

# CONSULTATION SUMMARY

## Case reference number(s)

2016/1779/P

## Case Officer:

John Diver

## Application Address:

26 Fitzroy Square

London

W1T 6BT

## Proposal(s)

Change of use between 2nd and 4th floors from office (B1) and ancillary residential accommodation to form 2x residential units: 1bed at second and 2bed at third and fourth floors including replacement three storey rear extension and associated alterations.

## Representations

<b>Consultations:</b>	No. notified	13	No. of responses	3	No. of objections	2
					No of comments	0
					No of support	1
<b>Summary of representations</b>  <i>(Officer response(s) in italics)</i>	The owner/occupiers of No's 20 & 25 Fitzroy Square have objected to the application on the following grounds:  <ol style="list-style-type: none"><li>1. Oppose new residential units, particularly at lower ground floor level.</li><li>2. Inaccuracies in application form regarding existing no. units</li><li>3. Increased levels of noise and disruption from proposed uses as well as new services.</li><li>4. Noise and overlooking impacts from roof terrace.</li><li>5. Increase stain on local parking provision and waste management.</li><li>6. Subdivision would reduce integrity of listed building.</li></ol> (Please note that these comments were received prior to significant revisions to the					

proposed scheme).

Officer's comments:

1 – Following the submission of revisions, the proposed scheme, no longer proposes residential units at lower ground floor level. The proposed units at upper floors are not considered to have a detrimental impact and are thus not objectionable.

2 – The application has been assessed on the basis that there was only one existing residential unit at top floors which remained ancillary to the office use below.

3 – Considering the size of the proposed units and the expected level of activity from within, it is not considered that the level of noise or disruption create would be significant enough to warrant a reason for refusal. The location of services is considered to be the most practical solution when balancing the need to preserve historic fabric of the building. These services are similarly not considered to lead to significant harm due to the expended level of use.

4 – The terrace at roof level has evidently been in situ for a long time (far more than 4 years) and is thus considered lawful due to the passage of time. This terrace does not therefore require permission and does not form a part of this assessment. Notwithstanding this, due to its size and location it is not considered to cause undue harm to any neighbouring resident.

5 – The application would be subject to a legal agreement to ensure that the newly proposed unit would be 'car-free'. As such the development would not cause additional strain to the local parking provision. The increase in refuse produced on site as a result of the additional unit is not considered significant to lead to a detrimental impact.

6 – As the proposed units would share a single front door and a number of communal spaces, the property would still function as a single planning unit. As assessed by Listed Building Consent application 2016/2501/L; the overall development is not considered to cause harm to the character and importance of the listed building.

**Recommendation:-**

**Grant planning permission subject to S106 agreement**