

Address:	22 Gordon Street London WC1H 0QB	
Application Number:	2006/3748/P	Officer: Jenny Fisher
Ward:	Bloomsbury	Case File:
Date Received: 15/08/2006 Proposal: The refurbishment of the building together with the erection of an extension at fifth floor level and new roof extension at sixth and seventh floor levels to the existing building, the erection of a new 9 storey building with 2 basement levels in place of the existing Christopher Ingold Auditorium building together with a full height atrium link to the existing building, to provide accommodation for educational purposes. Drawing Numbers: 096/PA/010 rev01; 020; 021; 022; 023; 024; 025; 026; 027; 040; 041; 042; 043; 050/rev04; 100/rev03; 101/rev03; 102/rev04; 103/rev03; 104/rev03; 105/rev03; 106/rev04; 107/rev04; 108/rev04; 109/rev05; 112/rev05; 201/rev03; 203/rev04; 301/rev05; 302/rev03; 303/rev04; 304/rev05; 305/rev04; 306/rev04; 401/rev02; 501/rev02; 502/rev02; 503; 504; 505 The Conservation Context;; Environmental Impact Report and Summary of Design Development by Bartlett Design Group; Tree Condition Survey dated 27th March 2006.		
RECOMMENDATION SUMMARY: Grant planning permission with conditions and a S106 Agreement		
<u>Related Application</u>	15/08/2006	
Date of Application:		
Application Number:	2006/1316/C	Case File:
Proposal: Demolition of the Christopher Ingold Auditorium comprising basement, ground and first floors. Drawing numbers: 096/CVA/01; 02; 03; 04.		
RECOMMENDATION SUMMARY: Grant conservation area consent with conditions		
Applicant:	Agent:	
Director of Estates and Facilities	The Bartlett Design Group	
University College London	Wates House	
Gower Street	22 Gordon Street	
London	London	
WC1E 6BT	WC1H 0QB	

ANALYSIS INFORMATION

Land Use Details:			
	Use Class	Use Description	Floor space
Existing	D1 Non-Residential Institution		6,500m ²
Proposed	D1 Non-Residential Institution		12,500m ²

Parking Details:		
	Parking Spaces (General)	Parking Spaces (Disabled)
Existing	0	0
Proposed	0	0

OFFICERS' REPORT

Reason for Referral to Committee: The proposal involves the construction of more than 1000m² of non-residential floor space [clause (i)], the demolition of a building in a conservation area [clause (v)] and a legal agreement [clause (vi)].

Members are advised that the development is categorised as a 'major' development and the Council are keen to ensure that a development is determined with a 13-week period, including the conclusion of the recommended S106. The decision must therefore be taken by 14 November 2006.

This item was deferred from the Committee meeting of 5th October 2006 owing to lack of time.

1. SITE

- 1.1 The site on which Wates House is situated is bounded by Taviton Street to the east, Endsleigh Gardens to the north, and Gordon Street to the west, within an area of considerable architectural diversity and quality. To the southeast of the site is a grade II listed terrace of 5 x 4 storey Georgian houses in use as a student hall of residence, and to the southwest is the 7 storey Christopher Ingold building that accommodates the UCL Department of Chemistry. On the opposite side of Endsleigh Gardens is grade II listed Drayton House comprising four storeys and dating from the early 1920s that occupied by the UCL Department of Economics.
- 1.2 Wates House comprises six storeys, it was built in 1975, and is occupied by the Bartlett Faculty of the Built Environment. The main access into the building is from Gordon Street, and a second access on Taviton Street acts as the main servicing and waste collection point. The building is a brick clad structure with vertical sliding aluminium framed windows, and the top (fifth) floor is recessed slightly. There are currently around 1250 students (half are graduates), over 100 full-time academic staff, a large network of part time staff and other external professionals accommodated within the building.

