

Address:	42-45 Belsize Park London NW3 4EE	
Application Number:	2011/2986/P	Officer: Adrian Malcolm
Ward:	Frognal & Fitzjohns	D.C. Committee: 15 Dec 2011
Date Received:	10/08/2011	

Proposal: Erection of new building on site of 42-43 Belsize Park comprising basement, lower ground, ground and first to third floor and new building behind retained façade (except porticos) of 44-45 Belsize Park linked at lower ground and ground floor level, to provide 10 residential units (2 x 6 bed, 2 x 3 bed & 6 x 2 bed) with associated car parking and landscaping.

Drawing Numbers:

Statement of Significance and Impact (by J. Sanderson, 10/8/11), Statement re Sustainable Urban Drainage System (by D.Maddox Associates, 23/11/11), Site location plan, Draft construction transport plan (by TTP Consulting, June 2011), Basement impact assessment comprising scoping and impact assessment report and basement impact assessment screening report (CGL, October 2011), Letter from Arup to Shaw Corporation reviewing Basement Impact Assessment (by D.Whitaker, 25/11/11), Code for Sustainable Homes Preliminary Assessments for 42-43 & 44-45 Belsize Park (by Abba Energy Ltd, 9/6/11), Construction Management Plan (by Belsize Park Developments, June 2011), Transport Statement (by TTP Consulting, June 2011), Internal Daylighting Calculations (by Abba Energy Ltd, 16/6/11), Energy Statement (by Abba Energy Ltd, 8/6/11), Sustainability Statement (by Maddox & Assoc's, June 2011), Structural Report (by R.H. Horwitz Assoc's, October 2011), Affordable Housing Economic Appraisal (by Shaw Corporation), Heritage Statement (by Maddox & Assoc's, 8/6/11), Design and Access Statement (by Maddox & Assoc's, June 2011), Planning Statement (by Maddox & Assoc's, 10/6/11),

Drawing Nos. 11-029/AP3 01C, E11-029/D2-S01, E11-029/D2-S02, E11-029/D2-S04, E11-029/D2-S05, E11-029/D2-S06, E11-029/D2-S07, E11-029/D2_S08

Drawing Nos. E11-029/D2-S09, E11-029/S10, E11-029/S02, E11-029/S03, E11-029/S04, E11-029/S05, E11-029/S06, E11-029/S07, E11-029/S08, E11-029/S10, E11-029/S09, E11-029/S11, 11-029/AP3-02 C, 11-029/AP03-03 C, 11-029/AP03-04 B, 11-029/AP03 05 B, 11-029/AP3 06 C, E11-29/AP3-07 C, 11-029/AP3-08 C, 11-029/AP3-09 B

, 11-029/AP3-10 B, 11-29/AP3-11 C, 11-029/AP3-12 C, 11-029/AP3-13 D, 11-29/AP3-14 B

11-029/Cond. 04, 05, 06, 07, 08

RECOMMENDATION SUMMARY: Grant Planning Permission subject to a legal agreement

Related Application?	Yes
Date of Application:	10/8/11
Application Number:	2011/2988/C

Proposal: Demolition of 42-43 Belsize Park except part of wall adjoining No. 41 (portico to No. 42 to be removed, set aside and reinstated) and substantial demolition of 44-45 Belsize Park retaining the front façade (except porticos) and part of wall adjoining No. 46 (part retrospective).

as shown on drawing numbers:

Statement of Significance and Impact (by J. Sanderson, 10/8/11), Statement re Sustainable Urban Drainage System (by D.Maddox Associates, 23/11/11), Site location plan, Draft construction transport plan (by TTP Consulting, June 2011), Basement impact assessment comprising scoping and impact assessment report and basement impact assessment screening report (CGL, October 2011), Letter from Arup to Shaw Corporation reviewing Basement Impact Assessment (by D.Whitaker, 25/11/11), Code for Sustainable Homes Preliminary Assessments for 42-43 & 44-45 Belsize Park (by Abba Energy Ltd, 9/6/11), Construction Management Plan (by Belsize Park Developments, June 2011), Transport Statement (by TTP Consulting, June 2011), Internal Daylighting Calculations (by Abba Energy Ltd, 16/6/11), Energy Statement (by Abba Energy Ltd, 8/6/11), Sustainability Statement (by Maddox & Assoc's, June 2011), Structural Report (by R.H. Horwitz Assoc's, October 2011), Affordable Housing Economic Appraisal (by Shaw Corporation), Heritage Statement (by Maddox & Assoc's, 8/6/11), Design and Access Statement (by Maddox & Assoc's, June 2011), Planning Statement (by Maddox & Assoc's, 10/6/11),

Drawing Nos. 11-029/AP3 01C, E11-029/D2-S01, E11-029/D2-S02, E11-029/D2-S04, E11-029/D2-S05, E11-029/D2-S06, E11-029/D2-S07, E11-029/D2_S08

Drawing Nos. E11-029/D2-S09, E11-029/S10, E11-029/S02, E11-029/S03, E11-029/S04, E11-029/S05, E11-029/S06, E11-029/S07, E11-029/S08, E11-029/S10, E11-029/S09, E11-029/S11, 11-029/AP3-02 C, 11-029/AP03-03 C, 11-029/AP03-04 B, 11-029/AP03 05 B, 11-029/AP3 06 C, E11-29/AP3-07 C, 11-029/AP3-08 C, 11-029/AP3-09 B

, 11-029/AP3-10 B, 11-29/AP3-11 C, 11-029/AP3-12 C, 11-029/AP3-13 D, 11-29/AP3-14 B

11-029/Cond. 04, 05, 06, 07, 08

RECOMMENDATION SUMMARY: Grant Conservation Area Consent

Applicant:	Agent:
Mr Mike Watson Belsize Park Developments Ltd/ Goldsmith Cottage Ltd (In Liquidation) c/o agent	Mr David Maddox Maddox and Associates Ltd 70-74 Cowcross Street London EC1M 6EJ

--	--

ANALYSIS INFORMATION

Land Use Details:			
	Use Class	Use Description	Floorspace
Existing	<i>C1 Hotel</i>		<i>2786 m²</i>
Proposed	<i>C3 Dwelling House</i>		<i>4,356m²</i>

Residential Use Details:										
	Residential Type	No. of Bedrooms per Unit								
		1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9+
Existing	N/A									
Proposed	<i>Flat/Maisonette</i>	0	6	2	0	0	2	0	0	0

Parking Details:		
	Parking Spaces (General)	Parking Spaces (Disabled)
Existing	11	0
Proposed	0	5

OFFICERS' REPORT

Reason for Referral to Committee:

The application involves substantial demolition of buildings in a conservation area [Clause 3(v)], it constitutes a major development involving the erection of a building containing 10 dwellings [Clause 3(i)], and involves the making of a planning obligation under Section 106 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 for matters which the Director of Culture and Environment does not have delegated powers [Clause 3(vi)].

