

Delegated Report (Members Briefing)		Analysis sheet		Expiry Date:	01/01/2016
		N/A /		Consultation Expiry Date:	03/02/2016
Officer			Application Number(s)		
Elaine Quigley			2015/7028/P		
Application Address			Drawing Numbers		
8 & 10 Stukeley Street London WC2 5LQ			See draft decision notice		
PO 3/4	Area Team Signature	C&UD	Authorised Officer Signature		
Proposal(s)					
Erection of replacement mansard roof extension at no. 8 and installation of new mansard roof extension at no. 10; excavation of a single storey basement extension including lightwell to create additional Class B1c office floorspace; change of use of the ground floor of no. 8 from office to residential associated within the enlargement and reconfiguration of the two 1 bed residential units to create two 2 bed flats; alterations to the ground floor front and rear elevations; erection of first floor rear extension, and creation of external terrace at basement and first floor levels at no. 10.					
Recommendation(s):		Grant planning permission subject a section 106 legal agreement			
Application Type:		Full Planning Application			

Conditions or Reasons for Refusal:	Refer to Draft Decision Notice					
Informatives:						
Consultations						
Adjoining Occupiers:	No. notified	50	No. of responses	9	No. of objections	9
			No. Electronic	9		
Summary of consultation responses:	A site notice was displayed on 06/01/2016 (expired on 27/01/2016) and a press notice was advertised on 29/12/2015 (expired 19/01/2016).					
	<p>Original scheme</p> <p>5 letters of objection were received from Flat A, 182 Drury Lane, 182 Drury Lane, 12 Stukeley Street, Flat 5, Goldsmith Court, Flat 4, Goldsmith Court raising the following concerns:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Unauthorised air-conditioning plant outside bedroom window that has been installed without planning permission <i>See para 2.1 and 7.11</i>• Design of the metal and glazed rear façade is too contemporary <i>See para 2.1 and 5.4</i>• Raised skylight will obstruct view <i>See para 2.1 and 7.6</i>• Structural damage to adjoining properties as a result of the proposed basement excavation having a considerable risk to the structural integrity of no. 12. <i>See para 6.5</i>• Raising the height of the parapet and roof on the Stukeley Street elevation will adversely affect the sense of enclosure and light penetration and set a bad precedent to any future potential development of no. 10 Stukeley Street. <i>See para 7</i>• Increase in height of the single storey link between Stukeley Street and 182 Drury Lane would significantly damage the amenity of the residential accommodation at nos. 182 and 180 Drury Lane. <i>See para 7.5</i>• The proposed terrace at second floor would affect privacy to bedrooms and living rooms in Goldsmith Court to the north as well as to the flats at nos. 180 and 182 Drury Lane <i>See para 2.1 and 7.10</i>• The scheme is a gross over-development of the site <i>See para 5</i>• The basement flat would have limited daylight that would not comply with the Council or London housing design standards.					

See para 4.2, 4.4 and 4.5

- Upper dwelling is serviced by one staircase and access to bedrooms would have to pass through the kitchen/dining room to escape in case of fire which clearly doesn't comply with building regulations.
See para 4.8

- Increased Human traffic
See para 4.2 (the proposal would not increase the number of flats and the increase in the number of bedrooms would not be considered to significantly increase pedestrian traffic to and from the site)

Revised drawings

5 further objection letters were received from International House, 16 Stukeley Street, 5 Stukeley Street; Flat 5, Goldsmith's Court, 182 Drury Lane and 12 Stukeley Street. Concerns regarding basement works, air conditioning units and treatment of the rear façade of no.10 have been raised and are already detailed above. The following additional concerns have been raised:

- General disruption to the street
See para 7.12 to 7.15
- Rough sleepers using the protection of the scaffolding at night
See para 7.12 to 7.15
- Drug dealers using the protection of the scaffolding to operate at night
See para 7.12 to 7.15
- Increased dirt and waste
See para 7.12 to 7.15
- Scaffolding to facilitate other works to other buildings within the street attracted numerous rough sleepers living under cover in the doorways and on the street. This resulted in anti-social behaviour on top of noise and disruption of the building works itself. It affects the local businesses and was very unpleasant. What measures are being taken to address the environmental and business impact of the proposal
See para 7.12 to 7.15
- No indication what has been revised either in note form or by bubbling the changed areas on the drawing; there are lot of inconsistencies and the revised drawings are very obscure.
See para 10.1