- 1.3 The building to be demolished is a modern 2 storey plus basement concrete faced building that accommodates a lecture auditorium with associated plant and store rooms. It is adjacent to Wates House and is accessed from Gordon Street.
- 1.4 The buildings are within the University Precinct as identified in the Supplementary Planning Guidance for Central London. It is located within the Bloomsbury Conservation Area. The area is subject to restricted parking with parking bays on Gordon Street and Taviton Street. It is not within an area of archaeological significance. The safeguarding line of the proposed Chelsea/Hackney Underground line lays some 100m. to the south.

2. THE PROPOSAL

- 2.1 The Bartlett Faculty of the Built Environment comprises five schools. The aim is to provide additional space of a higher quality than currently provided by Wates House. This would enable all the schools to be accommodated within a single building, facilitating greater collaboration between them and enhancing operational effectiveness through shared resources.
- 2.2 The existing building would be extensively refurbished; the fifth floor would be extended and sixth and seventh floors added. The two storey Christopher Ingold Auditorium would be demolished and replaced with a new building comprising basement levels and 7 storeys over. A full height atrium would connect the two buildings, with a fully glazed elevation to Gordon Street (west), and a partially glazed elevation to Taviton Street (east). A system of walkways, bridges and stairs would be installed within the atrium. Existing lifts would be retained and two additional lifts installed.
- 2.3 The main entrance to the building would be directly off Gordon Street as existing, a bar ancillary to the main use of the building would have a separate access from Endsleigh Gardens. Recycling and waste bins would be placed to one side of an area that would also be used as a workshop goods loading bay. The bay is accessed via Taviton Street and would be secured behind a galvanised mesh panel gate set back 4.5m. behind the main building line of the adjacent terrace. Fire exits would be routed out onto Gordon Street, Endsleigh Gardens and Taviton Street.
- 2.4 Where possible separate departments have been arranged horizontally on separate floors, with some provision for space sharing. Proposed development would include space for existing staff and student working areas and include studios, seminar rooms, offices, research and computer spaces, and a library.
- 2.5 The lower basement would accommodate stores, plant room, and a chemistry lab. The basement would accommodate seminar rooms, research labs. workshop studios and mechanical plant rooms. The ground floor would accommodate multi-purpose spaces e.g. a bar, an exhibition space, and seminar and conference rooms. Research studios and a large auditorium shared by other UCL faculties would at first floor level. Second to sixth floors would accommodate open plan studios, offices and seminar rooms. A library, lecture room and faculty rooms would be located on the seventh floor.

- 2.6 The new building would have a predominantly glazed elevation to Gordon Street (west) with openable vertical aluminium louvres designed to protect computer rooms from the sun at third to sixth floor levels. The ground to second floors would be wholly glazed. The elevation to the library on the seventh to eighth floors would be part render/part glazed with a projecting copper clad pod and copper roof. The roof has been conceived as a wrapping surface linking the refurbished (Wates) and the new building together. The Taviton Street (east) elevation would have a raked façade above fourth floor level to maintain reasonable daylight to the rear of the existing terrace on Taviton Street. To combat potential problems of overlooking this façade would have limited fenestration and is copper clad to match the roof. The elevation facing the chemistry building (south) would also be raked to safeguard levels of daylight and there would be limited openings to provide some light to seminar rooms. This elevation would be glazed at ground to second floors and copper clad above.
- 2.7 The Taviton Street (east) elevation would comprise two vertical planes. One half would have translucent cladding, the other, closest to the adjacent listed terrace (20 – 24 Taviton Street), would be white render with incised shadow gap lines that reflect the scale and vertical proportions of the elevations of these houses. The upper storey would have been set back approximately 6 metres. When viewed from the junction of Taviton Street and Endsleigh Gardens, the upper storey would have been concealed. However following discussions with English Heritage and officers on site, the upper storey has been redesigned with a set back of an additional 2 metres. In addition the glazed line reflecting the adjoining cornice line has now been returned along the south elevation that faces the flank wall of 24 Taviton Street. The metal mesh panel that echoes the first floor balcony to the houses also returns to the south elevation. The intention is give added emphasis to the render as a reflection of the houses.