1. SITE

- 1.1 The buildings at the application site originally comprised 2 pairs of large semi-detached villas linked by two rather unsympathetic extensions at lower/upper ground and second floor level. The buildings were last used as a hotel (Class C1). The open land to the rear formed part of the curtilage of these buildings, and was accessible via a vehicular entrance off Belsize Lane.
- 1.2 Adjoining the site to the north-east on Belsize Lane there was previously a row of modern 2-storey residential dwellings. These were demolished and replaced by 3 new townhouses in 2005 and are now known as nos. 77D-F Belsize Lane. The townhouses have the benefit of underground car parking, which is located below the open land to the rear of nos. 42-45 Belsize Park. The permission which approved these works also included the conversion of nos. 42-45 Belsize Park to residential flats and the excavation of a larger basement car park in order to provide sufficient off-street car parking for the flats as well. Numerous applications were made to amend this element of the proposal (see para 3.0 and section 6.1 of assessment), but the work was never completed.
- 1.3 On 13th October 2008 a partial collapse occurred to the rear of nos. 42-43 Belsize Park. Following this a Dangerous Structure Notice was issued by London Borough of Camden Building Control which required action to be taken to remove the danger within 10 days. In order to satisfy the requirements of this Notice, it was necessary to carry out substantial demolition of the building. Only the front portico and ground floor bay of no. 42 Belsize Park remains intact. A second Dangerous Structure Notice was issued on 22nd October 2008 in respect of nos. 44-45 Belsize Park, which required action to be taken to remove the danger within 21 days. Large scale propping and supporting works have been undertaken, but no demolition work has been undertaken.
- 1.4 The buildings on the site were/are not listed, but the site is located within the Belsize Conservation Area and the buildings were considered to make a positive contribution to the conservation area.
- 1.5 This part of the conservation area is characterised by repeated forms of stucco paired villas which gives the area a strong identity and unity in appearance. The villas are symmetrical about their slab chimney stacks, have hipped slate roofs with overhanging eaves which are supported on brackets, the elevations have large rustic quoins, recessed sash windows diminishing in size on the upper floors with

classically detailed surrounds, canted three-light bays on the ground floor and steps up to porticos.

2. THE PROPOSAL

Original

- 2.1 Conservation area consent is sought retrospectively for the demolition work which has already been undertaken to nos. 42-43 Belsize Park. It is proposed to carry out further works of demolition to this villa, removing the remaining bay window and portico (although the portico is to be retained and reinstated) and retaining only the lower/upper ground floor link between nos. 42 and 41. In terms of nos. 44-45, it is proposed to demolish the building with the exception of the front façade. The front façade, apart from the porticos, is to be retained. A small section of the flank wall of no. 45 is also to be retained at lower ground and upper ground floor level, as this is linked to no. 46.
- 2.2 Planning permission is sought to erect a new building comprising basement, lower ground, upper ground, two upper floors and an attic storey. The building would appear from street as two pairs of semi-detached stucco fronted villas with hipped slate roofs, porticos, three-light bay windows at ground floor level and sash windows. The two villas are proposed to be linked by a two-storey structure between nos. 43 and 44 at lower/upper ground floor level.
- 2.3 The proposal is to construct a building which replicates the original buildings on the site, but would also include some of those alterations and extensions approved as part of the conversion scheme granted in 1996 and amended in 1998, 2002, 2003, 2007 and 2008 (see section 3: Relevant History). These works included: excavation of basement, rebuilding of the two storey link, the addition of dormer windows with insert balconies to front and rear, skylights in side roof slopes, addition of metal balustrading to bay at rear ground floor level and bottle balustrading to bay at rear first floor level, elevational changes including reinstatement of original features.
- 2.4 The buildings are proposed to provide 10 residential units, comprising 2 x 6 bed, 2 x 3 bed & 6 x 2 bed) with associated car parking and landscaping (Class C3). The proposal originally included the provision of 10 off-street car parking spaces at basement level. Like the last 2008 application, the basement level originally extended across nearly the entire plot with the exception of some modest areas at the front of the plot to enable the planting of two trees in the front garden. Aside from the parking area, the basement included areas for the proposed residential units including, for example two swimming pools and two Jacuzzis.

Revisions

- 2.5 The proposed basement has been reduced in size during the course of consideration such that the proposed basement is proposed to follow the line of the front elevation and would not lie under any part of the front gardens, thus allowing more scope for planting in the front gardens (where 2x Fastigate Oak trees, ornamental trees, privet hedges and other soft landscaped areas are now proposed) and a Sustainable Urban Drainage System. N.B. Two Jacuzzis are no longer proposed and the two swimming pools reoriented and reduced in size.

- 2.6 At the rear, the number of proposed parking spaces has been reduced to five vehicular parking spaces and the extent of the proposed basement beyond the rear of the property has been reduced, such that it would be pulled away from the side boundaries (and has almost been completely removed to the rear of no.45). Cycle storage has been reorganised. The extent of soft landscaping at the rear has been increased, including some small trees. A Copper Birch tree is proposed next to the car park ramp and staircase at the rear, where a tree had been previously removed and additional planting is indicated in the area next to the ramp.
- 2.7 All windows to flank elevations and the lower rows of roof skylights are now proposed to be obscure glazed.
- 2.8 An assortment of minor changes has been made to improve disabled access.

3. **RELEVANT HISTORY**

3.1 **9500249R6**

Planning permission was granted on 14/08/96 for change of use of the existing building from a hotel to 26 self-contained residential units together with the erection of a single storey rear extension at basement level, and the landscaping of the land to the rear together with the provision of 17 car parking spaces.

3.2 **PW9802361R2**

Planning permission was granted on 27/08/98 for variation of planning permission dated 14/08/96 (for the change of use of the existing building from a hotel to 26 self-contained residential units together with the erection of single storey rear extension at basement level and the landscaping of the land to the rear together with the provision of 17 car parking spaces) in relation to conversion from hotel to 25 units, external alterations, provision of three new dwelling houses and construction of an underground car park with 26 car parking spaces and a landscaped area above.

3.3 **PWX0103947**

Planning permission was granted on 01/07/02 for amendment of the design of 3 new houses together with a 30 space underground car park and associated landscaping as a variation to the planning permission granted on 27/08/98 (ref: PW9802361R2) for the conversion of 42-45 Belsize Park to 25 self-contained flats, the erection of 3 new houses and construction of a 26 space underground car park with landscaping above on land adjoining 79 Belsize Lane.

3.4 **PWX0202857**

An application was submitted on 23/09/02 for approval of details pursuant to the grant of planning permission PWX0103947/R1 dated 01/07/02 for details of hard and soft landscaping as part of condition 7. The application was withdrawn on 27/01/03.