Statutory consultee responses	<p>Bloomsbury Conservation Area Advisory Committee (CAAC) - objects The CAAC objects to the original proposal on the following grounds: We strongly object to this proposed new mansard on this small but prominent building. The existing mansard on this characterful building pushes the boundaries of acceptability and to increase its height, bulk and footprint in the way proposed would result in it appearing overdominant and top-heavy and thereby seriously harmful to the character and appearance of the conservation area and should be rejected. <i>See para 2.1 and 5.2 to 5.6</i></p> <p>Other aspects of the proposal are a cause for concern and appear overly ambitious over-development for this diminutive site including the infillings. <i>See para 5</i></p> <p>Revised drawings The CAAC was notified about the revised drawings; however no further response was received.</p> <p>Covent Garden Community Association (CGCA) - objects They have objected to the original proposal on the following grounds:</p> <p>Air conditioning unit</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The location of the proposed air-conditioning plant due to its location directly outside a residential, noise-sensitive bedroom window. The applicant has caused great disturbance to residential amenity by using the plant without consent, thus indicating a lack of concern for nearby residents. <i>See para 2.1 and 7.11</i> • Should the Council be minded to grant approval, conditions must be included to ensure that the air-conditioning units do not cause noise and disturbance to residential amenity. <i>See para 7.11</i> <p>Metal and glazed façade and raised skylight</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The CGCA objects to the proposed massed metal and glazing façade as shown on the Proposed SW Elevation (Drg. A1716) as well as the raised skylight shown in Section B. These proposals contradict CPG1 – 5, which states that the effect on neighbouring properties shall be a main consideration in such proposals. The large elevation of glazing is directly opposite residential properties and, thus has a negative impact on their view. Similarly, the raised skylight will obstruct residents' views. <i>See para 2.1 and 5.4</i> <p>Revised drawings CGCA was notified about the revised drawings; however no further response was received.</p> <p>Cross Rail – no objection subject to condition <i>See para 10.3</i></p>

Site Description

The application site is located on the corner of Stukeley Street, that bounds the site to the north and east – the eastern section is a cul-de-sac that leads to the rear of no. 9 Macklin Street. This part of Stukeley Street is a narrow pedestrianized street that lies within the Seven Dials conservation area. The City Literary Institute building dominates the south side of the street being 5 storeys in height with large glazed areas of metal windows.

The ground floor of both no. 8 and 10 Stukeley Street comprise B1(c) office floorspace (126.7 sq. m), the first floors of both buildings are residential as is the second floor of no 8 providing 2 self-contained flats. No. 8 is two storeys in height with a mansard roof extension. No 10 is also two storeys with a steep roof pitch (no mansard roof). It has been incrementally extended during the 1960's and 1970's at the rear adding a roof extension to its original two storey closet wing and 2 storey rear extension infilling what would originally have been a rear garden area.

The 19th century buildings have an industrial character as they were originally built as banana warehouses. The buildings form part of the character of the street where there are a number of 2 storey buildings, with both residential and commercial use, that adds contrast and interest by their lower roof lines and cottage appearance. Nos. 8 and 10 are identified as positive contributors to the conservation area for their group value as part of nos. 2-14 (evens).

The site lies within the Central London Area, an Archaeological Priority Area and is identified as lying within an area of hydrological constraint (slope stability and groundwater flow).

Relevant History

8 & 10 Stukeley Street (Application site)

Ref 18609 - Change of use of the existing building at 182 Drury Lane and 10 Stukeley Street, WC2 to provide a betting office on the ground floor with basement storage, architects office at the rear ground floor and two self-contained flats on the first floor, Granted August 1974

Ref 32545 - Change of use from storage to residential and the erection of an additional storey to provide a dwelling house, Granted August 1981.

Ref 47967 - The change of use from storage to light industry, Granted December 1982.

Ref 8501082 - The erection of an extra floor for light industrial purposes and alterations to the front elevation, Granted November 1985.

PS9604238 - Change of use from employment use within Class B1 of the Town and Country Planning (Use Classes) Order to a single family dwelling, Granted February 1997

14 Stukeley Street

Ref 2004/2163/P - The installation of new glazed door and brick screen to front of recessed lobby, Granted July 2009.