3. RELEVANT HISTORY

- 3.1 Plans for the redevelopment of this site have evolved since 2002 when initial discussions were held between the applicant and L.B.Camden Planning and Conservation and Urban Design Officers. In 2003 the applicant was advised that a phased scheme for the two sites to be developed separately would be unacceptable. Since then detailed studies have concentrated on internal spaces plus the design of a more integrated elevational concept for the sites. The application submitted in 2004 raised concerns about, the impact of the development proposed on daylight to a student hostel in Taviton Street, the design of the Endsleigh Street ground floor elevation, the height of the building and, bulk of the roof with particular reference to the setting of the listed terrace on Taviton Street.

4. CONSULTATIONS

Statutory Consultees

- 4.1 English Heritage Summarise revisions since previous withdrawn application: The east elevation of the proposal has been revised to increase the set back of roof storeys, and to increase the emphasis of architectural detail on the render. In addition the applicant has submitted an analysis of the conservation context, including information about the University's estate strategy.
- 4.2 Comment: Whilst the buildings to be demolished do not make a positive contribution to the conservation area. English Heritage continue to believe that the new

development would, by virtue size and appearance, adversely affect both the setting of listed buildings and the character and appearance of the conservation area in which it is located.

- 4.3 Welcome the additional set back of Taviton Street roof storey, which further reduces the impact of the building in oblique views of the listed terrace, but remain concerned at the overall impact of the proposals on the character and appearance of the conservation area, and on the setting of the listed Drayton House. The increase in height of the development above the height of the present Wates House would form an intrusive backdrop in views of Drayton House from the north side of Euston Road. Cannot concur with the applicants that this intrusive impact is 'only marginally true' in the view presented in the revised proposals.
- 4.4 The analysis of the conservation area context for the development submitted by the applicants demonstrates, as we have previously acknowledged, that the character of this street block is less cohesive than those that surround it. Agree that the affinity that many of the later buildings have with the more traditional, proportional facades of the earliest development in the conservation area may not derive from the same classical architectural language. However, consider that the proposed building represents a significant departure from this traditional character that, combined with its height and bulk, would be damaging to the character and appearance of the conservation area.
- 4.5 Whilst acknowledging the benefit of providing a single building to house the newly combined Faculty of the Built Environment, English Heritage nevertheless considers that a further reduction in the height and bulk of the building is desirable in conservation terms. Seek further amendments to minimise the effect on the setting of listed buildings, and on the character and appearance of the Bloomsbury Conservation Area.

Conservation Area Advisory Committee

- 4.6 Bloomsbury CAAC The proposed revisions make minor alterations to a scheme that is still far too big and inappropriate for this part of the conservation area.

4.7 Adjoining Occupiers

Original	
Number of Letters Sent	25
Number of responses Received	00

5. POLICIES

- 5.1 Set out below are the UDP policies that the proposals have primarily been assessed against, together with officers' view as to whether or not each policy listed has been complied with. However it should be noted that recommendations are based on assessment of the proposals against the development plan taken as a whole together with other material considerations.

Replacement Unitary Development Plan 2006

- 5.1 Camden Unitary Development Plan 2006

S1 and S2	Strategic policies <i>complies</i>
SD6	Impact on amenity and environment <i>complies</i>
SD1C	Access for all <i>complies</i>
SD3	Mixed use development <i>complies</i>
SD2	Planning obligations <i>complies</i>
SD1D	Community safety <i>complies</i>
B1	General Design Principles <i>complies</i>
SD9	Air and water quality; energy <i>complies</i>
B2	Design and layout in context <i>complies</i>
B6	Listed buildings <i>complies</i>
B7	Conservation Areas <i>complies</i>
B9	Views <i>complies</i>
N4	Providing open space <i>complies</i>
N5	Biodiversity <i>complies</i>
N8	Protected trees <i>complies</i>
SD5	Location of Development with Significant Travel Demand <i>complies</i>
T1B	Transport Assessments <i>complies</i>
T1C	Travel Plans <i>complies</i>
T3	Pedestrians and Cycling <i>complies</i>
T4	Public Transport <i>complies</i>
T7	Off - Street Parking <i>complies</i>
T9	Impact of Parking <i>complies</i>
T12	Works Affecting Highways <i>complies</i>
C1	New Community Uses <i>complies</i>

Supplementary Planning Guidance

- 5.2 Public Open Spaces para. 6.4S
Supplementary Planning Guidance for Central London
11. University Precinct

6. ASSESSMENT

- 6.1 The principal considerations material to the determination of this application are summarised as follows:

- demolition;
- design;
- sustainability;
- transport;
- amenity;
- use;
- trees;
- open space; and
- diversity

Demolition

- 6.2 Existing buildings do not make a significant contribution to the character of the Conservation Area and there is no objection to demolition proposed, provided the replacement building is considered acceptable.