3.5 **2003/0066/P**

Planning permission was granted 02/10/03 for variation to planning permission dated 01/07/02 (PWX0103947) for erection of 3 x 3 storey town houses, in respect of design amendments to the roof, dormer windows and front elevations.

3.6 2004/5025/P

Approval was given on 07/02/05 for details relating solely to the erection of three new houses on Belsize Lane, as follows:

a) Details of the elevations, detailing of the front parapet wall and details of the junction between the new houses and 77 Belsize Lane, pursuant to condition 2 of planning permission dated 01/07/02 (PWX0103947/R1) as amended by condition 1 of planning permission dated 02/10/03 (2003/0066/P).

b) Details of hard and soft landscaping for the 3 houses, means of enclosure and ventilation to the car park, pursuant to part of condition 7 of planning permission dated 01/07/02 (PWX0103947/R1) in relation to the 3 new houses only.

c) Details of the refuse storage areas and bicycle stands pursuant to part of condition 10 of planning permission dated 01/07/02 (PWX0103947/R1) in relation to the 3 new houses only.

3.7 2005/1316/P

Approval was given on 29/04/05 for details relating to treatment of the front elevation of new terraced houses pursuant to condition 2 of planning permission dated 01/07/02 (PWX0103947/R1).

3.8 2007/0126/P

An application was submitted on 29/01/07 for a reduction in number of proposed residential units from 26 to 25, plus enlargement of the approved basement level car park as an amendment to planning permission reference PWX0103947 (granted 01/07/02). The application was withdrawn on 26/03/07.

3.9 2007/2309/P

An application was submitted on 14/06/07 for a reduction in the number of approved flats from 26 to 25, change of residential mix to 4 x studios, 4 x 1-bedroom, 11 x 2-bedroom and 6 x 3 bedroom, enlargement of the approved basement level car park (reduction in parking spaces to 26) and other minor elevational changes as an amendment to permission dated 01/07/02 (PWX0103947) itself an amendment (alterations to design of 3 town houses, increase to 30 car parking spaces and landscaping) to permission dated 27/08/98 (PW9802361R2) for conversion of 42-45 Belsize Park to 25 self-contained flats, the erection of 3 new houses and construction of a 26 space underground car park with landscaping above on land adjoining 79 Belsize Lane. The application was reported to member's briefing on 09/08/07, who agreed that planning permission should be granted subject to a S106 to secure 5 of the units as car-free. The S106 agreement was not completed as the site was sold and the application was subsequently withdrawn on 15/09/08.

3.10 2007/2793/P

Planning permission was granted on 20/02/08 for conversion of 42-45 Belsize Park to 4 single-family dwelling houses; enlargement of basement to provide additional habitable floorspace and 4 car parking spaces (total of 10 for 42-45 Belsize Park and 3 town houses on Belsize Lane); erection of side extensions at lower and upper ground floor level to 43 (south elevation) and 44 (north elevation) (following demolition of existing link extension between 43 & 44); minor elevational changes, landscaping and tree planting; as an amendment to permission dated 01/07/02 (PWX0103947) (alterations to design of 3 town houses, increase to 30 car parking spaces and landscaping) itself an amendment to permission dated 27/08/98 (PW9802361R2) for conversion of 42-45 Belsize Park to 25 self-contained flats, the erection of 3 new houses and construction of a 26 space underground car park with landscaping above on land adjoining 79 Belsize Lane.

3.11 2007/6122/P

Planning permission was granted on 21/07/08 for amendments to planning permission granted 20/02/08 (2007/2793/P) for conversion of 42-45 Belsize Park to 4 single-family dwelling houses; enlargement of basement to provide additional habitable floorspace and 4 car parking spaces (total of 10 for 42-45 Belsize Park and 3 town houses on Belsize Lane); erection of side extensions at lower and upper ground floor level to 43 (south elevation) and 44 (north elevation) (following demolition of existing link extension between 43 & 44); minor elevational changes, landscaping and tree planting (itself an as an amendment to planning permission dated 01/07/02 (PWX0103947) (alterations to design of 3 town houses, increase to 30 car parking spaces and landscaping) and planning permission dated 27/08/98 (PW9802361R2) for conversion of 42-45 Belsize Park to 25 self-contained flats, the erection of 3 new houses and construction of a 26 space underground car park with landscaping above on land adjoining 79 Belsize Lane) namely, additional excavation at basement level under the front garden, introduction of ground source heat pumps, alterations to layout of basement car park, revised landscaping scheme, revised bin stores, rebuilding of link between 43 and 44 Belsize Park, alterations to internal layout of houses, alterations to windows, installation of skylights on the side roof slopes and balustrading to the rear bay windows at raised ground floor level.

3.12 2008/1516/P & 2008/0408/C

Applications for conservation area consent and planning permission were submitted on 25/04/08 for demolition of existing hotel buildings behind retained façade (with the exception of the portico) and redevelopment to provide two buildings comprising basement, lower ground, ground and first to third floor to with link at lower ground and ground floor level, to provide 4 single-family dwelling houses, provision of basement car parking, and associated landscaping. The applications were withdrawn on 19/01/09 as the proposals were no longer workable due to the collapse and subsequent demolition of part of the buildings.

3.13 2008/5974/P & 2008/5976/P

The Council's Development Control Committee resolved to grant planning permission subject to completion of a legal agreement and conservation area consent in 2009 for the erection of new building on site of 42-43 Belsize Park comprising basement, lower ground, ground and first to third floor and new building behind retained façade (except porticos) of 44-45 Belsize Park linked at lower

ground and ground floor level, to provide 4 single-family dwelling houses with basement car parking and associated landscaping. This planning permission was not issued as the applicant did not sign the legal agreement, having entered into administration, and the applications were treated as withdrawn.

4. CONSULTATIONS

Statutory Consultees

- 4.1 English Heritage- Delegate to determine in accordance with national and local policy guidance and on the basis of specialist conservation advice.
- Metropolitan Police- Windows and doors to comply with relevant British Standards (BS) re security, lower ground floor windows may need collapsible grilles. Audio/video access control needed, entrance to garage at have full width/height gating and key fob entry with effective barriers against intruders, recommended wall system for post deliveries or post boxes, any foyer to comply with BS. Fob control to lift. Locking, self-closing fit for purpose doors to refuse stores needed. Lighting to be at uniform level. Utility meters in central location. Bicycles to be in self-closing and locking cage. Consideration should be given to CCTV.
- Thames Water- No objection to proposal in respect of water or sewerage infrastructure. It is the developer's responsibility to make proper provision for drainage to ground, water courses or a suitable sewer. The applicant is recommended to ensure surface water storm flows are attenuated or regulated into the receiving public network through on or off site storage. Connections are not permitted for the removal of ground water. Groundwater discharge permit/prior approval required where a developer proposes to discharge groundwater or make other discharges into a public sewer. If connecting to a combined sewer, site drainage should be separate and combined at final manhole cover nearest the site boundary. Request informative re minimum water pressure and flow rates.
- Environment Agency- Stated they did not need to be consulted as site lies in Flood Zone 1. Main flood risk issue is management of surface water run-off and ensuring that drainage from the development does not increase flood risk on site or elsewhere. Sustainable surface water management is recommended as good practice. Flood Risk Assessment only necessary if site drainage problems are identified (e.g. by surface water management plans).