8900133 - Erection of new basement and 5 storey building for Class B1 purposes, Refused

September 1989.

6 Stukeley Street

Ref 2016/1445/P – Demolition of an existing single storey house and erection of two four storey, 2 x bedroom dwelling houses including basement excavation, Pending decision August 2016.

Relevant policies

National Planning Policy Framework (2012)

The London Plan March 2016

LDF Core Strategy and Development Policies

CS1 Distribution of Growth

CS5 Managing the impact of growth and development

CS6 Providing quality Homes

CS11 Promoting sustainable and efficient travel

CS13 Tackling climate change through promoting higher environmental standards

CS14 Promoting high quality places and conserving our heritage

DP2 Making full use of Camden's capacity for housing

DP5 Homes of different sizes

DP6 Lifetime homes and Wheelchair homes

DP13 Employment sites and premises

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 Heritage

DP26 Managing the impact of development on occupiers and neighbours

DP27 Basements and lightwells

DP28 Noise and Vibration

DP29 Improving access

Camden Planning Guidance

CPG1 Design (2015)

CPG2 Housing (2015)

CPG4 Basements & Lightwells (2015)

CPG6 Amenity (2013)

CPG7 Transport (2011)

CPG8 Planning obligations (2011)

Seven Dials Conservation Area statement (adopted 1998)

Assessment

1. Proposal:

1.1 Planning permission is sought for the following:

- erection of replacement mansard roof extension at no. 8
- installation of new mansard roof extension at no. 10
- excavation of a single storey basement extension under the footprint of both buildings measuring approximately 11.5m in width by 21m in length by 3.3m in depth
- creation of lightwell to rear of no. 10 measuring 7 sq.m
- alterations to the ground floor front and rear elevations including replacement entrance doors and shopfront to no. 10 and removal of door and replacement with enlarged window opening at ground floor level on the front elevation of no. 8
- first floor rear L-shaped extension at no. 10 measuring between 1.8m and 2.7m in width by 3.1 to 6.6m in length by 3.6m in height to create a new master bedroom
- creation of external terrace to the rear of no. 10 at basement (7 sq. m) and first floor levels (12 sq. m) with installation of 1.8m high obscure glazed privacy screen
- installation of two raised skylights in the roof of the existing ground floor rear extension at no. 10

Amendments

1.2 The design of the original proposal has been amended following discussions with the Council. These include the following amendments:

- The reduction in the size and position of the mansard windows at no. 10 to follow the fenestration pattern on the first and ground floors of the host building. The windows on the mansard roof extensions have been altered to a 3/6 sash design set lower behind the parapet.
- The existing brick chimney at no. 10 to be retained as a traditional feature of the building (the original plans included its removal).
- The treatment of the proposed south west rear elevation of the first floor rear extension at no.10 has been revised from fully glazed elevations at first and second floors to reduce the amount of glass and include more solid elements with traditional brickwork and traditional window openings.
- The removal of the second floor rear roof terrace and associated balustrade from the first floor rear extension to no. 10
- Installation of 1.8m high privacy screen around the perimeter of the first floor rear terrace at no. 10 to prevent overlooking to the adjacent dwelling no 6 Stukeley Street and nos. 182 and 183 Drury Lane.
- Removal of the existing historic air conditioning units and installation of new air conditioning units to be housed within the existing timber enclosure on the roof of the ground floor extension at no.10.
- Reduction in the height of one of the skylights within the roof of the existing ground floor rear extension at no. 10 from 1.4m in height to 0.3m

2. Principle of development:

2.1 The existing uses within the building comprise a mix of commercial office B1(c) floorspace on the ground floor and residential C3 use on the first and second floors. The proposed development would increase both office B1(c) and C3 floorspace within the buildings overall. The principle of intensifying both uses within the site is considered acceptable subject to other qualifying criteria including high

quality design and acceptable amenity.

2.2 DP13 requires land and buildings to be retained that are suitable for continued business use and will resist a change to non-business uses unless justification has been provided. There is currently 126.7 sqm of office space at ground floor level. The proposal would create 159.2 sq. m of office space (64.3 sq. m at basement level and 94.8 sq. m at ground floor level). Due to internal reconfigurations there would be a loss of floor space at ground floor level however overall there would be an increase in new office floor space of 32.5 sq. m and there would be no overall loss of office floorspace.