Design

- 6.3 The conservation area context submitted with the current application demonstrates that the character and land use of this part of the Bloomsbury Conservation Area has been in a state of continual evolution since originally built. The application site is within close proximity to a variety of architectural styles including an original 19th century five storey terrace (20-24 Taviton Street), early 20th century buildings (Drayton House and The Wellcome Building) constructed in classical style but different in scale, and post second world war University development including the Gordon Street 'brutalist' style concrete Chemistry Building characteristic of the 1960s, the minimalist glazed infill Nanotechnology building completed in 2004 also in Gordon Street, and the Taviton Street SEES building opened in 2005 a building that reflects the current emphasis on sustainability,
- 6.4 The new building would be introduced into the urban context briefly described above. It would redefine a focal point for the campus and create a gateway into the east side of the University precinct. It is considered that the given its position at the junction of Endsleigh Gardens and Gordon Street, the new building would provide a visually interesting and contrasting built element, particularly in localised views along Gordon Street and from views into the conservation area from Euston Road.
- 6.5 The dominant view would be of the east elevation fronting Gordon Street between Drayton House and the Wellcome Building. A mature tree visible from this viewpoint would partially conceal the building. The new building would echo the height of the slightly taller Student Union building at the junction of Gower Place and Gordon Street.
- 6.6 Viewed from Gordon Square along both Gordon Street and Taviton Street, the new building would appear similar in height to the Institute of Archaeology, with buildings of various heights in between. Lightness achieved by the application of white render and by the transparency of the elevation would provide a sympathetic transition between the terrace of listed buildings and Drayton House.
- 6.7 Viewed from Endsleigh Gardens, the new building would provide a transition in scale from the domestic proportion of Endsleigh Gardens terraces to the Union Building and new Wellcome building beyond.
- 6.8 The roof form would be seen as two separate, but nevertheless related buildings, by virtue of the pronounced 'valley' introduced into the roof profile. Visual cohesion would be achieved by the copper clad roof proposed which would cover both buildings. The extensive use of copper sheeting as a cladding material for the roof and parts of the elevations unifies this with other University buildings within the campus where the same material has been applied.
- 6.9 Gordon Street Elevation (west): The elevation treatment of this façade was considered unacceptable in previous schemes. The current design respects the rhythm of the cladding to the adjacent Chemistry Building, and upper storeys now appear more subordinate. The raking line to the southern elevation carries the copper roof down to the third floor, visible from views along Gordon Street from the south. The transparency of the lower floors of the new building will assist in enlivening the street scene.