Conservation Area Advisory Committee

- 5.2 Belsize CAAC- No objection, provided front basement reduced in size to enable growth of wide canopied trees found along Belsize Park (*Officer's note: The basement has been reduced in size during the course of consideration and is no longer proposed beneath the front garden area*) and that front façade details are modelled on Daniel Tidey's details set out in 'Belsize 2000 (A Living Suburb).' Clarification requested regarding rear window materials and rendering to brickwork window reveals.

Local Groups

4.3 N/A

Adjoining Occupiers

Site notices displayed: Expiry 9/9/11
Press notice: Expiry 8/9/11

Number of letters sent	62	
Total number of responses received	7	
Number of electronic responses	5	
Number of comments (points of information)	1	
Number of objections	6*	

* 2 of the letters of objection are supportive of development in principle.

- 4.4 Reasons for objection (made to original proposal):
- Traffic and parking implications for nearby roads not adequately addressed. Nearby traffic junction and zebra crossing are a traffic black spot and part of a rat run. Commonly associated with illegal traffic manoeuvres and parking. Part of Lancaster Grove should be made one-way.
 - Concern regarding construction traffic in narrow streets.
 - Oppose deep excavation and arising vibration to create basement due to structural implications and potential subsidence to adjoining property and party walls. Adjoining properties have simple foundations above the full depth of the proposed excavations. Reports lack reassurances about impacts and measures to protect adjoining property and compensation arrangements if this results (especially if developer becomes bankrupted), nearby hotel (which has some lodgers that need to sleep during the day) and the area.
 - Noise and dust/debris nuisance from building works to nearby residents
 - Oppose creation of swimming pools at basement level.
 - Oppose demolition of buildings of good character in a conservation area.
 - Treatment of facades and front gardens out of character.
 - Excessive occupation of properties out of character.
 - Proposal should be scaled down.
 - Any overlooking from skylights or windows should be prevented.
 - No access should be created to the side of no.46.
 - Uncertainty re proposal.

5. POLICIES

5.1 LDF Core Strategy and Development Policies

Core Strategy

- CS1 (Distribution of growth)
- CS4 (Areas of More Limited Change)
- CS5 (Managing the impact of growth and development)

- CS6 (Providing Quality Homes)
- CS8 (Promoting a successful and inclusive Camden economy)
- CS10(Supporting Community Facilities and Services)
- CS11 (Promoting sustainable and efficient travel)
- CS13 (Tackling climate change through promoting higher environmental standards)
- CS14 (Promoting high quality places and conserving our heritage)
- CS15 (Protecting and improving our parks and open spaces and encouraging biodiversity)
- CS16 (Improving Camden's health and well-being)
- CS17 (Making Camden a Safer Place)
- CS18 (Dealing with Our Waste and Encouraging Recycling)
- CS19 (Delivering and Monitoring the Core Strategy)

Development Policies

- DP1 (Mixed Use Development)
- DP2 (Making Use of Camden's Capacity for Housing)
- DP3 (Contributions to the Supply of Affordable Housing)
- DP5 (Homes of Different Sizes)
- DP6 (Lifetime Homes and Wheelchair Homes)
- DP13 (Employment Premises and Sites)
- DP14 (Tourism Development and Visitor Accommodation)
- DP16 (The Transport Implications of Development)
- DP17 (Walking, cycling and public transport)
- DP18 (Parking Standards and Limiting the Availability of Car Parking)
- DP19 (Managing the impact of parking)
- DP20 (Movement of Goods and Materials)
- DP21 (Development Connecting to the Highway Network)
- DP22 (Promoting sustainable design and construction)
- DP23 (Water)
- DP24 (Securing high quality design)
- DP25 (Conserving Camden's heritage)
- DP26 (Managing the impact of development on occupiers and neighbours)
- DP27 (Basements and lightwells)
- DP28 (Noise and vibration)
- DP29 (Improving Access)
- DP31 (Provision of, and Improvements to, Open Space and Outdoor Sport and Recreation Facilities)

5.2 Camden Planning Guidance

5.3 Belsize Conservation Area Statement

5.4 London Plan

6. **ASSESSMENT**

6.1 The principal consideration material to the determination of this application and summarised as follows:

6.2

- **Background**
- **Principle of Demolition**
- **Replacement Buildings**
- **Land use and Mix of Units**
- **Affordable Housing**
- **Standard of Accommodation**
- **Basement Issues**
- **Amenity**
- **Cycle Parking**
- **Highways and Other Construction Issues**
- **Tree and Landscaping**
- **Sustainability**
- **Other: Security, Employment in Camden, Educational Contributions**

6.1 Background

- 6.1.1 There is a history of applications on this site dating back to the mid-1990s. The planning permission granted in 2002 (itself an amendment of permissions granted in 1998 and 1996) was part implemented. The 3 new town houses fronting onto Belsize Lane have been completed, as has part of the underground car parking which currently provides 6 spaces (2 for each of the dwellings).
- 6.1.2 The officer's report in respect of the 2002 permission stated that the proposal was conceived to be constructed in two phases. The first phase was for the 3 townhouses and 26 of the car parking spaces to be provided. The second phase was for the conversion of the hotel to residential and the provision of the rest of the underground parking. It appears that 'Phase 1' was completed some time ago (the detailed design of which was revised by permissions granted in 2003 and 2005). The underground parking which has been constructed doesn't provide 26 spaces; it is smaller, and only 6 spaces have been provided so far. It should be noted that there were no conditions attached to this permission to require the scheme to be carried out in its entirety or to cover the fact that all the car parking could only be provided in the event that both the new build and the conversion to flats were carried out.
- 6.1.3 The site was subsequently sold, and the new owner intended to finish implementing the permission that was granted in 2002 by carrying out 'Phase 2' of the works which related to the hotel on Belsize Park. In February 2008, and again in July 2008, they were granted planning permission for amendments to the approved scheme. These are detailed in paragraphs 3.10 and 3.11 of this report. Following this, the owner submitted an application for redevelopment of the buildings behind the retained façades. The justification for demolition was the structural condition of the existing buildings. English Heritage did accept that the buildings were structurally unsound and raised no objection to the proposed façade retention scheme, subject to the submission of a method statement adequately detailing how the facades would be underpinned and supported. Unfortunately, prior to the determination of these applications, the buildings suffered a partial collapse and two Dangerous Structures Notices were issued by Building Control. In order to

satisfy the requirements of the Notices, nos. 42-43 were substantially demolished leaving only the portico and bay to no. 42. Nos. 44-45 have been subject to large-scale propping and supporting works.

