

| | | | | | | | |
|--|----------------------------|---|-------------------------------------|---|-------------|-------------------|--|
| Delegated Report (Members Briefing) | | Analysis sheet | | Expiry Date: | | 16/06/2006 | |
| | | N/A / attached | | Consultation Expiry Date: | | 25/5/06 | |
| Officer | | | | Application Number(s) | | | |
| Miss Kiran Chauhan | | | | 1. 2006/0215/P 2. 2006/0216/L | | | |
| Application Address | | | | Drawing Numbers | | | |
| York & Albany P.H. 127-129 Parkway London NW1 7PS | | | | Site location plan, YA101 HA1; 102 HA1; 103 GA1; 104 GA1; 105 FA1; 106 CA1; 107 CA1; 108 CA1; 109C; 110A; 111A; SK05B; SK06A; SK07; SK08; SK10; 2000; YA001 C; 002C; 003B; 004C; 005B; 006B; 007B; 008B; Part one document; Part two document; Part three document; side hung light details x 2; letter from London Plastercraft Ltd dated 2 nd Feb 06; viability statement; sustainability statement. | | | |
| PO 3/4 | Area Team Signature | C&UD | Authorised Officer Signature | | Date | | |
| | | | | | | | |
| Proposal(s) | | | | | | | |
| 1. Erection of part single-storey rear extension, part three storey extension to Park Village East elevation, excavation of basement floor level and external alterations for reinstatement of mixed use as a public house and restaurant (sui generis) and use of upper floors as a 10 bedroom hotel (Class C3). 2. Erection of part single-storey rear extension, part three storey extension to Park Village East elevation, excavation of basement floor level, internal and external alterations for reinstatement of mixed use as a public house and restaurant (sui generis) and use of upper floors as a 10 bedroom hotel (Class C3). | | | | | | | |
| Recommendation(s): | | Grant both | | | | | |
| Application Type: | | Full Planning Permission Listed building consent | | | | | |

| | | | | | | |
|--|---|----|------------------|----|-------------------|----|
| Conditions or Reasons for Refusal: | Refer to Draft Decision Notice | | | | | |
| Informatives: | | | | | | |
| Consultations | | | | | | |
| Adjoining Occupiers: | No. notified | 20 | No. of responses | 07 | No. of objections | 05 |
| Summary of consultation responses: | Site notice also displayed. 2 letters of comment and 5 letters of objection received on the following grounds: | | | | | |
| | <u>The frontage</u> | | | | | |
| | Why hasn't the existing tile frontage been included within the demolition plans? Especially seen as it has been granted twice previously. It is ugly. It is a 1920's-1930's addition which is totally out of keeping and unsympathetic to the Nash period. We had expected the owner to take it back to the original frontage incorporating the original colonnade and canted bays. | | | | | |
| | <i>Response: Officers are not able to require that the frontage be included in the demolition plans.</i> | | | | | |
| | The original structural walls should be reinstated with the windows and doors positioned as shown on the previously consented schemes. The reinstatement of the colonnade could be put on hold but at least it could be reinstated at a later date with a canopy erected in the mean time. | | | | | |
| | <i>Response: Officers are not able to require that these works be included in the proposals.</i> | | | | | |
| | <u>The Tower extension</u> | | | | | |
| | Height and bulk is shocking and looks like a giant urinal, but we understand its needed for viability. | | | | | |
| | <i>Response: The extension is required to house the services to avoid the loss of historic fabric in the original buildings. The height and bulk is comparable to the other extensions previously permitted.</i> | | | | | |
| | Shiny white tiles are absolutely inappropriate in a Nash setting; they are expensive to clean and may not stand up to the vibration of the railway | | | | | |
| <i>Response: The principle of the use of white tiles has been accepted on the previous permissions. Other matters raised are non material or are subject to control by other legislation.</i> | | | | | | |
| Can some form of coating be used so that the tower can be painted the same colour as the York and Albany? Or covered in self coloured continental style render? | | | | | | |
| <i>Response: The use of white tiles has previously been accepted.</i> | | | | | | |
| It should be kept as discreet as possible so it doesn't overpower the delicate houses of 2 and 4 Park Village East. | | | | | | |
| <i>Response: It is not considered to overpower those buildings.</i> | | | | | | |
| Loss of light to No. 1 Park Village East. | | | | | | |
| <i>Response: This is a commercial building. See below assessment.</i> | | | | | | |
| <u>Planting</u> | | | | | | |
| Some sort of small tree should be proposed inside the railings to soften the impact of the tower, especially for those living in 2 and 4 | | | | | | |
| <i>Response: Hard and soft landscaping details will be required by condition.</i> | | | | | | |
| <u>First floor assembly room</u> | | | | | | |
| The proposed cut out bathroom makes no sense at all; it ruins the symmetry of the room, destroys a fireplace and blocks a window; it creates a dead, dark space between it and the door to the corridor: a bathroom can be accommodated in Stable 3. | | | | | | |
| <i>Response: There is already a partition wall as existing across this end of the room. See further assessment below.</i> | | | | | | |
| There is a desperate need in the vicinity for an attractive, sizeable function room | | | | | | |
| <i>Response: The first floor assembly room has been designed with flexibility so that it can be used as a function room.</i> | | | | | | |