- 6.10 Endsleigh Gardens (north): Compared with Gordon Street, this is a somewhat more subordinate elevation. A revised roof design, and a refined fenestration pattern coupled with the introduction of a greater level of glazing, have reduced the random, busy appearance of previous schemes to a simpler, calmer and visually lighter appearance. Given that this is the longest elevation of the site, it is considered that the current design has achieved a more appropriate contextual response.
- 6.11 During discussions with the applicant, it was agreed that the entrance to the proposed Bar would require greater emphasis. A narrow vertical white rendered over panel with high visibility vertical signage is proposed and is considered acceptable.
- 6.12 Taviton Street (east): The main issue for consideration is the impact of the development on the adjacent terrace of listed buildings. The upper storey of the Taviton Street elevation is set back by approximately 6 metres and has been reconfigured into two vertical planes. Half the elevation would comprise translucent glazing over cladding, the other half, adjacent to the terrace, white render with incised shadow gap lines which refer to the scale and proportion of window openings and storey heights of the adjacent terrace (Nos. 20-24). The east elevation now adopts an inherently vertical rhythm (by virtue of two, key vertical planes), rather than the overtly horizontal one as proposed previously. It is considered that the current scheme now respects the fundamental rhythm established by the adjoining terraces. The adjoining cornice line and first floor balcony are also directly reflected in the new elevation. The gap created by the service access also would also moderate the impact of the juxtaposition of the new building with the terrace of listed buildings.
- 6.13 UDP Policy B8 states that the setting of a listed building is of great importance and should not be harmed by unsympathetic neighbouring development. Notwithstanding the views expressed by English Heritage, Officers consider the design to be a suitably neutral transition between 'old' and 'new' elements, and that the setting of the listed terrace adjacent to the site, and listed building beyond (Drayton House), would not be compromised by the development. It should be noted that the redevelopment of two sites to the southern end of the terrace have recently been approved. They are smaller in scale than the Bartlett scheme, however they have introduced new architectural styles within close proximity to the terrace, and this is considered relevant to this application.
- 6.14 Auditorium: Originally designed as a projecting copper clad element to the south elevation. This has been omitted from the current application, and replaced with a glazed elevation.
- 6.15 Ground Floor Details: During the course of discussions with the applicant, it was agreed that there was a need for higher quality detailing of the raised plinth, including the mesh panelling. This particularly applies to the Endsleigh Gardens and Taviton Street elevations. Details submitted are considered acceptable.
- 6.16 Impact on the conservation area: In considering applications for schemes within conservation areas, it should be demonstrated that development proposed would be of more or equal benefit to the special character and appearance of the conservation area than existing buildings. It is considered that the current submission represents a

suitably contemporary response to the redevelopment potential of this site. Compared to the existing buildings on site, the new building would enhance and invigorate this part of the conservation area without harm to its particular character and appearance, and as such it is in compliance with policy B7.

- 6.17 Design out crime: A major contributory factor associated with the harassment of staff and students working outside normal hours is the pedestrian walkway between Gordon Street and Taviton Street. Current proposal would eliminate this route and security gates would be installed at the Taviton Street service entrance. Creating a safer environment in line with policy SD1D and the Council's intention to reduce opportunities for criminal or anti-social behaviour.
- 6.18 Access All new work should meet the requirements of Approved Document M. Level access would be provided at the main entrance. Wheelchair platforms incorporated within the two auditoriums, Unisex WCs provided. The new building would comply with policy SD1C that requires new public buildings and alterations to existing public buildings to be fully accessible to disabled people.

Sustainability

- 6.19 Because of the inadequate standard of the existing brick façade, the entire building would be re-clad to the most up to date Building Regulations standards for insulation and air tightness and the conservation of energy. The fabric of the building has been designed to contribute to the modifying effect of external conditions to produce a fairly stable internal environment. All materials would be sourced from sustainable and well managed sources and a life-cycle analysis carried out on construction materials. Where possible demolition material will be re-used.
- 6.20 Wherever possible the building would be naturally ventilated, this would reduce power consumed by mechanical ventilation. The building has been designed to gain benefits of daylight. Materials and equipment would be selected to minimise pollution.
- 6.21 Policy SD9B seeks measures to conserve water. Equipment would be selected to reduce water consumption, however the only statement made by the applicant is that the amount of water used will be monitored and minimised. The BREEAM assessment includes a water consumption element, but the only commitment given in the submission is the installation of a water meter. More information is required on what can be achieved in the development, with implementation of measures secured by conditions.
- 6.22 Lecture theatres, seminar rooms and IT rooms would require mechanical ventilation and a comfort cooling system will be provided. The main plant room would be located in the lower basement. Heat would be recovered from air extract systems and returned to the air supply, reducing heating demand and energy consumption. Cool water would be drawn up through boreholes and returned below ground. Variable speed systems would be applied to all motors and high efficiency light fittings installed.
- 6.23 In order to comply with policy SD9C the applicant needs to demonstrate the energy demand anticipated from the proposal, and to show how a proportion of needs can be met from generation by renewable means on-site. It is possible that ground water

cooling proposed may make a contribution, but the mechanism will have to be shown to be feasible.