6.1.4 The owner of the site is now unable to implement any of the earlier permissions on the site. One of the previous applications for demolition and redevelopment behind the retained façade had to be withdrawn, since it would not have been possible to carry out the works. The last pair of applications was treated as withdrawn when the previous applicants entered into administration and were unable to sign the legal agreement that would have been attached to the grant of planning permission. The current application seeks to remedy the situation, by retaining as much of the buildings remaining on the site as is possible and practicable, and redeveloping the site so that the resultant buildings replicate the original buildings, albeit incorporating some of the alterations approved as part of the approved conversion schemes.

6.2 Principle of Demolition

6.2.1 Local Development Framework policies set a general presumption against total or substantial demolition of unlisted buildings that make a positive contribution to a conservation area, unless exceptional circumstances can be shown which outweigh the case for retention. There should be a case for full justification of the demolition of a building that makes a positive contribution to the conservation area and that this should have regard to Planning Policy Statement 5 (PPS5), as discussed below. This is notably the condition of the existing building, the cost of repairing and maintaining it, the adequacy of effort to maintain the building in use and the merits of alternative proposals for the site.

6.2.2 The application site was inspected by English Heritage officers and their structural engineers in August 2008 as part of the assessment of an earlier application for demolition behind the retained façade (2008/1516/P & 2008/0408/C). They stated in respect of the earlier applications that, although the proposed loss of fabric was regrettable, there was no objection to the proposed demolition, subject to adequate protection of the retained façades, due to the poor structural condition of the buildings. In October 2008, a partial collapse of the buildings resulted in the Council's Building Control Team issuing Dangerous Structure Notices against both buildings. In order to satisfy the requirements of the notices, nos. 42-43 have had to be substantially demolished (only the front portico and ground floor bay of no 42 remains). Nos. 44 and 45 are still standing, but are being propped and supported and are in an extremely poor condition and structurally unstable.

6.2.3 The current application seeks retrospective conservation area consent for the demolition work which has already taken place, and proposes demolition of the remaining part of nos. 42-43 and substantial demolition of nos. 44-45, with only the front façade (except the porticos) being retained. The current applications propose the same level of demolition as the previous scheme, with the addition of the demolition of the existing portico at No.42, which is discussed below. As justification for demolition was accepted previously, the justification provided in the form of a Heritage and PPS5 Statement is considered acceptable.

6.2.4 Although only the portico and ground floor bay of Nos.42-43 remains intact and Nos.44-45 is structurally unstable, both buildings are still recognised as undesignated heritage assets which form an integral part of the conservation area which is a designated heritage asset. Consideration of the proposals must be given to PPS5 which sets out Government policy on development affecting the historic environment and, in particular, policy HE9 relating to the consideration of applications. The proposals for the substantial demolition (retrospective in part) of Nos.42-45 will lead to substantial harm to the designated heritage asset i.e. the Belsize Conservation Area, thereby consideration must be given to HE9.2. Based on HE9.2 the following can be concluded:

- (i) The substantial harm caused by the demolition and loss of historic fabric is necessary in order to deliver the substantial public benefits of redeveloping the site with a like for like replacement (externally) and restoring the architectural features which have been lost over time, thereby enhancing the conservation area.
- (ii) It was accepted as part of the previous applications that the structural integrity of the buildings had failed to such a degree that the condition of the buildings prevented all reasonable uses of the site; and
- (iii) no viable use of the heritage asset itself can be found in the medium term that will enable its conservation as a result of the level of decay and structural failure;
- (iv) conservation through grant-funding or some form of charitable or public ownership has not been possible over the last 3 years; and
- (v) The harm to or loss of the heritage asset is outweighed by the benefits of bringing the site back into use.

6.2.5 There are numerous examples along the street where alteration and replacement of original details has taken place, including modern windows and replaced porticos or steps; resulting in the loss of classical iconic columns and decorative details. This has resulted in the dilution of well executed architectural details, which the redevelopment scheme should help to restore.

6.2.6 The previous application proposed the retention of the portico of No.42. However, this application proposes the demolition of the portico and it's like for like replacement. It is considered that the existing portico has weathered to such a degree that the loss of historic fabric and the only surviving architectural element of this building would be outweighed by the benefits of fully restoring the original character and appearance of the dwelling by restoring the original detailing, including the dentilled cornice and Ionic column profile, which have been lost.

6.3 Replacement Buildings

6.3.1 The proposal includes works which were approved as part of a scheme granted for approval in 1996 (and amended subsequently a number of times, the latest amendment being in 2008), namely excavation of basement level, rebuilding of the link, dormer windows and balconies, roof lights, and other elevational changes, including the addition of metal balustrades at the rear. It is considered that the rebuilding and reinstatement of the buildings to reflect the prevailing form and design on both the south and north elevations will reinstate the strong uniformity in this part of the conservation area. The two pairs of villas would be linked at basement and ground floor level only, thus the gap between the paired villas would

be discernible; retaining legible space and maintaining the rhythm of the streetscape, definitively enhancing the character and appearance of the conservation area.

- 6.3.2 It is proposed that the rear of No.44-45 will be rebuilt on the footprint of the existing building and the new building at No.42-43 will reflect the adjacent facade of Nos.44-45, thus presenting two paired stucco villas, thereby reinstating the lost symmetry and detailing of the original buildings in this part of the conservation area.
- 6.3.3 The new buildings are considered to be a good replica of the original buildings and are, in this context, considered to preserve the character and appearance of the Belsize Conservation Area. It is considered that the success of the scheme will be in its execution and it is therefore essential to impose conditions requiring the submission of materials and detailed drawings of architectural details.
- 6.3.4 The scheme also proposes the restoration of the front gardens to echo those of the original and adjacent properties i.e. with low rendered front walls. Although the front gardens as originally proposed were for hard landscaping, in accordance with Camden Planning Guidance 1: (Design), the proposals have been revised to incorporate soft landscaping to enhance the greenery within the streetscape which forms an integral part of the character and appearance of the conservation area.
- 6.3.5 In light of the regrettable sequence of events and the current visual appearance of the site it is imperative that the Council secures redevelopment of the site with a replica of the original buildings, so as to preserve the character and appearance of the conservation area. It is therefore recommended that the applicant enter into a legal agreement requiring the following
- The planning permission hereby granted shall be implemented in its entirety, in strict and full accordance with the approved drawings including those provided for windows and doors and materials approved by the attached conditions within 24 months from the date of the permission.
 - A method statement for retention of the façade prepared by a specialist contractor shall be submitted to the Council within three months of the date of decision notice detailing how the façade for Nos. 44-45 Belsize Park will be supported and retained throughout construction of the replacement buildings. The statement will need to be agreed to in writing by the Council in conjunction with advice from English Heritage.
 - A full photographic record of all original items which are salvageable and details of their reinstatement should be submitted within three months of the date of decision notice. The statement will need to be agreed to in writing by the Council in conjunction with advice from English Heritage.

