

LONDON BOROUGH OF CAMDEN REPORT FOR DECISION UNDER DELEGATED POWERS

Officer:- Vanessa Leadra	Application Number(s): 9802473
Application Address 10 Carfield Place New Is.	Drawing Numbers 01, 02, 03, 04
Signature - Area Team:- SW	<div style="border: 2px solid black; padding: 5px; transform: rotate(-5deg);"> <p style="margin: 0;">31 AUG 1999</p> <p style="margin: 0; font-weight: bold;">RECOMMENDATION AGREED</p> <p style="margin: 0; font-weight: bold;">ON BEHALF OF AUTHORIZING OFFICER:-</p> <p style="margin: 0; font-size: 1.2em;">[Signature]</p> </div>

SITE DESCRIPTION:- Site comprises (war damaged) lock-up garages which have ^{light} industrial use rights. ~~Previously~~ ^{newly} used mainly for car repairs, ~~the remainder~~ ^{newly closed & locked up} of the premises is used for mixed commercial + resi use. LEB station at western end of mess. Not in a CA.

PROPOSAL:- Redevelopment of site by erection of a part 3 storey, part 4 storey building comprising 7+ Class B1 units.

RELEVANT HISTORY:- pp granted 13/11/90 for redevelopment of site by erection of a part 3 storey, part 4 storey bldg comprising 7+ Class B1 units under UCO 1987. Subject to conditions for detailed elevations + mats, highways delineation, refuse storage + CP in garden if B1(c). (Expired prior to this application + unimplemented)

RELEVANT POLICIES:-
Borough Plan -

UDP - EN16 + 27 + 42 + ECT7, 11, 13 - employment uses
TR 13 - private non-resi parking

Others - Parking Standards in SPG. DS9, 10 + 11

CONSULTATIONS:- Adjoining Occupiers Number Notified 73 No. of Responses 3 letters No. of Objections 1

CAAC/Local Groups Comments:- <hr style="width: 20%; margin-left: 0;"/>	<p>Summary of Consultation Response:-</p> <p>Letters from Carfield Place Resi Ass 4 (c/o 21 Carfield Place) - <u>object</u> - inappropriate devlpt in terms of size + nature of use. Attached previous objⁿ to earlier scheme. Include - condition of roadway, impact on area, commercial enterprise only, height + design unacceptable amenity issues, increase in traffic parking</p>
---	---

ASSESSMENT:-

- this proposal for redempt is the same as that granted PP in November 1990. Scheme not implemented + expired
- this ^{scheme} was negotiated in terms of design, bulk + amenity + prop use considered acceptable in this news. At that time, the scheme provided a 'rationalisation + improvement to CP + servicing in the news'
- unfortunately for applicant, the whole concept of parking/transport has changed in draft UDP → now discouraged. Proposal still shows 1150 sqm of gfa for BI use - the current standards would allow a max. of 1 CP space. Scheme shows 7 (altno not clear quite how this is achieved) CP spaces. Issues also over off-street servicing for this proposal.
- no good reasons given by applicant (see correspondence) as to an exception to rule. Considered that further traffic generation in vicinity (it is already appalling w/ + around site) will exacerbate current problems.
- considered by traffic engineers that sufficient to warrant refusal of PP.
- principle of BI use + amenity issues still considered acceptable
- design acceptable in principle (bulk + massing relates to news). Detailed design would be subj to condition if parking etc acceptable
- long delays in this one. Agreed with agent that scheme would be re'ded for refusal accordingly

RECOMMENDATION:-

RP.

Refuse for the following reasons:-

Approve subject to the following conditions:-

Conditions/Reasons for Refusal :-

The proposal would not comply with the Council's policies for the provision of car parking ^{and servicing} as set out in the draft U.D.P. and S.P.G. ~~It~~ would result in an excessive amount of the site being used for parking purposes and would encourage further traffic generation to the vicinity of the site.

Reasons for Conditions:-

Informatives:-