- 6.24 Should planning permission be granted, a condition is recommended that requires the applicant to submit an assessment of anticipated energy demand, the plausible methods of generating renewable energy, and an achievable proportion of on-site generation. The condition should also ensure the application of features that meet the committed target. This could be through a Renewable Energy Plan confirming the contribution from each element prior to the implementation date.
- 6.25 Waste created on site during construction would be recycled where possible. UCL has an integrated waste management strategy.
- 6.26 A BREEAM assessment has been submitted in accordance with policy B1. The proposals appear to perform positively in sustainability terms, but the assessment is not now considered to be adequate. The BREEAM methodology and ratings are regularly updated, and need to be carried out by accredited assessors. The assessment submitted is based on an office assessment model for 2003, and amalgamates characteristics of new and refurbished buildings. Whilst it is stated that an "excellent" BREEAM rating can be achieved, it is by no means clear the same rating could be achieved under a 2006 model. A Pre-assessment Estimator needs to be submitted to show that a "Very Good" score is now possible, using a current BREEAM model and conducted by a qualified assessor. Agreed features need to be secured by a legal agreement.

Transport

- 6.27 Should planning permission be granted, it is expected that the Bartlett building would play a significant role in the final development of the University precinct. UCL now recognise the need to encourage a more cohesive environment and an Estates Strategy is currently being developed. Pedestrian route ways throughout the campus would be studied, including linking the Gordon Street buildings with the main block. The Strategy would be subsumed within an overall policy of environmental sustainability and include reference to a long term plan currently being developed by Terry Farrell and Partners, supported by L.B.Camden, to look at the future Euston/Marylebone Road as a distinctive 'place' rather than as an urban motorway serving through traffic.
- 6.28 The main access into the building is via Gordon Street approximately 100m. from the junction with Euston Road. The site is highly accessible to public transport, buses along Euston Road, Euston mainline station with St, Pancras and King's Cross within close proximity, and Euston and Euston Square underground stations.
- 6.29 It should be remembered that the chief purpose of the proposed development is to provide sufficient space to accommodate staff and students within one building. Numbers would consist of those already occupying Wates House as well as staff and students using Nos. 9 - 11 Endsleigh Gardens and 1- 19 Torrington Place, both in very close proximity to the site. As a consequence the development would not result in a significant increase in pedestrian movements or numbers of people using the local transport networks.

- 6.30 Cycle and pedestrian access: UCL promotes and facilitates cycling. Wates House currently has 30 cycle spaces, this will be increased. Lockers, changing rooms and showers would be provided.
- 6.31 Appendix 6 of the revised UDP requiring D1 institutions to provide 1 cycle storage space per 250m² of space (or part thereof) over a threshold of 500m² for staff and the same number for visitors (students) i.e. 2 per 250m². As the development involves creation of an additional 6,006m² of floor space, 44 new cycle parks are required and a condition should be placed on the planning permission to this effect. 22 Sheffield-type stands would be sufficient to meet this requirement provided there was adequate width between them to ensure parking for two cycles. There is flexibility in terms of the location of stands. However, the final locations of the cycle parking will need to be approved by the transport planning team prior to construction beginning on site.
- 6.32 There is a heavily used pedestrian route between the site and the Student Union immediately opposite. Although pedestrian movement from the Bartlett to the Union building may be reduced once the BAR is operational, the applicant has agreed in writing (letter dated 4th April 2006) to contribute to a Pelican crossing. It is recommended that this be secured by a legal agreement. It is also considered that the applicant should be required to replace paving immediately outside the site, which is currently in poor and hazardous state, and likely to be worsened by the development proposed.
- 6.33 Travel Plans: The University has had an operative Travel Plan since June 2001, updated in November 2003. The Travel Plan should be extended to cover the proposed development and a revised plan should be secured by s106 agreement, in compliance with T1C.
- 6.34 Servicing: Some deliveries would be via the main security controlled entrance off Gordon Street. Deliveries in connection with maintenance and workshop facilities in the basement would be via Taviton Street as at present.