6.4 Land Use and Mix of Units

- 6.4.1 The previous buildings on the site were in use as a hotel (Class C1). Development Plan Policy DP14 states that the Council will protect visitor accommodation in suitable locations. The Council has previously accepted the loss of the hotel on

this site. The original buildings on the site were constructed for residential purposes and the general character of the area is predominantly residential. The loss of the hotel in favour of reinstatement of this site as permanent residential accommodation is considered to be acceptable.

- 6.4.2 LDF policy makes it clear through policies such as CS6 and DP2 states that the Council will grant planning permission for development that maximises the amount of land and floorspace in residential use and provides additional residential accommodation, provided that the accommodation reaches acceptable standards. The proposal is in accordance with these policies and objectives, as it allows an increase in the provision of residential units on site from 0 to 10; it also allows an increase of 4356m² of residential floorspace.
- 6.4.3 The provision of solely residential accommodation on this site is considered to be acceptable, subject to compliance with other policies of the Plan. Policy DP1 normally seeks a mix of uses in developments, but the Council will not seek secondary uses where the sole or primary use of the proposed development is housing.
- 6.4.4 Policy DP5 requires that residential developments provide an appropriate mix of unit sizes. The private dwelling mix compares well against the dwelling size priorities table attached to this policy in that it provides six 2 bedroom units (very high priority) and four family sized units (medium priority). The dwelling mix is therefore considered to be acceptable. It is not considered such a mix is inappropriate for the locality.

6.5 Affordable Housing

- 6.5.1 This development proposes 10 new residential units comprising 4356m² of floorspace and as such contributions towards affordable housing would normally be expected under Policy DP3 .
- 6.5.2 The supporting paragraphs to DP3 (paragraph 3.17iii) point out that that the Council will take a flexible approach to the provision of off-site housing for schemes close to the affordable housing threshold- although this scheme only provides 10 units, it would provide well above the floorspace of 3,500sqm suggested by this advice as being at the top of the range to which such consideration applies. The applicant has drawn attention to the fact that these supporting paragraphs also recognise that retention of a building on a site (in this case only areas of the facades and other minor areas would be retained) may limit the potential for inclusion of affordable housing. It would be impractical, for example, for social rented and private housing to share common areas due to the differences in the management, materials and finishes expected and the ability to meet the costs of providing these. The potential to provide separate access arrangements would be limited on such a site and further reduce viability.
- 6.5.3 Affordable housing was also considered during the course of consideration of the last pair of applications in 2008/09, when it was concluded that the site could not provide affordable housing (largely as a result of the high costs associated with the

poor structural condition of the property and the requirement to rebuild the properties as an exact replica of the original).

- 6.5.4 The applicant has produced an affordable housing economic appraisal and this has been independently assessed by the Council's own consultant (henceforth referred to as the independent assessment).
- 6.5.3 The toolkit models four scenarios (with 50% affordable housing and 25% affordable housing options, plus 2 x 100% private options including one with reduced costs and specifications. Both affordable options produce very substantial negative outcomes in comparing residual value against existing use value. As such, it is contended that it would not be financially viable for the scheme to bring forward affordable housing to accompany development proposals at this site and thus none is offered.
- 6.5.5 The independent assessment of the toolkit analysis agrees that the scheme viability is such that there is no scope for affordable housing to be incorporated on site as part of the development. However, it does question some of the cost, floorspace and value inputs, but even allowing for significant revisions to matters such as sales values and build costs, the overall viability for any of the four scenarios referred to above is such that very significant (and unlikely) improvements would need to be made for there to be any difference to the conclusions reached with regard to the scope for affordable housing to be provided on site. It also concludes that the Existing Use Value used in the toolkit appears to represent a reasonable assumption directly related to market evidence.
- 6.5.6 In answer to the question as to why the developer would proceed with development, given the negative financial outcomes produced, it has been explained that the bank that currently owns this site (since the last owner entered into administration) needs to recover part of its debt for this property and has partnered the housing developer Galliard Homes for this reason. Galliards intend to build the scheme out and have built previous schemes in Camden (e.g. 2-20 Winchester Rd).
- 6.5.7 The high costs associated with the site compared with the value of the completed development are such that the scheme is most unlikely to break even and officers advise that it is not currently possible to achieve affordable housing contributions from this development. The independent assessment suggests that reduced specifications and increased sales values might possibly create scope for an off-site contribution or deferred contribution (at the time of writing, some clarification is needed of the points referred to above). However the level of loss against Existing Use Values (and the bank's debt) are very unlikely to be overcome, irrespective of extremely optimistic projections on future sales values. Officers consider that imposing a deferred contribution risks deterring the developer and lender/investor from proceeding with the scheme which could result in the indefinite continuation of the existing unsatisfactory situation of a derelict and deteriorating set of structures in the heart of the conservation area— whereas the proposed scheme could re-establish the site's positive visual contribution if it were to be implemented. On balance, it is therefore recommended that a deferred contribution should not be sought in this case, as the prospects of this being activated are limited and its

deterrent to site development in this specific case may prove counter-productive to the compelling need to address the unsatisfactory condition of the site and its relationship to the conservation area.

- 6.5.8 It is recommended, however, that a Head of Term be included in the legal agreement which allows the Council to give consideration to seeking a contribution towards affordable housing in the event that the buildings are further sub-divided.

6.6 Standard of Accommodation

- 6.6.1 All the proposed units comfortably comply with guideline threshold residential space standards set out in Camden Planning Guidance. Most of the units have direct access to either private outdoor garden space or terraces, including all of the family-sized units, the exception being two of the 2 bedroom units only having balconettes.
- 6.6.2 A Lifetime Homes statement has been submitted which all lifetime homes criteria that can be met within the heritage constraints of the premises (condition recommended). One unit is specifically designed to wheelchair user standards (including ramped access), in accordance with Camden Planning Guidance and an allotted disabled parking space will be provided in the basement parking area (all can potentially be used by wheelchair users). The layouts and site arrangements have been amended to meet changes requested by the Council's Access Officer.
- 6.6.3 An assessment of the internal daylight standards to the proposed residential accommodation, compared against BRE daylight guidelines (Average Daylight Factor). Most of the rooms tested comply, however failure in respect of the guidelines for some rooms is considered to be acceptable in the circumstances of the case to provide an appropriate development that contributes to the character of the conservation area in an urban setting
- 6.6.4 A refuse and recycling storage area is indicated at the front of the development and a condition is recommended requiring submission of further details to ensure the Council's standards are complied with.

