

Delegated Report		Analysis sheet	Expiry Date:	08/04/2016
		N/A / attached	Consultation Expiry Date:	30/12/2016
Officer			Application Number(s)	
Kate Phillips			2016/0788/P	
Application Address			Drawing Numbers	
20 Flaxman Terrace London WC1H 9AT			Refer to Draft Decision Notice	
PO 3/4	Area Team Signature	C&UD	Authorised Officer Signature	
Proposal(s)				
Erection of single storey roof extension to provide 226sqm additional office space (Class B1a) and associated works				
Recommendation(s):	Refuse planning permission			
Application Type:	Full Planning Permission			

Conditions or Reasons for Refusal: Informatives:	Refer to Draft Decision Notice					
Consultations						
Adjoining Occupiers:	No. notified	19	No. of responses	09 R1- 09	No. of objections	09 R1- 01
Summary of consultation responses:	<p>A Site Notice was displayed on 04/03/2016 (expiry date 25/03/2016) and a notice was placed in the local press on 10/03/2016 (expiry date 31/03/2016).</p> <p>In response to the original plans, responses have been received from 9 different properties (Flat 2, Grafton Mansions; Flat 3, Grafton Mansions; Flats 4 and 5, Grafton Mansions; Flat 6, Grafton Mansions; Flat 7, Grafton Mansions; Flat 8, Grafton Mansions; Flat 9, Grafton Mansions; 22 Duke's Road; 2nd floor, 20 Flaxman Terrace).</p> <p>The comments are summarised as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Out of keeping with the surrounding area • Loss of upper part of original warehouse building • Impact on adjacent business (noise during construction period and from plant) • Impact on existing businesses within the building • Impact on traffic, access to buildings during construction period • Loss of light • Light pollution • Dust during construction period • Impact on flats at Grafton Mansions (overlooking, loss of light, privacy) • Inaccuracies in Daylight/Sunlight Report • Alteration to primarily residential character of area • Additional comings and goings to the building • Impact on bin store on Grafton Mansions <p>In response to the revised plans, 1 response was received from the occupier of Flat 7, Grafton Mansions.</p> <p>The comments are summarised as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No loss of light and privacy to Grafton Mansions • Existing 1950's building hides the historic part of the warehouse, which should be made more visible – the proposed roof extension would block views of the warehouse roof altogether • Proposal should be re-designed 					

Bloomsbury CAAC

No comments received (consultation expiry 23/03/2016).

Site Description

The building at 20 Flaxman Terrace comprises two parts; the original 1900's warehouse building and a later front and side extension (1950's) which fronts onto Flaxman Terrace. The building is between 2 and 3 and a half storeys tall above ground level. There are basements within each separate element of the building.

The part of the building which fronts onto Flaxman Terrace (the modern element) features yellow bricks, white render, Crittall windows and continuous glass block banding at street level to allow light into the lower floors.

The application site is within the Bloomsbury Conservation Area. Neither part of the building is listed. Nearby listed buildings include 17 Duke's Road (Grade II) and Flaxman Lodge and attached railings (Grade II).

Relevant History

PSX0104610 - The change of use of the basement and ground floor from Class B1(a) light industrial to Class B1(a) offices without complying with condition 1 of planning permission PL8601583 dated 19 May 2001 under the meaning of the Town and Country Planning (Use Class) Order 1985 – **Granted 24-07-2001**.

8601583 - Continued use for University purposes – **Granted 14-05-1987**.

Relevant policies**LDF Core Strategy and Development Policies****National Planning Policy Framework (2012)****London Plan (2016)****LDF Core Strategy and Development Policies (2010)**

- CS1 Distribution of growth
- CS3 Other highly accessible areas
- CS5 Managing the impact of growth and development
- CS6 (Providing quality homes)
- CS8 Promoting a successful and inclusive Camden economy
- CS9 Achieving a successful Central London Borough of Camden
- 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
- CS18 Dealing with our waste and encouraging recycling
- CS19 Delivering and monitoring the Core Strategy

DP1 Mixed use development
DP2 Making full use of Camden's capacity for housing
DP3 Contributions to the supply of affordable housing
DP12 Supporting strong centres and managing the impact of food, drink, entertainment and other town centre uses
DP13 Employment sites and premises
DP15 Community and leisure uses
DP16 The transport implications of development
DP17 Walking, cycling and public transport
DP18 Parking standards and limiting the availability of car parking DP24 Securing high quality design
DP20 Movement of goods and materials
DP24 Securing high quality design
DP25 Conserving Camden's heritage
DP26 Managing the impact of development on occupiers and neighbours
DP28 Noise and vibration

Camden Planning Guidance

CPG1 Design (2015)
CPG2 Housing (2015)
CPG3 Sustainability (2015)
CPG5 Town Centres, Retail & Employment (2013)
CPG6 Amenity (2011)
CPG7 Transport (2011)
CPG8 Planning Obligations (2015)

Bloomsbury Conservation Area Appraisal and Management Strategy (2011)

Assessment

1. The proposal

1.1. This application seeks planning permission for the following:

- Single storey roof extension to provide 226sqm (GIA) additional office space (Class B1a); and associated works.