| | |
|--|---|
| | <p><u>Other</u> Noise and disruption during construction <i>Response: Non material planning objection</i></p> <p>A restoration fund could be started or the National Heritage Lottery Fund be approached for funding purposes? <i>Response: Not relevant to the determination of this case.</i></p> <p>Details and positioning of railings and gates needs to be amended <i>Response: Condition attached.</i></p> |
| <p>CAAC/Local groups* comments: *Please Specify</p> | <p>English Heritage: Recommend that the application should be determined in accordance with planning policy and on the basis of specialist conservation advice.</p> <p>The Georgian Group: Object on grounds of the insertion of a bathroom into the principle room at first floor level. While the method of subdivision is indicated as a 'pod' structure and certain divide, this will still have a detrimental impact on this internal space. <i>Response: See below assessment.</i></p> <p>Regents Park CAAC have commented: it is regretted that the application does not seek to reinstate an original form of fenestration at ground floor to the building, but accepted the reasoning behind this decision</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - concern of height and finish of rear lift tower; a self coloured render may be more appropriate; could the plant on the tower roof be better located on the roof of the main building, so reducing the height of the tower <i>Response: Height is comparable to the height of the extensions previously approved. The finish (white tiles) has also been previously approved.</i> - it is regretted that the main central staircase does not extend properly to the basement <i>Response: See below assessment in the 'basement' section.</i> - there is no disabled access to the basement – could the lift not be extended? <i>Response: The basement floor contains the kitchen and store rooms. There are wc's located here but there is also a disabled wc at ground floor level.</i> - Proposed bathroom at first floor level is objected to (room P) – could it be moved into Stable 3? <i>Response: See assessment below.</i> - We have some reservations about the bathroom window in stable 5 looking on to the corridor <i>Response: It is assumed that this window would be obscure glazed.</i> - Maybe landscape proposals should be included to ensure that drinkers do not congregate on the Park Village pavement, but on the Parkway pavement where there is more space, more safety and less likelihood of creating nuisance <i>Response: Details of hard and soft landscaping details will be requested by condition.</i> - A mature tree should be planted on the Park Village East side within the railed-in area of York Stone paving, to soften the impact of the tower. This would require a modification to the plant room (F3) <i>Response: See above response.</i> - The details of the gates should be reserved <i>Response: Condition is attached.</i> - Green landscaping of flat roof and to the installation of a rainwater collection system <i>Response: The applicant has provided a sustainability statement – see below assessment.</i> <p>There is no provision for parking – this would mean extra pressure on parking in the vicinity when residents parking bays were not operational e.g. in the evenings. Maybe the Zoo car park could be used? <i>Response: No parking provision is required.</i></p> <p>The Park Village (& Environs) Residents Association have commented:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - the existing appalling façade has not been included in the demolition plans - the front looks like a public lavatory - the height and bulk of the tower extension is shocking but we understand it is needed for viability and it does preserve the inside of the building so that is good - shiny white tiles are inappropriate and are expensive to clean and will suffer from vibration - can they plant a small tree inside the railings to soften the appearance of the tower - the bathroom cut out on the first floor ruins the symmetry of the room <p><i>Response: These issues have been already addressed above.</i></p> |

