

Design
Policy SD25 of the Conservation Area Statement addresses the issue of roof extensions. The policy indicates that "There are limited opportunities for roof extensions as alterations to the roofscape could adversely affect the character of the Conservation Area." It is considered that there is scope for the addition of a mansard in this case, however its design must be considered carefully, given that the roofscape is visible in views north west along West Street. Due to the narrowness of the road and the mansard on the adjacent building at no.28, views of the roofscape looking south east are much more limited.

Notwithstanding this, the proposed design of the mansard is not considered acceptable. The flat topped design does not comply with the guidance contained in section 41 of Camden Planning Guidance 2006. The proposed mansard would benefit from being reduced in height as far as possible and its shape modified to a steep lower pitch and shallower upper pitch. Given that the party wall with no.24 is already partly built up, this would help to minimise the proposed mansard's visual impact.

Furthermore, the proposed fenestration to the front of the mansard is not considered acceptable, with large doors opening onto a narrow terrace. Given the visibility of the front slope, the dormers should be modestly sized and proportioned so as to reflect the fenestration pattern below. Camden Planning Guidance should also be followed in terms of the positioning of the dormers on the roof slope, both to the front and the rear.

It is also proposed to replace the existing windows with double glazed units. This is acceptable in principle. However, it is not clear why the new windows fail to follow the glazing pattern of the existing windows. The omission of the horizontal glazing bar to the ground and 1st floor casements, and the inclusion of only a single vertical transom at 2nd floor level, detracts from the visual interest of the building's elevations and is not considered acceptable.

It is proposed to replace the manually operated railings to the front entrance door with a pair of fully glazed doors. The removal of the railings and their replacement with sliding glazed doors was permitted in 2003. I have no objection to the removal of the railings. Given the recent permission it would be difficult to refuse the glazed doors as currently proposed. However, it is considered that the proposed design can be significantly improved upon, as it does not reflect the character and architectural style of the building. The insertion of a pair of solid timber doors, with a glazed fanlight within the pointed arched opening, would serve to enhance the appearance of the building.

Mix of units

The outstanding matter regarding the mix of units also remains unresolved. From the site visit, although I did not have access to all the rooms, it would appear that there are currently 2 x 3 bed units that will be converted into 2x1-bed and 2x2-bed units. As a result the proposed mix as it currently stands is contrary to Policy H8. The proposed layout should be revised to allow the replacement of at least one 3-bed unit within the conversion.

11 SEP 09 (CONT'D)

I would advise that the current proposal would not be considered acceptable and could not be supported by the Council in its current form. Due to the time restraints associated with the application it would not be possible to accept amendments to the current scheme. Please advise if your client would be willing to withdraw the application in order to address the concerns raised. If your client is willing to withdraw the application can this be confirmed in writing by Tuesday 15th September 2009. If this is not the case I will continue to process the application as it currently stands.

Outstanding matters

The requirement to submit a construction management plan has been requested by the Council's Transport Team. You have advised that the works to 11 West Street did not require the submission of this information. Having checked the Council's records it would appear that no recent planning permission has been granted for any development at this address. I have forwarded this information to the Council's Enforcement Team for further investigation.

If you have any queries regarding this matter please contact me on the above email address or the telephone number listed below.

Kind regards

Elaine

Elaine Quigley

15 SEP 09

From: Iain Clavadetscher
Sent: 15 September 2009 14:28
To: Quigley, Elaine
Cc: Soma Hajnal
Subject: RE: 26 West Street

Dear Elaine

Further to our tel con yesterday please find attached our responses to your comments below. As agreed yesterday this is to be submitted by us today in the early afternoon so that you can forward it to the Conservation and Design officer for their input. Subject to receiving comments from Conservation & Design we will then agree the way forward.

I look forward to your response.

Kind regards

Iain

Iain Clavadetscher SIA RIBA

CH ARCHITECTS LLP
CLERKENWELL HOUSE
45-47 CLERKENWELL GREEN
LONDON
EC1R 0EB

16 SEP 09

From: Quigley, Elaine [mailto:Elaine.Quigley@camden.gov.uk]
Sent: 16 September 2009 09:01
To: Iain Clavadetscher
Subject: RE: 26 West Street

Dear Ian

Thank you for the information. I forwarded it to my colleague in the conservation and urban design team yesterday afternoon so I will hopefully have some feed back this morning. I will then contact you to advise of the further comments and how to progress the application. If the comments continue to support a recommendation for refusal I will continue to progress the application for a decision today or the application can be withdrawn and a new revised application submitted.

Kind regards

Elaine Quigley

17 SEP 09

From: Quigley, Elaine [mailto:Elaine.Quigley@camden.gov.uk]
Sent: 17 September 2009 09:30
To: Iain Clavadetscher
Subject: RE: 26 West Street

Dear Iain

Further to my email yesterday I had the opportunity to discuss the proposal with the conservation and design officer and my supervisor. The additional information you submitted was useful and provided further justification of the design concept. However it was considered that the issues that were raised by my email of 11 September regarding the design of the mansard and the dormer windows were still unresolved and the proposal was still considered unacceptable. Due to time restrictions relating to the application it was necessary to complete my report and was not possible to await confirmation of a withdrawal. The application was determined within the statutory time period.

