

Delegated Report (Members' Briefing)		Analysis sheet N/A / attached		Expiry Date: 15/09/2014		Consultation Expiry Date: 20/08/2014	
Officer				Application Number(s)			
Rob Tulloch				2014/4698/P			
Application Address				Drawing Numbers			
8-9 Oak Village London NW5 4QR				See decision notice			
PO 3/4		Area Team Signature		C&UD		Authorised Officer Signature	
Proposal(s)							
Erection of a 2 storey office building following the demolition of existing lock up garages.							
Recommendation(s):		Grant Planning Permission Subject to a Section 106 Agreement					
Application Type:		Full Planning Application					
Conditions:		Refer to Draft Decision Notice					
Informatives:							
Consultations							
Adjoining Occupiers:		No. notified	15	No. of responses	2	No. of objections	2
Summary of consultation responses:		<p>Site notice 30/07/2014-20/08/2014 Press advert n./a</p> <p>Nos. 4 and 7 Oak Village object to the provision of a garage which will lead to the loss of an on-street parking space. No. 4 also objects to the impact on trees, and questions whether remaining trees will be sufficiently protected. They also object to the yellow colour of the proposed building. No. 7 welcomes the replacement of an "eyesore" with a new useful building.</p> <p>Officer response: The provision of a garage and the loss of an on-street parking space are addressed in sections <u>5.1 & 5.2</u>. Tree officers accept the loss of scrub growth, and are satisfied the submitted arboricultural information demonstrates the remaining trees can be properly protected (see section <u>6.2</u>)</p>					

<p>CAAC/Local group comments:</p>	<p>Elaine Grove and Oak Village Residents' Association (EGOVRA) have concerns about the impact on trees and request that conditions ensure adequate tree protection, and that any trees removed should be replaced. They suggest London stock brickwork be used for the flank elevation of the building and that this be secured by condition. They object to the garage as it is unnecessary and would result in the loss of an on-street parking contrary to DP19.</p> <p>Officer response: A condition will require details of facing materials to be submitted to and approved by the Council (see section 3.3).</p>
--	--

Site Description

The site is occupied by a row of four garages at the northern end of Oak Village, between Mansfield Road and Hemingway Close. Immediately to the north of the site is a 1A Mansfield Road, a three storey corner building comprising a coffee shop on the ground floor and flat above. Behind the site is Oak Village Railway Embankment, a pocket of designated open space which forms part of the larger Gospel Oak Railsides Site of Nature Conservation Importance (Borough Importance – Grade I). The site is not within a conservation area, but to the south of Mansfield Conservation Area. To the south and east of the railway lines the area is predominantly low storey residential, on the other side of the railway to the north is Parliament Hill, and to the west is the Kentish Town Industrial Area.

Relevant History

2004/3065/P Demolition of existing storage/garages and erection of two storey office building (B1) including integral garage.

This application was refused on 17/09/2004, the sole reason for refusal being “The proposed development would lead to damage to the adjoining site of nature conservation importance, as identified in the London Borough of Camden Unitary Development Plan 2000 (the UDP), in particular the likely loss of, or serious damage to, a large ash tree which is protected by a tree preservation order.”

A subsequent appeal was allowed. The Inspector considered that the affected tree would have a good chance of survival, and if it were lost the benefit of redeveloping the site would outweigh the harm caused by its loss, and there would remain a backdrop of trees on the embankment.

PEX0300203 Erection of two storey office building (B1) including integral garage. Refused 26/03/2004

8703311 Redevelopment by the erection of a two-storey building for class B1 business. Granted 01/09/1988

Relevant policies

- LDF Core Strategy and Development Policies**
- CS5 Managing the impact of growth and development
 - CS8 Promoting a successful and inclusive Camden economy
 - CS11 Promoting sustainable and efficient travel
 - CS13 Tackling climate change and promoting higher environmental standards
 - CS14 Promoting high quality places and conserving our heritage
 - CS15 Protecting and improving our parks and open spaces & encouraging biodiversity
-
- DP13 Employment sites and premises
 - DP26 Managing the impact of development on occupiers and neighbours
 - DP18 Parking standards and limiting the availability of car parking
 - DP19 Managing the impact of parking
 - DP21 Development connecting to the highway network

DP22 Promoting sustainable design and construction

DP24 Securing high quality design

DP31 Provision of, and improvements to, open space, and outdoor sport and recreation facilities

Camden Planning Guidance 2013

NPPF 2012

Assessment

1 Proposal

1.1 The proposal is for the erection of a 2 storey office building following the demolition of existing lock up garages.

1.2 An identical scheme was submitted in 2004 (ref 2004/3065/P). This was refused by the Council, but allowed on appeal. The only reason for refusal was the harm to a nearby tree, which the Inspector considered would be overridden by the benefits of redevelopment of the site.

1.3 The main issues are:

- Land use
- Design
- Amenity
- Transport
- Biodiversity
- Community Infrastructure Levy

2 Land use

2.1 The provision of new employment space across the borough is welcomed in line with policies CS8 (Promoting a successful and inclusive Camden economy) and DP13 (Employment sites and premises), and the NPPF. There is a current regeneration programme for Gospel Oak which aims to address inequality in the area by working with local people and local businesses to improve employment opportunities, and the proposed development could provide up to 20 jobs. The Council's Economic Development team welcome the creation of employment space on this site, and members of the Gospel Oak Business Forum have commented on the wasted opportunity that this site represents and suggested that an active business use would be appropriate. In 2004 the Inspector recognised the value in redeveloping this long neglected site.