Site Description

The subject site is located on the prominent junction of Park Village East and Parkway in the Regent's Park area of Camden. The site contains a former three storey public house building known as the York and Albany (No. 129) while to the north is an attached two storey stables building (No. 127) which is currently vacant although in the recent past it has been used as garage. To the east there is also a side extension and gated entrance to the surrounding yard. The buildings have been empty for 20 years but work has recently started in relation to the implementation of the 2005 scheme submitted by the Crown estate (2003/1816 and 1818).

The buildings are Grade II listed (in 2000) and the public house is registered on the English Heritage Buildings at Risk Register. Both buildings have significant architectural and historic interest and their architectural development over time is physically evident in their alterations and additions.

The external elevations of the York and Albany are currently dominated by a 1920s addition in a design consistent with the brewery's owner's corporate style of the period. This is typically characterised by a curved frontage clad in faience tiles and containing Georgian style metal windows. The fenestration to the upper levels is original to the building's first construction. Internally at ground floor level, the character of its historic use as a public house is in evidence with a U shaped central bar around a surviving central staircase which appears to be original, although other 19th century features appear to be lost.

The stables building at No 127 is a mid 19th century addition. Externally the building retains much of its historic character but has lost interior fittings associated with its original function. This loss would most likely be due to its use as a garage for the majority of the 20th century. It was during this use that a mezzanine floor was added containing small office accommodation.

The site is within an area characterised by mixed development. The site is in close proximity to the rail track leading north from Euston, and is directly adjacent to a busy junction near to Regents Park. To both the south east and north is office/workshop accommodation at ground floor level, while to north east is a set of garages. The surrounding buildings are all of a mixed size and design. The forecourt area in front of the pub is used for car parking, although no formal car parking exists. The site also lies within the Regents Park Conservation Area.

Relevant History

The site has a fairly extensive planning history. The most recent and relevant to the determination of these applications is listed below.

10/11/2004– (2003/3270 and 3271) Planning permission and listed building consent granted for the internal and external alterations to 127 and 129 Parkway with new rear extension, in association with bringing the buildings back into Class A3 use (Food and drink). Applications submitted by Camden Civic Society.

18/02/2005 – (2003/1816 and 1818) Planning permission and listed building consent granted by the Crown Estate for the erection of a 3 storey plus basement side extension (facing Park Village East) and single storey rear extension and external alterations including the construction of a new regency frontage to the York and Albany - all in association with bringing the buildings back into Class A3 use. This scheme is currently being implemented.

Relevant policies

RUDP 2006

S1/S2 Sustainable development policies
SD1 Quality of life
SD6 Amenity for occupiers and neighbours
SD7 Light, noise and vibration pollution
SD8 Disturbance
SD9 Resources and energy
H3 Protecting existing housing
B1 General design principles
B3 Extensions and alterations
B6 Listed buildings
B7 Conservation areas
R2 General impact of retail and entertainment uses
R3 Assessment of food and drink uses and licensed entertainment
N8 Ancient woodlands and trees
T2 Capacity of transport provision
T3 Pedestrians and cycling
T9 Impact of parking
T15 Taxis, minicabs and coaches
E2 Retention of existing business uses
E3 Specific business uses and areas
R3 Assessment of food and drink uses and licensed entertainment
C5 Tourism uses
Regents Park CAS