6.7 Basement Issues

- 6.7.1 Amendments have been made during the course of consideration of this application to reduce the extent of the proposed basement, as is set out in section 2 of this report in describing the proposal.
- 6.7.2 A basement impact assessment (BIA) has been provided in accordance with the provisions of Policy DP27 and Camden Planning Guidance (CPG No.4) and the applicant has had this verified by a separate structural and environmental engineer. The BIA includes a screening report, scoping and impact assessment, plus a basement structural report.. The reports include the results of site investigations and studies. Contiguous piled walls are proposed as retaining walls for the basement, except beneath the existing retained facades adjacent to the neighbouring properties where existing foundations would be taken to the new basement depth using traditional underpinning techniques. The BIA includes predicted ground movements from the basement excavation and structural impact,

including basement slab and underpinned walls. The damage caused to neighbouring structures would be officially classified as 'category 1 or 2- very slight-slight' (according to CIRIA Damage Category Chart) which is classified as an acceptable level of consequence.

- 6.7.3 The construction sequence for the basement is described in detail in the structural report. To briefly summarise, it would follow the installation of the façade protection system (which would remain in place until almost the end of the construction process), their repair and restoration and removal of the remaining buildings at 42/43 and 44/45. The construction of the rear retaining basement walls starting at the rear would then commence with the installation of the contiguous reinforced pile walls using a contiguous flight auger or injection piles, followed by excavations to the initial basement level (forming a berm against the contiguous piled walls), thrust blocks and inclined props would then be installed in the open cut basement area on top of the piled walls, only removing the berm once the props have been installed. The construction of the basement and ground floor slabs would be followed by the removal of the temporary props (the structural report also describes how the facades would be retained during the demolition and construction process, though this is recommended to be controlled through condition to the conservation area consent and legal agreement). The basement below the façade retention system would however be constructed using traditional methods of underpinning, after carefully cutting out lower sections of the sub structure brickwork to enable reinforced concrete pins to be installed, then the top of the basement wall will be cast. (N.B. This is a necessarily a brief summary of a lengthy and complex process. A fuller version is set out in the submitted structural report).
- 6.7.4 Specialist analysis of ground movement provides evidence that the structural stability of adjoining premises would not be put at risk. This analysis takes into account heave beneath the basement slab in both short and long term and ground movement arising from the contiguous and underpinned walls. It recommends that further movement calculations would be possible once detailed structural loadings and construction sequences have been worked up later in the construction process.
- 6.7.5 The BIA concludes that there is no significant groundwater movement on the site and that there would be no impact from or to the River Tyburn and any flooding of it.. Belsize Park is not a road identified as being a road at risk of surface water flooding in Camden Planning Guidance No 4 on basements and lightwells. The BIA advises that the proposal would not cause any significant change to ground water conditions. Only minor percolation of water currently takes place into the ground beneath the gravel car park due to the impermeable underlying clay. Rainwater entering the ground at the rear of the site currently 'perches' beneath the gravel surface on the largely impermeable London Clay and its flow is further blocked by existing foundations nearby (some is likely to drain to the existing basement to the north). The proposals for the rear of the site would involve rainwater falling onto the rear gardens, most comprising surfaces of soil where it would gradually permeate before meeting a new impermeable barrier of the slab above the car park. However, this would go to drainage, rather than ponding beneath the level of foundations, as it does at the moment. Although a notable amount of the frontage would be soft landscaped, allowing water to percolate into the ground, there would be a marginal but insignificant increase in surface water runoff into the road from

the pathways themselves in the front of the houses. However, taking the site as a whole, the increased amount of soft landscaping proposed on the site would have a positive effect on surface water runoff from the site.

- 6.7.6 No window openings or lightwells are proposed at the front of the proposed houses at basement level. No habitable rooms are proposed at basement level.
- 6.7.8 The proposed basement is considered to be acceptable in light of Policy DP27 and Camden Planning Guidance, however it is recommended that a conditions be imposed requiring the development to be supervised by a qualified chartered engineer to ensure that the processes set out in the submitted reports are properly adhered to. A condition is also recommended requiring submission of further details of a Sustainable Urban Drainage System (also see section in this assessment on trees and landscaping). Furthermore, in view of the recommendation for further movement calculations to be made as the scheme is worked up towards implementation, it is recommended that conditions be applied requiring submission and approval of an independent review of the final design and construction method statements that shall be adhered to and of structural surveys of neighbouring structures to assess where any damage to adjacent or nearby premises may be caused prior to any development taking place.

6.8 Amenity

- 6.8.1 The proposed redevelopment scheme is for a building which has the same footprint, height and envelope as the original buildings on site (a condition is recommended regarding slab levels to ensure no additional impact is caused beyond that set out on the drawings). The building mass has the same relationship to the neighbouring properties as the original building and therefore there will be no significant loss of daylight, sunlight or outlook as a result of the proposed development.
- 6.8.2 The front and rear elevations of the replacement building would have the same number of window openings as the original with the exception of the additional dormer windows. The extent of overlooking from the dormer windows and inset terraces will be no more intense than from the existing window openings at lower levels and therefore they are considered to be acceptable in amenity terms.
- 6.8.3 There are windows facing towards each other at short distances in the side elevations of nos. 43 and 44 Belsize Park, however these are proposed as being obscure glazed (they would not serve habitable rooms) and are recommended to be conditioned as such to prevent any loss of privacy as a result of overlooking.
- 6.8.4 The windows to the flank walls and lower skylights closest to adjoining premises are also proposed to be obscure glazed and are also recommended to be conditioned as such to prevent any issue of overlooking. There are further high level rooflights to be positioned in the ceiling of bedrooms and bathrooms in the attic storey would not be obscured glazed, however these would too high to cause any problems of overlooking.

6.9 Car Parking

- 6.9.1 The site, though currently vacant, previously had capacity for eleven car parking spaces and is located in a highly accessible area for public transport with a PTAL of 6a. Now only five car parking spaces are proposed (one would be dedicated for disabled parking)- a ratio of 0.5 spaces per unit for the ten residential units proposed. This compares to four car parking spaces previously accepted by the Council for the 2008 applications for four residential units on this site before they were withdrawn- a ratio of 1 space per unit. Access would be via the existing basement parking area and ramp on the adjoining site created by partly implemented previous planning permissions (see history). The applicants advise that the level of parking proposed is the minimum in order to provide the incentive to proceed with the scheme. In light of the reduction of car parking relative to the previous use of the site, the number of family-sized units proposed and the circumstances of the case, it is considered that the provision of 5 parking spaces is acceptable in this particular case.
- 6.9.2 The site is located in a controlled parking zone and an area identified by Council records as being under night-time parking stress due to the high level of demand for streetside parking space. It is recommended that the scheme be 'car capped' via the recommended legal agreement to ensure that no residents of the scheme would be entitled to apply for a resident streetside parking permit.