2.3 The proposal would include the creation of additional residential floorspace to enlarge the two existing flats from 95.6 sq. m to 165.3 sq. m (GIA). This would comply with policy CS6 and DP2 and would be considered acceptable.

3. Dwelling mix

3.1 Policy DP5 seeks to ensure that all residential development contributes to meeting the priorities set out in the Dwelling Size Priorities Table (DSPT). The existing dwellings have 1 bedroom each at first floor level. The DSPT indicates that 1-bed market housing has “lower” priority, whereas 2-bed market housing has “high” priority. Insofar as the proposal would create larger flats by providing units which has a higher priority level, the proposal is welcomed.

4. Residential dwelling standards

4.1 Policy DP26 requires new development to provide an acceptable standard of accommodation in terms of internal arrangements, dwelling and room sizes and amenity space; facilities for the storage, recycling and disposal of waste; facilities for bicycle storage; and private outdoor amenity space.

4.2 There are 2 existing 1 bed flats at 8A and 10A measuring 47 sq. m and 48.6 sq. m respectively. The proposal would result in both flats being increased in size to create 2 x 2 bed flats measuring 82.7 sq. m and 82.6 sq. m. The Government’s current technical housing standards require a 2-bedroom 4-person 2-storey dwelling to provide 79 sq.m of floor space, including 2.5sqm of built-in storage. The new units would both exceed the required space standards.

4.3 The enlarged flat A would extend within the new basement under nos. 8 and 10, and on the ground, first and second floor levels within no. 8 itself. The living room and one of the bedrooms with ensuite bathroom would be located within the newly created basement. A full height window measuring 4m in length and a lightwell measuring 7 sq. m would allow light into the bedroom. Flat B is also being enlarged at 1st floor level and entirely within no. 10.

4.4 The living room of the flat would also be located within the newly created basement. There would be no window openings serving the living room; however the area would be lit from above by a 0.7m wide panel of glass blocks measuring 3.6 sq.m, that would be installed within the ground floor adjacent to the ground floor windows facing onto Stukeley Street.

4.5 BRE national guidelines for daylight confirm that the acceptable minimum Average Daylight Factor (ADF) target value depends on the room use. That is 1% for a bedroom, 1.5% for a living room. A daylight and sunlight assessment has been submitted in relation to the basement accommodation and illustrates that the living room would achieve an ADF value of 1.84 and the bedroom would achieve an ADF value of 1.04. This would meet and exceed the BRE guidelines and demonstrates that these rooms would receive an adequate level of daylight.

4.6 The existing entrance door to flat 8A fronting onto Stukeley Street would be replaced by an enlarged window opening and a single entrance door to the flat would be retained at the north-western side elevation of the building. The existing flat at 10A shares an entrance door with the ground floor offices. The proposal would include the reuse of an existing unused entrance door to flat

B thereby creating separate entrances for both flats.

4.7 Flat A would also benefit from a rear first floor terrace approximately 12.7sqm in area and a basement terrace approximately 7sqm in area. No exterior amenity space would be provided to the top floor flat B. However considering the Central London location, the lack of external space for a two bedroom dwelling is not uncharacteristic and is considered acceptable.

4.8 Concern has been raised by neighbouring occupiers that the upper dwelling is only serviced by one staircase and access to bedrooms would be via the kitchen/dining room which in case of a fire would not comply with building regulations. An informative would be attached to any permission advising the applicant that the proposed works would require building regulation approval. If any internal reconfiguration was considered necessary this would not require any further planning permission.

5. Design, Appearance and Impact on the Conservation area:

5.1 The site is within the Seven Dials Conservation Area (referred to below as CA) and therefore the design is an important feature in the success of the proposed development. The existing group of buildings (2-14 evens) are described in the Seven Dials CA statement as having a “utilitarian” and “commercial/industrial feel” giving a “mews quality” to the street. The “lower roof lines and cottage appearance” add contrast and lend interest. The buildings are located on a prominent corner site and are considered to make a positive contributor to the character and appearance of the Conservation Area.

Mansard roof

5.2 The proposed replacement mansard roof extension at no 8, although large, is of a similar size and form as the existing mansard roof extension and would retain a lower roof slope pitch of 75 degrees matching that of the existing mansard. It would be unreasonable to object to the principle of a mansard on no. 8 and its replacement is therefore considered acceptable.

