

Date: 3 December 2014
Our Ref: 2014/2889/PRE
Contact: Jenna Litherland

Direct Line: 020 7974 3070

Email: Jenna.Litherland@camden.gov.uk

Mark Furlonger
Temple Group Ltd
Devon House
58-60 St Katharine's Way
London
E1W 1LB
mark.furlonger@templegroup.co.uk

**Development Control
Planning Services**
London Borough of Camden
Town Hall
Argyle Street
London WC1H 8ND

Tel 020 7974 4444
Fax 020 7974 1975
env.devcon@camden.gov.uk
www.camden.gov.uk/planning

Dear Mark Furlonger,

**Re. Planning Pre-application advice meeting ref. 2014/2889/PRE
Arthur Stanley House
40 - 50 Tottenham Street
London
W1T 4RN**

Alterations and extension to enable a change of use from health care facility (Class D1) to a mixed use development comprising residential (Class C3) and office floorspace (Class B1) including new build to the rear.

I refer to our pre-application meeting held on **08/10/2014** about the above proposal.

Set out in this letter is a detailed note of the principal issues discussed at the meeting. The focus of this meeting was on height, bulk, massing and design. There are other material considerations to this proposal which were not discussed at this meeting as such this response should be read in conjunction with my letters dated 13 June and 24 September.

Site Description

The application site comprises vacant hospital (outpatients) with ancillary offices. The building is an eight storey brick-faced post war block of limited architectural merit. It is within the Charlotte Street conservation area, and is currently identified as a detractor in the Charlotte Street Conservation Area Appraisal due to its scale and bulk.

The site is identified in the Fitzrovia Area Action Plan (FAAP) as a potential site suitable for permanent self-contained homes if the established medical/healthcare uses are no longer required. Commercial use at ground floor level is noted as also being suitable. The FAAP states that any use on the site which increases the use of open space should provide new on-site public open space or if this is not possible this should be provided on an identified site in the vicinity.

The surrounding area contains a range of built forms and scales with traditional four storey terraced buildings to the south and more modern institutional blocks of a similar scale to the subject building directly to the north.

Proposal

You advised in the meeting that you are likely to be coming forward with option A5 which is for a predominantly office based scheme with a lesser number of residential units from earlier iterations of the scheme. As stated in previous correspondence it would be preferable to have a greater proportions of residential development, however, the proposal would be policy compliant as it stands in land use terms.

Main building

The Charlotte Street Conservation Area Appraisal makes reference to Arthur Stanley House as detracting from conservation area owing to its scale and bulk. It states that there is an opportunity to provide a replacement more consistent with the character of the conservation area. The current proposals look very big-gesture, cooperate and glassy which is considered to be out of character with the conservation area in which buildings are predominantly brick. The proposal result in a building which is less respectful of the conservation area than what is currently in place. This is clearly contrary to the aspirations of the Conservation Area Appraisal.

The existing building, with its brick facades and calm rhythms is preferable in terms of character than the proposed. It is not considered that this mid street block needs a corner expression. We would expect any re-facing of this building to result in an restrained brick façade with good quality details, proportions and layering to achieve quality, as in the Derwent scheme next door.

You explained in the meeting that it may be necessary to project beyond the existing building line. This may be acceptable if designed appropriately and gives opportunities for depth in the façade. This needs to be looked at further.

Rear extension

The rear extension is shown as the same eastern alignment as the gable on Middlesex House. However, Middlesex house does have a sloping setback on its top floor. We need to better understand where this element is visible from. The top storey may need to be set back. It is suggested that you provide a views analysis.

Mews houses

A more mews like/domestic aesthetic needs to be found for this element. Material should be brick with punched windows. Double height windows with spandrel panel have too much of a corporate aesthetic not in keeping with the mews character. If the proposal is to have a double setback then this must be achieved in a way that doesn't feel contrived in a ziggurat way. Note the approach on the Derwent scheme opposite where the upper storey are recessive in form and material.

Public space

The easing of the bottleneck is welcomed. However the recessed element raises concerns over quality (overshadowed, obscured from view etc). This could give rise to anti-social behaviour and a space which is not well used. It is suggested that you look at building in this area and compensating for it by pushing the mews houses back to widen the mews.

Please note that if you (the applicant or their representative) have drafted any notes of the pre-application meeting(s) held with the council you cannot assume that these are agreed unless you have received written confirmation of this from the case officer.

If you have any queries about the above letter or the attached document please do not hesitate to contact **Jenna Litherland** on **020 7974 3070**.

Thank you for using Camden's pre-application advice service.

Yours sincerely,

Jenna Litherland
Senior Planning Officer