Assessment

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

- Impact on the architectural and historic interest of the listed building and impact on the Conservation Area
- The acceptability of the land use issues that arise from the proposal and traffic and parking issues
- The impact on residential amenity
- The extent to which the proposal incorporates sustainable design measures through use of energy and resources
- Disabled access arrangements

The applicant has also submitted a viability statement which comments on the condition of the building and the resources required to bring it back into use and off the English Heritage Building at Risk register. It has been vacant for 20 years, and there is desperate need to bring it back into a long term functional, viable use. In order to preserve the integrity of the building, the three storey extension is required to provide the required services (lift, service risers). Previous schemes have not introduced a hotel use on the site, but again for viability reasons, this is required to ensure that the figures stack up.

Impact on the architectural and historic interest of the listed building and impact on the Conservation Area

The building is in an extremely poor condition having suffered from two decades of neglect. Significant water penetration has resulted in both dry and wet rot and the substantial deterioration of the main staircase and many of the internal finishes, including cornices and the ceiling rose to the front room at 1st floor level. Damage has occurred to structural timbers, involving rotten joist ends and embedded timbers. Work has begun on site, following the granting of consent in 2005 for a scheme submitted by the Crown Estate.

Unfortunately, the scale of the deterioration and damage is worse than anticipated, and the vast majority of internal finishes, including cornices, are beyond repair. At basement level it has been discovered that the brick wall that supports the upper floors of the building is severely decayed and lacks structural integrity. The cast iron columns that transfer the load from the upper floors behind the bay frontage at ground floor level are not formed on padstones and the earth retaining brick wall beneath is crumbling due to water penetration.

This proposal shares broad similarities with the 2004 consented Civic Society scheme. The key differences are set out below.

1. The 1920s faience ground floor frontage is to be retained. Previous schemes proposed the reinstatement of a Regency frontage based on James Mayhew's survey of 1834-35. The retention of the existing front gate is welcomed as this is attractive and of a high quality, representing one of many phases in the building's architectural and historic development.
2. The frontage of the stable building is to remain as existing. Previous proposals involved modifications to the front parapet and roof profile. In this case the roof profile will remain as existing and will be re-clad in natural welsh slate with glazing installed to one of the inner roof slopes. This will not be visible from the public realm.
3. The existing later 19th century structures to the rear of the building have been demolished, as approved under both previous consents. The extent of the ground floor additions are larger than those proposed by the Camden Civic Society. However, they do not extend as far as the Crown's scheme and retain a larger area of outside garden space. The proposed ground floor extension is in a contemporary style, with large areas of glazing to the rear amenity space and the retention of the fine Victorian rooflight which is to be refurbished.
4. The principle of an extension to the Park Village East elevation was established in both the Crown's and the Civic Society's consented schemes. This application develops the Civic Society's proposal, with a three storey contemporary addition. This is to be clad in white ceramic tiles as before, with a lead roof and bronze coloured metal casement windows. The footprint of the extension has increased and the shape has evolved to something akin to a rounded teardrop. This is attached to the main building by a glazed link, set back 2.9m from the building line. The consented Civic Society scheme terminated at the level of the cornice on the main building. However, following further research into specific lift machinery, the architect has indicated that the extension is to be slightly increased in height. A hydraulically operated lift is proposed which is powered from below, removing the need for a conventional sizeable over-run above 2nd floor level. However, if the lift is to serve all floors within the building, creating accessible accommodation without intervention into the fabric of the listed building, a small increase in height will need to be accommodated. The new addition will also allow for the incorporation of ducting from the new bar and kitchen. Given the position of the glazed link between the extension and the main building (which is set below the cornice line), and the curved shape of the extension, it would not visually conflict with the main building, nor appear overly dominant.
5. The refurbishment of the building is based on sound conservation principles outlined in their supporting document

Part Three: Design Statement. Extensive repairs are required throughout the building and will be undertaken on a like for like basis. New windows are proposed for the rear elevation at 2nd floor level where the existing units are missing, and are to be single glazed to match those on the front elevation at 2nd floor level. Simple secondary glazing is to be installed throughout the building which is acceptable given the level of traffic movements outside the building. Squeezes were taken from the ceiling rose in the 1st floor front room, and from cornices elsewhere in the building, allowing for reinstatement where they have been lost due to decay and deterioration.