5.3 There is currently no roof extension on the roof of no. 10. The proposal would include the erection of a mansard roof extension. Given the presence of the existing mansard roofs along this part of the street, the principle of a mansard roof extension is considered acceptable. It has been designed as a traditional mansard roof at the front of the building and is considered to be recessive and secondary to the main façade. Although the lower pitch of the mansard roof at 75 degrees would be greater than the traditional mansard roof of 70 degrees, it would match the pitch, slope and height of the neighbouring replacement mansard at no. 8 (see 5.2 above). The proposed fenestration pattern on the principal elevation relates appropriately to the windows below and the replacement dormer to no. 8.

5.4 The original plans included large expanse of glazing with strips of brickwork on the rear elevation of the new mansard roof at no. 10. Following discussions with the applicant this has been revised to incorporate a more solid brick traditional elevation with three traditionally design 3/6 window openings to match the style and design of the fenestration below. This is considered to complement the surroundings and heritage value of the building. Consequently the alterations and proposed mansard extension is acceptable on this pair of positive contributors and would preserve the character and appearance of the conservation area.

5.5 The roof line of the existing buildings is not uniform and the variety in heights adds to the interest of this part of the street. The existing building at no. 8 measures 8.9m in height to the ridge line and no. 10 is 8.4m. The proposal has been amended to incorporate variety between the buildings at roof level including the alterations to the heights of the roof extensions (no. 8 measuring 9.1m is lower than no. 10 measuring 9.3m) and the introduction of a parapet at the front of no. 10 with no parapet at no. 8. These amendments help to retain the interest of the changes of roof levels as you view the

buildings from the street.

5.6 To conclude the proposed replacement mansard at no. 8 and new mansard at no. 10 Stukeley Street are considered to result in an acceptable streetscape solution that is reflective of the existing building scale and would not disrupt or overwhelm the roof slopes and overall heritage value of the site and conservation area.

5.7 The retention of the chimney stack retains its traditional relationship with the roof and continues to reflect an important feature on the building as well as the heritage of the location.

First floor rear extension

5.8 The existing pitched roof first floor rear extension at no. 10 measures 4.3m in width by 4.4m in length and 3m in height. The roof slopes away from the rear elevation of no. 6. The extension is not considered to be of significant heritage value. Views of the rear of the building are limited to mainly private views from the upper floors of surrounding buildings. Although its loss is regrettable there is no objection to its demolition. The proposal would include a first floor rear extension measuring 2.6m in width by 6.6m in length by 3.6m in height. Although larger than the existing extension, its size and design is considered acceptable and would not dominate the host building and not harm the character or appearance of the conservation area.

Privacy screen

5.9 The installation of a 1.8m obscure glazed screen around the perimeter of the first floor rear terrace at no. 10 would not be sympathetic to the traditional materials of the host property. However the first floor terrace would be sunken and views of this part of the building are restricted from any public vantage point along the street as well as the majority of private views. The screen and its materials is considered acceptable. Given its location on the rear of the building at first floor level as well as the fact that it would not be visible from any public vantage points, the obscure glazed screen would not harmfully detract from the character and appearance of the host property or the conservation area.

Alterations to the front of the buildings

5.10 The proposal would include façade refurbishment at ground floor level on the main façade fronting Stukeley Street. This would include the removal of the entrance door at no. 8 and widening of the window opening with window proportions and glazing bars to match the existing. The proposal would also include the replacement of the existing four window panel shopfront with a simple timber framed shopfront with tripartite window openings to no. 10. It would also include the replacement of the existing entrance doors with more traditional panelled doors. This is considered to improve the appearance of the ground floor and is welcomed.

5.11 The design and access statement has stated that the brickwork of the front facades would be cleaned and mended and windows repaired and replaced where required. Details of all the new window materials and modes of opening (i.e. no tilt and swivel) will be sought by condition. Samples of the slates for the roof materials and brickwork, preferably reclaimed London stocks, would be required to be submitted and would be sought by condition. Finally, the brickwork of both buildings should not be cleaned and this would also be agreed by condition.

Basement

5.12 The proposed basement would be mainly contained within the footprint of the existing buildings. Its external manifestation would only be expressed at the rear. It would not have a harmful impact on the character or appearance of the conservation area.