Amenity

- 6.35 Noise and General Activity The development would not generate a significant increase in numbers of people in the area above existing users of Wates House and the two additional sites in the immediate vicinity used by the School. Because the numbers of students remain the same, there would be no further demand for housing.
- 6.36 To ensure no disturbance will result, a condition to ensure that noise is not audible from the use of the ground floor bar proposed is recommended
- 6.37 Sunlight/ Daylight: The south elevation facing the flank wall of the Christopher Ingold Chemistry Building has been designed with an incline giving a minimum separation of 5.0 metres at first floor level, increasing to 6.25 metres at fourth floor level. Spaces in the new building at this point are designed with horizontal bands of high level fixed lighting to each room. Such spaces are used intermittently and would be less affected by the lack of natural light.

- 6.38 Nos. 22 –24 Taviton Street is a student hall of residence; bedrooms face the east façade of the new building that would replace the existing two storey auditorium.
- 6.39 Due to the constraints of the site it would not be possible to build to a higher level without impact on windows to the rear of the student residences. In accordance with policy SD6 the applicant has been required to carry out a sunlight/daylight study to identify the extent of the impact.
- 6.40 The development has been designed to minimise impact and be most sensitive to the daylight requirements of the Taviton Street bedrooms. The recommended average daylight factor (adf) levels would be maintained in all bedrooms except at basement and ground floor level. The adf recommended by British Research Establishment (BRE) guidelines for bedrooms is 1%. The adf to basement and ground floor windows is currently marginally above 1%. With the new development this would fall below 1%. However the BRE guidelines advise that although daylight to bedrooms should be analysed, they are less important than living rooms, dining rooms and kitchens.
- 6.41 Basement and ground floor rooms are already overshadowed by balconies, site conditions and the existing auditorium and bathroom extensions. It is considered that since daylight conditions are already compromised, the new development would not be perceived as having an adverse impact. The applicant proposes to use a cladding material that would allow maximum light reflection from its surface into bedrooms and courtyard space, without glare. This would improve conditions slightly and in the light of this and BRE guidance, it is considered the proposal would comply with policy SD6 which states that the council will apply standards recommended by the BRE 'Guide to Good Practice'.
- 6.42 Mechanical plant Air handling units would be located in basement plant rooms. Calculations have been carried out for the level of noise that would result from the loudest air handling units that it is expected would be required. They are expected to meet the council's noise criteria.
- 6.43 The applicant should be reminded that any external chiller units proposed would require planning permission and an acoustic report should be submitted with an application. Standard noise level conditions are recommended to ensure that any mechanical plant installed operates in accordance with council standards.

Use

- 6.44 The University Precinct is identified as a specific local area for planning purposes in the SPG for Central London 2004. The SPG recognises that all University expansion cannot be contained within the Precinct and supports University expansion.
- 6.45 Policy SD3 seeks mixed use development. In Central London 50% of an increase in floor space should be for housing. Where the provision of housing or a mix of uses is considered inappropriate, the Council may seek a financial contribution for housing

off-site. However, a contribution to general purpose housing off-site is not required for University or hospital development where commercial development value is not created. Development of educational facilities is permitted provided there would be no harm to transport.

6.46 Policy C1C states that the council will seek to ensure that where appropriate education facilities are available for public use outside normal opening hours/ term time. Facilities at ground floor level, including exhibitions, would be available to the general public. It would not be appropriate to allow public access to areas of research. Through UCL's central booking system, any surplus capacity (e.g. lecture rooms) would be made available to other departments.

6.47 Policy C1D states that childcare facilities are sought in association with workplaces and education establishments. Childcare facilities are already provided in Taviton Street and Hertford Place. Numbers seeking childcare are unlikely to rise as a consequence of the development because there would be no significant increase in staff or students over and above those already at the Bartlett, (Wates House or satellite premises).

Trees

6.48 There are six pavement trees parallel with the Endsleigh Gardens side of the site, these would be retained. The proposal does not involve basement excavation, which would impact on the root zones of the street trees.