6. Railings are to be reinstated around the forecourt and rear garden to the Park Village East elevation which is welcomed. Archive evidence and the surviving plinths indicate that railings and double gates were historically located in this position. These were removed by the Crown prior to the listing of the building.
7. A window is to be reinstated to the main staircase. The original window had been modified in the past to create a doorway with a concrete lintel above. The proposed window is of a rather unusual shape, however, the applicant has indicated that there is evidence within the render on the rear elevation which would suggest the proposed proportions. Similar windows can be found on other properties in the surrounding area, such as on Arlington Roa, and are not untypical of the period.

Other minor, and mostly internal alterations include:

Stable

The internal partitions, 1st floor structure and modern ceiling are to be removed. The loss of this fabric was accepted as part of the previous consents. Both of these schemes involved the partial reintroduction of a floor structure in order to create a mezzanine. In this case a full floor is to be inserted. As such, it was initially hoped that the former floor structure could be re-used however this was found to be severely damaged and deteriorated. The removal of the modern ceiling will allow the roof structure of the stable block to be viewed from within the 1st floor hotel room.

A new doorway is to be created in the rear wall of the stable allowing access from the courtyard to the 1st floor. This is considered to be a small and acceptable loss of fabric and allows separation from the deli/bakery at ground floor level and independent access to the hotel room above.

Basement

Several walls are to be removed at basement level to create a new kitchen, toilets and other service areas. This is broadly similar to the previous consented schemes and the principle of the loss of this fabric, which is of little architectural merit, has already been accepted. In this scheme however, an original timber panelled door is to be retained which is welcomed. The Crown scheme received consent for the excavation of a basement area below the stable block and this is also proposed as part of this application. A wine cellar and micro brewery is to be created in this location, utilising salvaged bricks from the external demolition work and laid on edge as pavements.

An additional area of excavation is proposed beneath the footprint of the forecourt on the Park Village East elevation as a plant room. The concentration of servicing in the new basement areas avoids intervention into the fabric of the listed building, or the creation of external plant rooms. This is considered to be acceptable.

The basement to ground floor flight of stairs has been removed, probably following fire damage and decay/rot, and a temporary staircase has been inserted. It is not proposed to permanently reinstate this flight of stairs. A kitchen is proposed in this area which will involve the loss of parts of the walls that form the stair compartment at basement level. If we are to accept that the stairs will not be reinstated, then the footprint of the stair compartment should be more fully retained.

Ground Floor

The existing bar is to be removed. This was established as acceptable in both of the previous consents as it is later 20th century fabric.

The main staircase is to be retained from ground floor to 2nd floor level as the circulation spine and escape route for the upper floors. A small portion of wall to the rear of the ground floor hallway is to be removed. This will allow for a separate access from ground floor level to the upper hotel floors without having to use the main public bar. This is considered acceptable.

1st floor

This scheme has two additional proposals when compared with the previously consented schemes. A new opening is proposed through the side wall of the main building to link into a bathroom in the 1st floor of the stable block. This allows the northerly rear room in the main building to be utilised as a hotel room without the insertion of partitions to form a bathroom. A door from the large front room through to the 1st floor of the stable block also formed part of the consented Crown scheme. Therefore, the principle of breaching the side wall of the building has already been established and is considered acceptable in this instance.

The southerly rear room is to have a partition inserted in order to create a corridor through to the extension and passenger lift. The principle of a corridor was established in the Crown's schemes and also in the Civic Society's scheme, albeit with a more minimal partition. The idea of a glazed screen was suggested when the remainder of this room was to house service uses, however in this case this area is to be used as a hotel room, making a solid partition necessary.