Conclusion

5.13 In conclusion the proposed mass and scale of the roof extension and the first floor rear extension would be acceptable and would not harmfully affect the character or appearance of the building and would preserve the character and appearance of the conservation area.

6. Basement considerations

6.1 Policy DP27 notes that the Council will only permit basements and other underground development where the applicant can demonstrate it will not cause harm to the built and natural environment and local amenity and does not result in flooding or ground instability.

6.2 The Council's preferred approach is for basement development to not extend beyond the footprint of the original building and be no deeper than one full storey below ground level (approximately 3 metres in depth). The internal environment should be fit for the intended purpose, and there should be no impact on any trees on or adjoining the site, or to the water environment or land stability.

6.3 In this case, the proposed basement would marginally extend beyond the footprint of the original building: it would extend out to the side underneath an existing patio area measuring 2.5 sq. m. It would be single storey in height measuring 3.3m in depth with an internal floor to ceiling height of 3m. The basement works would also include a lightwell that would measure approximately 7 sq. m. The extent to which the basement extends beyond the footprint of the host building is considered to be modest. Furthermore, the internal environment would be fit for the intended purpose.

6.4 The following underground development constraint applies at the application site: slope stability. The application is accompanied by a Basement Impact Assessment (BIA) which has been independently audited by Campbell Reith, in line with CPG4.

6.5 The BIA screening exercise identified potential issues that were carried forward to scoping. Subsequent to the issue of the initial audit, additional information was provided by the applicant. Campbell Reith have reviewed the information and confirmed that the prediction of Burland Category 1 Damage is considered achievable. Based on the expert advice from Campbell Reith, the proposal accords with the requirements of Policy DP27 and CPG4. The application is therefore considered to be acceptable in this respect. Campbell Reith has not requested the submission of a Basement Construction Plan (BCP) as part of their recommendations.

6.6 A CMP (Construction Management Plan) will be submitted prior to commencement to minimise the potential disruption attributed to the basement excavation works outside of the delivery and removal of waste/construction materials related to the construction phase of the dwellings on the site. Given the constrained nature of the site and the close proximity of neighbouring occupiers, the excavation could cause significant disruption to neighbouring properties. The close proximity of the highway to the proposed elevations of the basement would require an "approval in principle" (AIP). Both the requirement for a CMP and AIP would be secured by s106 legal agreement. The proposed basement is therefore considered to meet Development Plan document policy DP27 (Basement and Lightwells) and guidance in CPG4.

7. Impact on neighbouring amenity

7.1 Policy DP26 notes that the Council will protect the quality of life of occupiers and neighbours by only granting permission for development that does not cause harm to amenity. The factors to consider include: visual privacy and overlooking; overshadowing and outlook; sunlight, daylight and artificial light levels; noise and vibration levels; odour, fumes and dust; microclimate; and the inclusion of appropriate attenuation measures.

7.2 The main properties that are likely to be affected by the proposal are nos. 6 and Stukeley Street (the neighbouring properties), nos. 182 and 183 Drury Lane and flats within Goldsmith Court that lies

to the north of no. 8. All other nearby residential properties are considered to be sufficiently removed from the application site so as not to be adversely affected by the proposal.

Daylight

7.3 A Daylight/Sunlight report has been submitted in support of the planning application. The assessment of the impact of the mass and scale of the building on the surrounding properties indicate that it would not represent any adverse impacts to the level of daylight and sunlight levels received to the surrounding adjacent properties. It is considered that the visual assessment of the site confirms the impact on the neighbouring dwellings would not result in any harmful loss of daylight.

Outlook

7.4 The proposed mansard roof extension is a modest addition to the roofscape that is not considered to result in a detrimental impact to the outlook of surrounding habitable windows at the rear of Drury Lane or single aspect habitable windows on Goldsmith Court.

7.5 The proposal would include the replacement of a first floor rear extension at no. 10 by a larger one. It would be L-shaped and would project out between 3.1m and 6.6m from the rear façade of no. 10. The separation distance between the first floor rear window opening at no. 182 Drury Lane and the closest part of the rear elevation of the extension that would measure 1.8m in width would be reduced by 1.5m from 11.2m to 9.7m. Given the fact that the bulk of the extension that is closest to this window is only 1.8m in width and the fact that the remainder of the extension would not project any closer to the rear facades of the properties along Drury Lane, the proposal would not be considered harmful to the outlook or result in a harmful sense of enclosure to these properties.

