Delegated Rep Members' briefing		port A	Analysis sheet		Expiry Date:	23/03/2007			
					Consultation Expiry Date:	01/03/2007			
Officer				Application No					
Jenny Fisher				2006/4876/P					
Application A	Address			Drawing Numbers					
25 Shelton St London WC2H 9HT				<u> </u>					
PO 3/4	Area Tea	m Signature	C&UD	Authorised Of	ficer Signature				
Proposal(s)									
Variation to previously approved schemes including alterations to residential mix (Class C3) a court yard roof light and the roof as amendments to planning permission granted subject to a section 106 legal agreement dated 29th July 2005 (ref. 2005/1394/P) and as varied by planning permission dated 7th July 2006 (ref. 2006/2095/P) (for the refurbishment of fire damaged building).									
Grant planning permission with conditions and a S.106 Deed of Variation									
Application 1	Full Planning	Permission							

Conditions or Reasons for Refusal:	Refer to Draft Decision Notice									
Informatives:										
Consultations		<u> </u>				<u> </u>				
Adjoining Occupiers:	No. notified	13	No. of responses	00	No. of objections	00				
Summary of consultation responses:		<u> </u>	TVO. CIGORIOTIIO	00		<u> </u>				
CAAC/Local groups* comments: *Please Specify	Covent Garden CAAC  In general the committee considers the variations to be acceptable on the basis that efforts are being made to conserve historical detail of the important south elevation.  Covent Garden Community Association Comments dated 15/02/2007: concerned about lack of clarity. [NB These comments received before a second set of drawings was delivered. Officer arranged the second set in order for ease of understanding].  Comments dated 29/03/2007  a. Believe dormer proposed on west side of roof (drawings (VA) 220 ar 221) unacceptable in volume and impact on building outline.  b. Moving position of lift shaft (drawings (VA) 206, 207 and 214) undertaken months ago and should have been submitted in earlier applications.  b. Dormer box proposed looks an afterthought to the consented refurbishment scheme and as such must not be allowed.  c. Consider new roof dormer and re-siting of lift overrun a serious material alteration as opposed to the other changes which the Community Assoc. consider minor amendments to the consented scheme. Should be submitted as a separate application.  d. Ask for confirmation that the new dormer box does not reduce daylight to roof velux of flat G 40 Earlham Street.  OFFICER COMMENT  a. The dormer to the west side of the roof was approved 29/07/2005 (reg. No. 2005/1394) (drawing PL (03) 220).  b. Relocation of the lift over run is part of the current application, and although an application should have been made earlier, it can be considered now.  c. There is no reason why all the amendments cannot be considered a one application.  d. The dormer is not new to the scheme and was previously approved.  The merits of each of the proposed amendments are discussed in detail in the assessment of the report.									

**Site Description** 

25 Shelton Street lies east of Seven Dials and north of Long Acre. The building is a late 19th century former merchant building, which historically formed part of the Woodyard Brewery that occupied a great number of buildings within Shelton Street and nearby Langley Street. Although the building is not considered to be of sufficient architectural merit to warrant listing, it does form part of a townscape pattern of warehouses in the immediate vicinity and has been identified as making a positive contribution to the conservation area. The building lies within the Central London Area and an Archaeological Priority Area as defined by Camden's UDP.

In 1999 the building was damaged by fire, which destroyed much of the two top floors and caused widespread damage to the lower levels. The building remained vacant and covered by scaffolding and tarpaulin for some time. It is in a poor state of repair, but appears to be structurally sound. The internal layout is of some interest with cast iron columns throughout all floors. The site was the subject of an application to DCMS for listing, however the application failed and the building was not listed.

The original building, within office use, comprised five floors, basement and a mezzanine level. The courtyard, accessed from Earlham Street through an alleyway under 36-40 Earlham Street, was originally used as a means of escape, for car parking and refuse storage. Since the 1999 fire, the courtyard has been boarded up.