As I am away on a course this morning and have site meetings arranged for this afternoon I have enclosed a copy of the delegated report for your convenience. The reasons for refusal are listed in a separate document as I am unable to reprint the decision notice at this time. Obviously the outcome of the application will be disappointing. However if you would like to submit some revised drawings I will be happy to provide some feedback on them prior to any further submission.

Kind regards

Elaine

Elaine Quigley

17 SEP 09

From: Iain Clavadetscher
Sent: 17 September 2009 11:26
To: 'Quigley, Elaine'
Subject: 26 West Street

Dear Elaine
Thank you for your email dated Thursday 17th September. The decision you have reached is surprising and extremely disappointing, especially in context of our discussion and agreement on Monday 15th by phone and your consequent confirmation of it in your e-mail on the 16th. As you recall we agreed that should the proposal still be considered unacceptable in the current form after providing you with further information and revised drawings (on Tuesday 16th as requested on Monday), you would inform me of this and the proposal would be withdrawn.

Therefore I cannot accept the refusal and request rather to be allowed to withdraw the plans as agreed. Please let me know how this can be facilitated.

In the meantime I would appreciate a discussion to understand the nature of your concerns more clearly as we were of the opinion that our revisions had satisfied them and then I can address them in the design accordingly. I hope you agree that a ping pong of drawings back and forth without understanding clearly the nature of your concerns is not a good use of either your or my time.

I look forward to your response.

Kind regards

Iain

Iain Clavadetscher SIA RIBA

CH ARCHITECTS LLP
CLERKENWELL HOUSE
45-47 CLERKENWELL GREEN
LONDON
EC1R 0EB

t: +44 (0)20 7253 2526
f: +44 (0)20 7490 4843
m: +44 (0)7866 461 376
e: iainc@clavadetscherhoffmann.com
w: www.clavadetscherhoffmann.com

06 OCT 09

From: Iain Clavadetscher
Sent: 06 October 2009 10:58
To: Quigley, Elaine
Cc: Soma Hajnal
Subject: 26 West street

Dear Elaine

Further to our tel con yesterday please forward your and Conservation and Design comments on mansard and dormer at 26 West Street so that we can get on with making the amendments. This will enable us to get revisions to you for Thursday this week for C & D comments Thur/Fri.

As requested please forward the Construction Management Plan template/headlines from Traffic/transport under separate cover if it is not available today so that we can press on with amending the drawings.

Thanks for your help.

Kind regards

Iain
Iain Clavadetscher SIA RIBA

CH ARCHITECTS LLP
CLERKENWELL HOUSE
45-47 CLERKENWELL GREEN
LONDON
EC1R 0EB

t: +44 (0)20 7253 2526
f: +44 (0)20 7490 4843
m: +44 (0)7866 461 376
e: iainc@clavadetscherhoffmann.com
w: www.clavadetscherhoffmann.com

07 OCT 09

From: Quigley, Elaine [mailto:Elaine.Quigley@camden.gov.uk]
Sent: 07 October 2009 10:31
To: Iain Clavadetscher
Subject: RE: 26 West street

Dear Iain

Further to our telephone conversation I now enclose the comments from C&UD regarding the design of the mansard and dormer windows that were part of the refused scheme. I have attached a copy of the requirements for a Construction Management Plan. There is information relating to service management plan and cycle parking. However it is not relevant to this proposal.

In terms of the mansard roof, a shallow pitched upper slope rather than a full 15 degree slope may be more acceptable as it brings the proposal in line with Camden Planning Guidance which states that 5 degrees is the lowest you can go and still have a 'true' mansard. It also can be argued that there are other buildings without fully traditional mansards (although some of these are in Westminster and some of them are modern or much later buildings than this one) within the immediate area.

The design of the front dormer fenestration should relate to the windows below. The front dormer fenestration was considered to be over scaled, too wide and too tall. Scale and proportionality should be explored in order to provide a more acceptable solution.

The front terrace may be acceptable however having compared the submitted drawings with the street view photograph it is clear that the mansard would be apparent in relation to the neighbouring modern property's mansard. This should be carefully considered as part of any further proposal.

A full set of sections should be submitted as the proposed floor plan makes it look like the front roof slope goes up vertically rather than at a slope. It would also be necessary to submit elevations showing the profile of the raised parapet walls in relation to the adjoining properties in order to fully appreciate their relationship with the adjoining properties.