7.6 The proposal has been revised to reduce the height of a new skylight that would be installed in roof of the ground floor rear extension at no. 10. It would now measure 0.3m from the main roof and would not cause any impact on the amenity of the adjoining properties in terms of loss of light.

Privacy

7.8 There would be no harmful loss of privacy to neighbouring properties facing Drury Lane as a result of proposed extensions and alterations to the rear fenestration of the mansard. Two new windows would be inserted into the first floor rear elevation of the main building and three new windows would be installed within the rear roofslope of the mansard at second floor level. The distance between these new window openings on the rear of no. 10 and rear windows of properties along Drury Lane would be approximately 16-17m. Guidance in CPG6 “normally” expects a minimum of 18m between windows of habitable rooms of different units that directly face each other. Considering the density of development and the close relationship between buildings being characteristic of the location, the slightly reduced distance between the habitable windows is considered acceptable.

7.9 The window opening in the side elevation of the replacement mansard roof at no. 8 would be obscure glazed. All other openings within this façade remain unchanged. There would be no loss of privacy to the flats within Goldsmith Court as a result of this element of the proposal.

7.10 In order to ensure that there will be no harmful overlooking from use as a roof terrace of the flat roof at second floor level above the proposed first floor rear extension, a condition would be attached to restrict its use as a balcony. It is proposed to create a first floor roof terrace adjacent to the rear of no. 6 Stukeley Street. No. 6 is a 1.5 storey self-contained house. There are two high level windows in the rear elevation of the house that serve a bedroom and a toilet and are obscure glazed. The proposed 1st floor terrace would be enclosed by a new 1.8m high obscure glazed screen that would restrict mutual overlooking between the neighbouring properties and future users of the roof terrace.

Air conditioning unit

7.11 Noise complaints have been received about the existing unauthorised air conditioning unit that were located beneath the window of no. 182 Drury Lane in a timber enclosure. During the course of the application these units have been removed as they were operating outside of the Council's minimum noise standards. The timber enclosure is being retained and it is proposed to install new units to facilitate the offices. The plant selection would be dependent on the needs of the new occupiers and is not known at this time. A noise impact assessment has been submitted and plant noise emission criteria have been recommended based on the results of the noise survey. It would be necessary to attach a condition requiring the submission of detailed plans showing the exact location and size of the new units as well as the submission of a noise impact assessment to demonstrate that the new equipment would satisfactorily achieve the Council's minimum noise standards.

Construction noise

7.12 Policy DP28 notes that the Council will seek to minimise the impact on local amenity from the demolition and construction phases of development. Given the extent of the proposed works (including the basement construction) and the nature of the application site, the Council will secure the submission of a Construction Management Plan (CMP) through a legal agreement.

7.13 Concern has been raised by local residents about the construction and its impact on the amenity of the neighbouring occupiers as well as potential anti-social behaviour resulting from use of the scaffolding for rough sleeping. The applicant has advised that at ground level, the scaffolding will be bounded by a secured hoarding as a security measure to prevent trespassing into the site or beneath the scaffolding throughout all day and night. The hoarding will also aid in keeping building noise and dust from escaping into the public realm and footpath. The longest run of the hoarding will be down the cul-de-sac towards no. 12 Stukeley Street, therefore there will be minimal disruption in front of No. 5 Stukeley Street.

7.14 The appointed main contractor and their sub-trades will be responsible for ensuring that the building site and its surroundings are maintained in a clean and organised manner whilst ensuring the health and safety of the general public. In terms of noise, best efforts will be employed to ensure minimal disruptions, such as using tools and machinery fitted with acoustic mufflers or silencers.

7.15 The contractor will be encouraged to be registered under the Considerate Constructors Scheme and adhere to its recommended guidelines for ensuring a clean and safe building environment and to liaise with local neighbours regularly on the scope of works being carried out. More information can be obtained from the draft Construction Management Plan dated 20 November 2015 which forms part of the planning submission documents.

8. Highways and transport:

8.1 The proposed dwelling has a PTAL rating of 6b (the highest possible) and therefore would meet criteria in Policy DP18 for the development to be car free, secured via section 106 agreement. The location has an extremely high demand for permits. The proposed scheme would not introduce any additional residential dwellings and therefore the Council's car-free policy does not apply and any existing spaces can be retained. The enlarged dwellings would be secured as car-capped (i.e. the future occupiers would have no access to on-street parking permits) through the section 106 legal agreement. This would prevent the proposed development from having an additional impact on parking stress within the CPZ.