3 Design

3.1 The existing garages are in a poor state of repair and were described by the Inspector as dilapidated. They have not been used for vehicles for over 10 years and the pavement in front of them has been reinstated. They make a negative contribution to the character and appearance of the street scene, with peeling paintwork and graffiti, as such there is no objection to their loss.

3.2 The proposed building is modest in scale with an understated appearance. The proposed building measures approximately 14.7 (w) x 6.46m (h) x 4.8m (d). It would be 1.2m lower than 1A Mansfield Road which is on the corner of Oak Village and Mansfield Road and would remain the prominent building.

- 3.3 The proposed design takes a modern approach, with a rectilinear building utilising a variety of materials. At the front, the ground floor would be a combination of louvered windows above a brick base, alongside timber-clad doors. The louvered treatment would be continued on the first floor level. The side and rear elevations would be constructed in brick. The submitted plans show what appears to be stock brick and this would tie in with the predominant material in the street. A condition will require samples of all external materials to be agreed.
- 3.4 Although the site is adjacent to designated open space it is considered to respect the size and form of the space and would not cause harm to its wholeness, appearance or setting.
- 3.5 The proposed design was considered acceptable previously, and was not a reason for refusal. The proposal is considered to enhance the street scene, which apart from the adjacent public house, suffers from uninspired design and unsympathetic alterations. As such the proposal would comply with policies CS14 (Promoting high quality places and conserving our heritage) and DP24 (Securing high quality design), and associated planning guidance.

4 Amenity

- 4.1 The proposed building would abut the flank wall of 1A Mansfield Road and would have no impact on sunlight or daylight to this building. Nos. 6 and 7 Oak Village are residential properties to the south west of the site, but due to the modest height of the proposed building there would be no loss of light to these properties. Similarly the modest scale of the proposed building is not considered to affect outlook to other properties in Oak Village.
- 4.2 The closest windows to no. 7 Oak Village would be 15m away, which is slightly under the 18m recommended for interfacing habitable rooms, but Oak Village is a collection of narrow streets with many houses less than 15m away from each other, and an office use, due to its limited hours of operation, would not significantly contribute to a loss of privacy. No windows to 1A would face the proposed building.

5 Transport

- 5.1 The proposal would provide an internal garage with space for one vehicle. The applicant states that on-site parking is required for their business as a facilities management company which carries out property maintenance and repair. The provision of a garage would require the creation of a crossover and lead to the loss of one on-street parking space. Policy DP19 (Managing the impact of parking) states that the Council will resist off-street parking, and development that will reduce the amount of on-street parking, where it would cause unacceptable parking pressure, particularly in areas of identified parking stress.
- 5.2 The site is located in the Kentish Town West controlled parking zone (CPZ). The ratio of permits to parking spaces in the CPZ is 0.68 which indicates that the area does not suffer from parking stress. As such, in this instance it is considered that the loss of a parking space would not have a harmful impact on local parking conditions, and would comply with policy DP19. The existing garages have not been used for over 10 years so the loss of the garages would not put additional pressure on parking in the area.
- 5.3 The plans indicate space for two cycles at ground floor level. Due to the limited scale of the development, cycle storage is not required and therefore a condition securing it would be unreasonable, however the provision of such storage is welcomed.
- 5.4 The site is located on a cycle route and near the junction of Gordon House Road/Mansfield Road (B518). The proposed construction works are therefore likely to have an impact on

amenity (noise, vibration, air quality) and transport (traffic congestion and road safety). Therefore a construction management plan will be secured via a Section 106 agreement.

6 Biodiversity

- 6.1 There are no trees on site, but the open space to the rear has dense vegetation including one protected tree (T1). The applicant has submitted an arboricultural report which indicates the removal of scrub growth (G3) and the pruning of the trees (T1 and T2).
- 6.2 Tree officers consider the removal of G3 to be acceptable as it is a mixture of elder and ivy and has little amenity value. The proposed pruning of the trees is also considered acceptable as this would only affect the south western side of T1 with minimal intervention to T2. It would only affect the lower sections of canopies that need to be removed to accommodate the new building. This would involve pruning up to a height of 8m, which is not considered harmful to the health of the trees, or their amenity value, as they are 15m in height. The arboricultural report includes detailed tree protection measures and a condition will ensure that the protection methods proposed are put in place and evidence of their implementation are submitted to the Council.
- 6.3 As the adjacent space is a Site of Nature Conservation Importance (Borough Importance – Grade I), the applicant has submitted an ecological survey to assess the impact of development on the site. This has been reviewed by an ecology officer who considers that the proposal would not have a harmful impact on the adjacent site as long as appropriate conditions relating to the timing of vegetation clearance, a lighting strategy and the incorporation of bird and bat boxes are attached.

7 Community Infrastructure Levy

- 7.1 The proposal would provide approximately 120sqm of floorspace, and would therefore be liable for a CIL contribution.

- 8 Recommendation:** Grant Planning Permission Subject to a Section 106 Agreement for a construction management plan

DISCLAIMER

**Decision route to be decided by nominated members on Monday 16th February 2015.
For further information please go to www.camden.gov.uk and search for 'members briefing'.**