The site is located within the Covent Garden Area of Central London, and is within the Seven Dials Conservation Area

## **Relevant History**

The site has an extensive planning history, and the following two decisions are the most relevant, as they are the proposals the current application seeks to amend:

**2005/1394/P** planning permission granted 29/7/05 for the refurbishment of the existing fire damaged building to create office use (Class B1) at basement and ground floor levels, and 14 self contained flats above (Class C3); together with external alterations including lead clad dormer addition to west roof slope, replacement windows and doors.

**2006/2095/P** planning permission granted 7/7/06 for use of basement and ground floor for an alternative use, as either retail (A1) or health and beauty spa (sui generis), or a combination of the two.

### Relevant policies

Replacement UDP S1, S2, SD6, B1, R1, R2 and R6

SPG for Central London; Seven Dials (Covent Garden) Conservation Area Statement

#### **Assessment**

The proposed alterations are described and assessed below:

### Relocated refuse room Drawings PL (VA) 206 rev. A 207 rev. A 300 rev. B and 307

The approved scheme drawings show a basement refuse room with collection from the residential entrance via a platform hoist. This arrangement was originally proposed to avoid the need for a bin store off the Shelton Street frontage. However the consequence is that residents would be using the same entrance/exit used for refuse collection. A separate ground floor refuse room is therefore proposed to the south/east corner of the site accessed directly off Shelton Street. This would speed up the collection process and reduce any amenity nuisance to residents. The sill to an existing door would be lowered and a hardwood door installed within a steel frame with a grey louvred vent above the door, the details of which are reserved by condition. It is considered that the originally proposed grey steel door would harm the appearance of the building and character of the conservation area, and the proposed installation of a hardwood door is considered an improvement and as a consequence approval is recommended. An informative should be attached to remind the applicant that an application for the installation of shop front will be required.

# Redesigned residential entrance doors and ground floor render and associated stringcourse. Drawings 045.PL.(VA)221 Rev. A and 308

The existing granite surround to the residential access and the adjoining window would be retained. The previously approved scheme included decorative steel grilles around the residential access and steel gates across the entrance. Retaining the granite surround is welcomed, as is the restoration of the decorative lintel above the door as it is an attractive feature of the original building. Hardwood doors would be installed.

The previous proposal included extending the existing render covering to the lower sill level of the first floor windows, however since this cannot be carried out without damaging the brickwork beneath, the applicant now proposes retaining the existing render, making good where necessary, and running the string course around the lower part of the windows.

## Redesign lift, stair and service risers Drawings 045.PI(VA) 214 and 240

Main service core has been relocated and redesigned to reduce the amount of original building fabric that would need to be removed. In the previous schemes the lift overrun and riser duct termination was located in the centre of the pitched roof of the building, and it is proposed to move them to the western dormer roof. The height of the overrun would be reduced in comparison to the previous schemes and would be less visually intrusive and have a lesser impact on sunlight and daylight.

### Removal of void at first floor level over Shelton St. entrance Drawing PL (VA) 208

It was previously proposed to have a void at first floor level over the main entrance to the ground floor unit. Having opened up the ground floor it has been discovered that there is sufficient headroom without the need to remove this section of the existing floor. Therefore additional residential space can be provided at first floor level.

### Residential mix Drawings 045.PL (VA) 208 - 213

The approved mix of units is 1 x 1 bed, 10 x 2 bed, and 3 x 3 bed flats. The proposed mix is 12 x 2 bed and 1 x 4 bed flats. The proposed mix is considered to be acceptable, but would require an increase in the educational contribution (which would increase from £64,186 to £67,263) as part of the S106 agreement.

### Courtyard roof light Drawings 208 and 220

The approved scheme included a flat rooflight in the roof over the rear courtyard. The proposal is to

have a lantern rooflight in its place. The size of the rooflight is not increased and the more traditional rectangular lantern form is more in keeping with the industrial character of the building.
Gable ends facing materials Drawings 045.PL/ (VA) 240
The approved scheme incorporated a lead finish to the gable ends of the roof, and the current proposal is to change this to natural slate to match the slates used elsewhere on the roof.
The proposed amendments to the approved scheme will lead to an overall improvement in the appearance of the building. The impact on the amenity of neighbours will not be significantly altered, and the relocated lift shaft will be lower and no closer than that approved, and so will have slightly lesser impact. A S106 deed of variation is required to address the increased educational contribution.