This scheme also proposes an intervention into the large principal room to the front of the building. A partition already existed across the northern end of the room but this was to be removed in both the Crown and Civic Society's schemes. In this case, a bathroom 'pod' is proposed for the northern end of the room which would also conceal a bed in its base. This would allow the room to be used as either a hotel room, or when the pod is fully closed, as a function room for the hotel or pub. The applicant has indicated that he will retain the partition, which is unsympathetically located, if there are objections to the proposed 'pod'. Whilst the reinstatement of this room to its original proportions is preferable, this solution builds in flexibility. This is considered to be important in ensuring the viability of the business and in supporting a variety of uses that will help to avoid the problems of redundancy which have resulted in the past. The pod will not be full height and will be setback from the front elevation, therefore allowing the most northerly window and the reinstated cornice to remain visible in the way that a full, solid partition would not.

2nd floor

This scheme is broadly similar to the Civic Society's consented scheme. The southerly rear room adjacent to the new extension is already partitioned and this space is to be reconfigured to allow a corridor through to the passenger lift, as at 1st floor level. A hotel room is to be created from the remaining space. The northerly rear room is to be partitioned more sympathetically than the consented scheme, leaving the chimneybreast expressed and avoiding a door opening through the spine wall. The only additional intervention relates to the middle room to the front of the building. This is to be subdivided to form two bathrooms for the adjacent hotel rooms. The existing historic door and architrave to the corridor are to be retained and concealed behind the wall finishes of the bathroom. This is considered to be a small and acceptable modification at this floor level within the building.

Roof

Four rooflights are proposed for the main flat roof of the building, however these will not be visible.

Curtilage

It is proposed to lay reclaimed york stone to the strip around the front of the building and within the forecourt area enclosed by the reinstated railings. This is welcomed and will enhance the setting of the building. The existing brick pavements to the stable block and its forecourt, as well as the small section of york stone on the Park Village East forecourt are to be lifted and re-laid.

Services

Two SVPs are marked on the drawings, running adjacent to the chimneybreast in the northerly rear room as well as up through the landings on the main staircase. It would be preferable if the boxing for services were relocated so as to allow the chimneybreast to remain unobstructed.

This building is in an extremely poor condition and its retention and refurbishment are critically important. The scheme as proposed represents a balance between the incorporation of a range of viable uses and the conservation of the fabric that has survived the building's long period of neglect. The conservation approach to the retention of existing historic fabric is sound and decorative features such as cornices and external railings are to be reinstated, to the benefit of the special interest of the building. As such, the proposal does not harm the architectural or historic interest of the listed building, nor the character or appearance of the conservation area.

Land use and traffic and parking implications

Loss of industrial floorspace: The proposal involves the loss of industrial space within the former stables building which was once linked to the public house. In association with previous applications, 127 Parkway has been referred to as garages used in connection with the public house, as a car showroom and as a garage for car repair. Permission was granted in 2004 and 2005 for two alternative schemes involving re-use of 127 Parkway as an extension to the established public house use.

If there had indeed been an industrial use such as motor vehicle repair, the policies now applied would be E3C (accommodation for small firms) and E2 (retention of existing business uses). Under E3C, the industrial space would be an appropriate scale for a small business. However, the space would also need to be suitable for continued business use under E2. The site would be exceedingly difficult to service from Parkway (on a short stretch of classified highway between busy light-controlled junctions) and is too awkwardly configured to provide a range of business uses - and so an assessment against policy criteria (b), (d) and (g) would consider it unsuitable for continued business use (other than B1a). No policy objection arises from the loss of this use.