6.49 An arboriculture report has been submitted; this provides an assessment of the amenity value, condition and potential impact on the six plane trees. They are considered to be of high amenity value and contribute to the character of the Conservation Area. The report identifies the need for pruning works during the construction works to reduce conflicts with scaffolding work and also protective fencing to protect the trunks. No details have been provided for these works; whilst acceptable in principle any permission should be conditional on the provision of a method statement for the protection of these trees, which includes these details.

Providing public open space

6.50 The aim of the UCL Estates Strategy referred to above (para. 6.28) is not just to identify further development opportunities but also to identify contextual setting in which open space and landscaping could play a much bigger role.

6.51 The current proposal includes the retention of a small area of open space between the new building and the Chemistry Building, that would be landscaped. The proposed development would not allow for the creation of open space. Additional demands on existing open space will not be made because additional floor space created would be taken up by staff and students already in the building or in premises within close proximity. The site is part of the University campus for which an overall strategy is being developed. It is therefore considered that a financial contribution to open space provision sought by policy N4 is unnecessary in this case.

Biodiversity

- 6.52 This is a brown field site with little or no ecological value. Replacement UDP policy expects schemes to have considered conserving and enhancing biodiversity, including the creation of wildlife habitats. Six plane trees planted immediately in front of Wates House along Endsleigh Gardens would be protected and maintained. In addition, a condition is recommended to ensure further measures are incorporated into the building, which would have to be submitted and approved by the Council prior to the commencement of development.

7. CONCLUSION

- 7.1 There is a long tradition of innovative design in the Borough and modern architecture has played an important role in the renewal of the built environment avoiding the replication of existing buildings or the introduction of pastiche. The Bartlett building is one of the first 21st century buildings proposed for the area and expects to continue the ideal 'state of the art' building within Bloomsbury.
- 7.2 Notwithstanding the English Heritage objection that the building proposed would be taller and bulkier than existing buildings and dominate the listed terrace; it is considered that the current design has succeeded in breaking up the mass of previous schemes and as such it is considered acceptable by officers. The most sensitive issue in this case is the impact the new building would have on the setting of listed buildings. Viewed in context it can be seen that there are a wide variety of architectural styles in the immediate vicinity and that currently buildings adjacent to, or within site lines of, listed buildings, fail to make a positive contribution to the conservation area. The new building would be built to a high standard of, design, use of materials and sustainability, with a sensitive approach to the elevation adjacent to the Taviton Street terrace. The setting of the listed buildings would be altered however it is considered that it would be enhance by the development as would the character and appearance of the conservation area.
- 7.3 The established educational use of the area and the Development Framework designation as an educational area means the use is acceptable and the mixed use policies allow the development without provision of residential space.
- 7.4 The fact that the development replaces existing educational use in the locality would mean that it is acceptable in highways terms and any additional vehicle or pedestrian movements would be offset by the agreed highway improvements and travel plan.
- 7.5 The proposed building would not result in a material loss of local amenity subject to the recommended conditions to control noise. All trees adjoining the site would be retained and the recommended condition would allow enable control over the incorporation of biodiversity measures into the building itself. Finally, the open space provided within the scheme is considered sufficient to meet Council policy, having regard to the fact that it would not add significantly to use of existing spaces in the locality.

8. LEGAL COMMENTS

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

9. RECOMMENDATION

- 9.1 Grant planning permission subject to conditions and completion of a satisfactory legal agreement covering the following issues:-
(i) payment of costs towards the provision of a Pelican Crossing over Gordon Street between the site and the Student's Union building and the replacement of paving immediately outside the site (ii) the occupation of the premises in accordance with the principles of a revised UCL Travel Plan to be submitted for approval (iii) a BREEAM report and Design Stage Assessment (iv) a Renewable Energy Plan.
- 9.2 Grant conservation area consent subject to conditions.

10. RECOMMENDATION 2

- 10.1 In the event that the applicant fails to conclude the Section 106 planning obligation within the 13-week period, that the application be refused on grounds relating to the failure to provide pedestrian improvements in the highway; failure to agree a green travel plan; and failure to meet sustainability policies.

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