8.2 The proposed ground floor plans include 3 separate internally stacked cycle storage areas within the offices and the flats. They do not meet Camden's cycle parking standards in terms of size and design as they are stacked; however it must be noted that there is no existing formal cycle parking facilities for the offices or residential units. Taking this into consideration, the provision of cycle

parking spaces cannot be insisted upon in this instance.

8.3 Policy DP20 seeks to minimise the impact of the movement of goods and materials by road. As already noted, due to the scale and nature of the proposed development and the very constrained application site, a CMP will be secured by the legal agreement to ensure the development can be implemented without being detrimental to amenity or the safe and efficient operation of the highway network in the local area.

8.4 The proposed development could potentially result in damage to the adopted highway and therefore a highways contribution of £3,439.02 has been considered necessary, secured via a s106 legal agreement.

9. Water

9.1 Policy DP23 requires developments to reduce their water consumption, pressure on the combined sewer network and the risk of flooding. A suitable planning condition can ensure that development will be capable of achieving a maximum internal water use of 110 litres a day (plus an additional 5 litres for external water use).

10. Other issues

Accuracy of revised plans

10.1 Concern has been raised regarding the quality and accuracy of the revised plans that have been submitted. It is not a requirement for architects to 'bubble' revisions in order to make them clear. Having checked the remainder of the plans it would have been beneficial to submit an existing side elevation of no. 10 showing the first floor extension. However having visited the site and viewed the existing floor plans, officers do not consider its submission necessary to make a full assessment of the scheme. All other existing and proposed plans are accurate.

Archeology

10.2 The site lies within an archaeological priority area. As the proposal would include basement excavation works GLAAS were notified about the application. Given that the proposal would result in a total loss of archaeological remains from within the site, they have recommended a condition requiring a two stage process of archaeological investigation comprising (i) evaluation to clarify the nature and extent of the surviving remains followed, if necessary, by a full investigation. A condition would be attached to the permission to ensure that this information is submitted prior to commencement of development.

Crossrail safeguarding zone

10.3 The site falls outside of the limits of the safeguarding zone for Crossrail. However it is close to very shallow tunnels (13m) to be of concern to Crossrail. The horizontal distance is about 14m which is quite close and there could be some significant horizontal ground movement during the basement excavation. Therefore their engineer would like to safeguard the infrastructure by applying safeguarding conditions. This would enable Crossrail to review the developers' assessment in respect of construction methodology, noise and vibration and ground settlement mitigation during their construction. A condition would be attached to ensure that this information is submitted prior to commencement of development.

11. Community Infrastructure Levy:

11.1 The proposal will be liable for the Mayor of London and Camden Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) as the floor space exceeds 100sqm. The Mayoral CIL rate in Camden is £50/sqm and the Camden CIL rate for residential development (below 10 dwellings) in Zone C is £500.

11.2 The proposal represents approximately 102.2sq.m of new floorspace. The development is therefore liable for the Camden CIL payment Zone A tariff of £500 per square meter for the residential floorspace and £45 for the office floorspace 32.5sqm, proposed in the development.

11.3 Approximately 69.7sqm of residential floorspace is proposed amounting to £34,850 and 32.5sqm of office floorspace amounting to £1,462. The CIL contribution would be payable on commencement of the development. The total sum of £36,312 Camden CIL and £5,125 Mayoral CIL would be expected.

12. Summary

12.1 The principle of the extension and alterations are justified and acceptable from a design and heritage perspective. The proposal has been amended to improve and reduce the impact on the neighbouring amenity and enhance the conservation area without harming the character and appearance of the building as a positive contributor to the conservation area. The development is acceptable in terms of design and scale and in accordance with residential standards for the newly enlarged flats and would be car-capped reducing the impact on local road usage and parking.

13. Recommendation:

13. 1 Grant conditional planning permission subject to a section 106 legal agreement.

DISCLAIMER

The decision to refer an application to Development Control Committee lies with the Executive Director of Supporting Communities. Nominated members will advise whether they consider this application should be reported to the Development Control Committee on Monday 19th December 2016. For further information, please go to www.camden.gov.uk and search for 'Members Briefing'.