Elaine Quigley

16 NOV 09

From: Iain Clavadetscher
Sent: 16 November 2009 18:00
To: Quigley, Elaine
Cc: Maija Korpak; Soma Hajnal
Subject: 26 West street 1 of 2

Dear Elaine

Further to our recent discussions please find attached
A) revised plans for 26 West Street addressing your concerns as follows:
1) The top floor flat has been revised to be a 3 bed unit and the total mix now stands as 2x1-bed, 1x 2-bed and 1x 3-bed. We trust this to be in accordance with Policy H8.
2) The proposed mansard has been revised to be a true mansard (lower/upper slopes =70 degree / 5 degree). We trust this to be, as per our previous discussions, acceptable to the conservation concerns and in accordance with the section 41 of Camden Planning Guidance.
3) The dormers have been reduced in size and aligned with fenestration below. This applies to both the windows and the glazed doors opening on to the terrace. The position of the dormers on the roof slope, both to the front and rear, has been revised to follow the Camden Planning Guidance. Also the sizing and proportions of the doors to the terrace to the front has been revised to correspond and match the scale of the windows below. Rear dormer cills have been lowered to below parapet level.
4) Further detail has been added to the elevations (dwgs 20_230-232) to show the glazing intention more precisely to alleviate concerns over transoms division, sliding sash and such issues as expressed in your e-mail dated 11/09/09. We trust this to be now acceptable.
5) The proposed front entrance doors have been revised in line of your comments of the 11/09/09
6) Elevations 20_231 and 20_432 show the proposed and existing gable ends to No. 24 west street respectively.
7) We would like to clarify that the plan of the mansard roof is drawn at 1m above FFL.

B) Construction Management Plan (CMP) as required by the Council's Transport Team.

As per our previous agreement, we appreciate if you could please comment on the current proposals without prejudice to enable timely resubmission of the proposal in due time. If you require any further information or clarifications, please do not hesitate to contact me.

Kind regards

Iain

Iain Clavadetscher SIA RIBA

CH ARCHITECTS LLP
CLERKENWELL HOUSE
45-47 CLERKENWELL GREEN
LONDON
EC1R 0EB

t: +44 (0)20 7253 2526
f: +44 (0)20 7490 4843
m: +44 (0)7866 461 376
e: iainc@clavadetscherhoffmann.com

16 NOV 09

From: Iain Clavadetscher
Sent: 16 November 2009 18:02
To: Quigley, Elaine
Cc: Maija Korpak; Soma Hajnal
Subject: 26 West street 2 of 2

Dear Elaine
Please find attached Construction Management Plan.
Regards
Iain

Iain Clavadetscher SIA RIBA

CH ARCHITECTS LLP
CLERKENWELL HOUSE
45-47 CLERKENWELL GREEN
LONDON
EC1R 0EB

t: +44 (0)20 7253 2526
f: +44 (0)20 7490 4843
m: +44 (0)7866 461 376
e: iainc@clavadetscherhoffmann.com
w: www.clavadetscherhoffmann.com

26 NOV 09

From: Quigley, Elaine [mailto:Elaine.Quigley@camden.gov.uk]
Sent: 26 November 2009 11:17
To: Iain Clavadetscher
Cc: Maija Korpak; Soma Hajnal
Subject: RE: 26 West street 2 of 2

Dear Iain

Following our conversation on Tuesday regarding the revised scheme for the above property I can confirm the Council's response in relation to the amended design and the details of the construction management plan.

Amended design:
The change to the design of the mansard is welcomed and you have incorporated all of the suggestions that were provided by the Conservation and Urban Design officer. These changes include improvements to the dormers as well as the two planed mansard.

Construction management plan (CMP):
You submitted details of the CMP. I forwarded this to the Council's Transport Team and the following comments have been made.

It is generally acceptable, although some points will need to be clarified:
Construction vehicles will not be permitted to stop on the north side of West St as there are double yellow lines preventing this. Therefore the parking bays will need to be suspended on the other side for vehicles to wait and load. As this is a borough boundary road, Camden does not control the southern side of the road, so a parking bay suspension will need to be sought from Westminster for this. The CMP will need to be amended to reflect this point.
Skips will not be permitted to be set down on the footway outside the site, or on the double yellow lines. Therefore waste materials will need to be stored above a scaffold gantry built over the pavement. The CMP will need to be amended to reflect this.
In regard to further information the applicant should be made aware of the following; a highways licence will need to be obtained from Camden (outside of the planning process) for the construction of a scaffold and gantry. A gantry plan will need to be submitted as part of the highways licence application. Further, the eastbound lane of Oxford Street will be closed from Jan - Nov 2010 to allow the enabling works for Crossrail to begin, and Charing Cross Road will be closed from May 2010 till 2017. This will mean there will be a significant amount of diversionary traffic using Shaftesbury Avenue which will make accessing this site more difficult given that Shaftesbury Avenue is on the vehicle route to the site.

I hope this information is of use to you.

Kind regards
Elaine

Elaine Quigley
Senior Planner
East Area Team
Telephone: 020 7974 5117