The continuation of the restaurant and pub use (sui generis) on the site: The buildings have both been vacant for around 20 years, and the public house use is evident. This proposal seeks to introduce a restaurant function on the site which is welcomed on account of the lower intensity of usage. An increase of 61sqm of food and drink floorspace is proposed and this is considered acceptable in this location as no harm is likely to be caused to residential amenity, the vitality and viability of Camden Town nor to transport conditions, subject to conditions. The increase in floorspace has also been considered acceptable on the previous permissions. The hours of operation will be controlled by condition and noise conditions will be attached to protect residential amenity. Provision for the storage for waste and litter has been made. No tables and chairs on the highway are proposed.

The plans also show the provision of a bakery area at ground floor level. This is considered to be ancillary to the pub use

on account of the small amount of floorspace involved.

Acceptability of a hotel on the site: The location of new hotels is controlled by UDP policy C5B (Tourism uses). Preferred locations are Central London Area, King's Cross Opportunity Area and the larger Town Centres but the application site does not lie within any of these areas. Policy C5B also provides for hotels to be permitted in other locations that would not harm residential amenity, the environment or transport systems and notes that any necessary off-highway pick-up and set-down points for taxis and coaches should be provided.

Hotels are not considered to generate significant travel demand unless they occupy around 2,500 sq m. At the scale of hotel development proposed, it is not generally anticipated that pick-up and set-down space for taxis is warranted. However, because the site is outside the preferred location, transport systems are an issue specifically identified in policy. Notwithstanding the small scale of the proposal (10 bedroom hotel), there is a possibility that a material increase in taxi movements could arise from the hotel proposal. However, officers are satisfied that taxi pick-up and set-down can be accommodated within the highway at Park Village East and this will be assisted by the pavement build-outs already implemented at the northern end of Park Village East where it meets Parkway.

The proposal involves the loss of 123m² of ancillary residential accommodation that was once used by staff in association with the public house use. This accommodation was entirely non self contained and therefore no loss of permanent self-contained residential accommodation will occur.

No car or cycle parking is required for either customer use or for staff.

Consequently, the proposal is considered to be consistent with Replacement UDP policies E2, E3, H3, C5, T1, T7 and T15.

Impact on residential amenity: The proposal does not raise any new amenity issues. No loss of light or overshadowing is caused by the extension to the No. 1 Park Village East as there are no windows in the facing flank elevation. This building is in commercial use anyhow and as such no residential amenity is affected.

Sustainability: The applicant has submitted a sustainability statement assessing the scheme under the requirements of policy SD9 (resources and energy). The building is on the English Heritage Building at Risk register and has been vacant for over 20 years. The applicant has stated that the materials which retain structural integrity will be retained and re-used. The building will use a gas fired high efficiency boiler with highly insulated pipework routed. Photo voltaic rays were looked into but the small roof area was considered to provide too little capacity for the installation to be effective. All original windows and doors will be retained and restored and secondary glazing is to be inserted to the hotel room windows. The applicant has also addressed the issue of waste water recycling and has concluded that the relatively small roof area does not provide sufficient catchment area for a full grey water water flushing system. However rainwater will be harvested for the garden and the tree irrigation system with a central cistern and leaky pipe system incorporated within the landscape design.

Disabled Access: A building regulations application has already been submitted and building control officers have been in discussion with the applicant to ensure the highest level of accessibility achievable. Overall officers are happy with the proposal in terms of access and an access statement has been received detailing where access cannot be achieved. Hotel: Level access is proposed to the hotel entrance and a suitably detailed door will be provided to ensure access to reception.

The proposed lift has already been approved by Building Control and the re use of the existing stair and consider the level of access proposed suitable within this situation.

An accessible bedroom is proposed which should meet the relevant requirements.

Bakery area: Level access is to be provided and a suitable door. There are internal issues which have been discussed with the applicant.

Pub/Restaurant: Level access is to be provided and a suitable door. While no lift is to be provided due to the structural constraints an access statement detailing the future provision of a stair lift has been submitted. A ground floor accessible WC has also been provided.

Recommendation: Grant both.

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