6.10 Cycle Parking

- 6.10.1 A total of 24 cycle parking spaces are shown on the proposed drawings in three secure areas at basement level, using Sheffield stands. This meets Camden Planning Guidance and is considered to be acceptable, though a condition is recommended requiring submission of full details.

6.11 Highways and Other Construction Issues

- 6.11.1 Given the proposed extent of demolition and excavation that is being proposed and that Belsize Park and Belsize Lane are both heavily parked narrow residential streets, it is considered that a Construction Management Plan should be provided to ensure that the development does not have an adverse impact on the local transport network. A Construction Management Plan outlines how construction work will be carried out and how this work will be serviced (e.g. delivery of materials, set down and collection of skips), with the objective of minimising traffic disruption and avoiding dangerous situations for pedestrians and other road users. This should be secured by legal agreement in accordance with Policy DP20.
- 6.11.2 A section 106 agreement would be required for repaving the footway adjacent to the site and vehicular crossover on Belsize Lane and the footway on Belsize Park following construction (estimated cost: £14,580).
- 6.11.3 Camden also expects developers to comply with Considerate Contractors practices in undertaking developments and the Council's Pollution Control section oversees such practices and has powers should unreasonable behaviour occur.

6.12 Trees and Landscaping

6.12.1 The proposed plans indicate planting of small trees and boundary privet hedges in the front gardens of the proposed properties, plus entrance pathways, steps and some additional hard landscaping. Most of the rear garden areas would be soft landscaped, other than some hard surfaced patio areas immediately to the rear of the properties. Most of these garden areas would be above the proposed basement and these soft landscaped gardens would have a depth of up to 0.9m, which is considered to be acceptable. Some indicative small tree planting is shown, however it is recommended that submission full details of all hard and soft landscaping be required by condition.

6.12.2 A Copper Beech tree is proposed just to the rear of the gardens, as it is understood such a tree was felled on the site by a previous owner some years ago.

6.12.3 The proposed landscaping is considered to be acceptable in principle, subject to recommended conditions.

6.13 Sustainability

6.13.1 The proposed units are predicted to achieve a Code for Sustainable Homes Level 3 including achieving at least 50% of the available credits in the categories of energy, water and materials, according to a submitted Preliminary Assessment. This meets the expectations set out in Camden Planning Guidance.

6.13.2 An energy report has been provided which indicates that 7.8% carbon dioxide (CO₂) emissions savings can be made from energy efficiency proposals and 10.9% through energy efficiency and passive design. 20.6% CO₂ emissions savings could be made from renewable energy over an energy efficient scheme with the use of photovoltaic panels, however no details have been supplied and it is doubtful that these can be accommodated without harming the appearance of the conservation area. A suitably worded condition is recommended to secure the recommendations of the submitted energy statement.

6.13.3 In respect of water, the proposals involve a significant increase in the area of soft landscaping on the site, thus providing a permeable surface for water to infiltrate into soil. Such infiltration also helps to prevent flash flooding during periods of heavy rain. This is also helpful, as infiltration to London Clay found in the area is slow. Water butts are also proposed to collect and store rainwater for gradual release. Gradual release of rainwater will also reduce pressure on the surface water drain during periods of heavy rain. A condition is recommended in respect of this matter requiring submission of full details. Water saving devices such as low flush toilets, aerated shower heads, spray taps will be used in the development.

6.14 Other Issues: Security, Employment in Camden, Educational Contributions

- Security

6.14.1 The Crime Prevention Officer of the Metropolitan Police has assessed the proposals and is satisfied subject to a number of points of detail being met (see representations above). A condition requiring subsequent submission of proposed security measures is therefore recommended.

-Employment in Camden

6.14.2 In accordance with Policies CS8, CS19 and DP13 of the Local Development Framework and Camden Planning Guidance (CPG No.8), the Council seeks employment and local procurement obligations for development schemes of the nature proposed. Following the information provided about the scheme and the advice set out in CPG8, the following should be provided (these would be secured via a legal agreement):

- Agreement to work with King's Cross Construction Skills Centre (KCCSC) to support a recruitment target of 20% of construction workers employed at the site being Camden residents.
- Provide 3.5 FTE construction apprenticeships to Camden residents recruited via KCCSC during construction and £5,250 contribution towards apprentice placement and support via KCCSC.
- Agreement to work with Camden Council to provide opportunities for Camden-based business during the construction tender process.

N.B. If the applicant were not to agree to provide apprentice placements, a contribution of £24,500 for the creation of training opportunities elsewhere in the borough, again in line with advice in CPG8.

- Educational Contributions

6.14.3 In accordance with Policies CS10 and CS19 of the Local Development Framework and Camden Planning Guidance (CPG No.8), the Council seeks educational contributions from residential developments of this nature to contribute towards the additional demand for educational provision that can reasonably be expected to be generated by the development. Using the levels of contributions set out in CPG8, a contribution of £68,910 is expected. This is recommended to be secured via a legal agreement.

7. CONCLUSION

- 7.1 The application site has a long and unfortunate planning history. The proposed development presents the opportunity to restore a site that is considered to detract from the character and appearance of the conservation area in its present state, albeit with remnants of buildings that could contribute positively to the conservation area. The façade retention and creation of effectively near replica buildings (in terms of their external appearance) is a great opportunity to develop this site in an appropriate manner.
- 7.2 It would not be economically viable to provide affordable housing, however family-sized accommodation and very high priority two bedroom residential units would be provided. The scheme would not cause any serious loss of amenity to nearby occupiers with the application of the recommended conditions and legal agreement. It would also meet modern housing standards and provide a number of planning benefits, secured by the proposed legal agreement.
- 7.2 Planning Permission is recommended subject to a S106 Legal Agreement covering the following Heads of Terms:-

- Requirement for the planning permission hereby to be implemented in its entirety within 24 months from the date of the permission.
- Submission of a method statement for the façade retention and a photographic record of original items to be salvaged and reinstated.
- In the event that the buildings are sub-divided consideration will be given to a contribution to affordable housing.
- Car-capped.
- Construction Management Plan.
- A financial contribution towards associated highways works (estimate: £14,580).
- Educational Contribution of £68,910
- Agreement to work with King's Cross Construction Skills Centre (KCCSC) to support a recruitment target of 20% of construction workers employed at the site being Camden residents.
- Provide 3.5 FTE construction apprenticeships to Camden residents recruited via KCCSC during construction and £5,250 contribution towards apprentice placement and support via KCCSC (If the applicant were not to agree to provide apprentice placements, a contribution of £24,500 for the creation of training opportunities elsewhere in the borough).
- Agree to work with Camden Council to provide opportunities for Camden-based business during the construction tender process.

8. **LEGAL COMMENTS**

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