1.2. The proposed extension would sit above the 1950's modern element of the building (the part that faces Flaxman Terrace). It would cover the whole of the undeveloped part of the flat roof and would adjoin the existing 3 ½ storey element above the older, original 1900's warehouse building at the rear of the site.

1.3. The proposed roof extension would measure approximately 2.6 metres tall and the building materials include buff brickwork and double glazed metal windows.

1.4. The existing overhang at the front of the building would be retained and the proposed extension would sit above. The front elevation would align with the existing front elevation.

2. Revisions

2.1. The following revisions have been made during the course of the application:

- Reduction in height of roof extension by one storey (retention of existing pitched warehouse roof and creation of extension at 2nd floor level on Flaxman Terrace side

only)

- Omission of changes to retain rear elevation
- Change of facing material – buff brick instead of glazing

3. Assessment

3.1. The principal considerations material to the determination of this application are summarised as follows:

- The principle of development;
- Mixed use policy- housing contribution;
- Impact on the character and appearance of the wider area (including the Bloomsbury Conservation Area and the settings of nearby listed building);
- The impact on the visual and residential amenities of the occupiers of nearby and neighbouring residential properties;
- Transport considerations;
- Sustainability considerations;
- Planning obligations and CIL

4. The principle of development

- 4.1. Policies CS8 and DP13 seek to safeguard existing employment sites and premises in the borough that meet the needs of modern industry and other employers.
- 4.2. Policy CS3 seeks to promote appropriate development in the highly accessible areas of Central London (outside of the designated Growth Areas), as these areas are considered to be suitable locations for the provision of homes, shops, food, drink and entertainment uses, offices, community facilities and are particularly suitable for uses that are likely to significantly increase the demand for travel.
- 4.3. The principle of this development with office expansion in this location is considered to be acceptable, subject to the detailed consideration below.

5. Mixed use policy- housing contribution

- 5.1. Policy DP1 requires development in Central London which is creating more than 200sqm (gross) additional floor space to provide 50% of all floor space as residential floor space. The revised proposal would provide 226sqm of additional commercial floor space, and therefore 50% should be provided as residential floor space.
- 5.2. The Council will normally require any secondary uses to be provided on site, particularly where 1000sqm (gross) of additional floor space or more is proposed. Housing provided as part of a mixed use scheme should be independent of other uses and have a separate access at street level, or other arrangements which provide for occupation independent of any non-residential use. In this case, the applicant has failed to provide any comment on the provision of housing on-site; however, the provision of a secondary use on site does not appear to be practical due to the difficulties of providing a separate access.
- 5.3. In cases where it is not possible to provide the required residential floor space on site, the Council may accept an off-site contribution to housing in the same area, secured by means of a planning obligation. The Council expects additional housing floor space to match the net

addition to non-residential floor space (e.g. if 226sqm of additional office space is provided, the same amount of residential floor space should be provided), either through building elsewhere in the local area, or by converting an existing building to housing.

5.4. The applicant has not demonstrated that it is not possible to provide the required residential floor space off-site (i.e. on other land / buildings within their ownership), or that it is not possible to purchase any suitable land or buildings for this purpose. Nevertheless, the Council may, in exceptional circumstances, accept a payment-in-lieu of provision, directly related in scale and kind to the development proposed. The payment would be pooled into an affordable housing fund and used to assist the provision of affordable housing elsewhere in the borough.

5.5. The proposal would provide 226sqm (GIA) of new floor space, which represents 282.5sqm GEA (i.e. multiply the GIA by 1.25, as per paragraph 6.13 of CPG8). Where a contribution to housing is sought under Policy DP1, CPG8 requires a payment of £700 per square metres multiplied by the on-site target for housing (in this case 50%), which equates to 141.25sqm. The proposed figure for the payment-in-lieu of housing is £98,875. The applicant has failed to enter into a section 106 legal agreement to secure this, and the application is recommended for refusal on this basis.

6. Impact on the character and appearance of the Bloomsbury Conservation Area and the setting of nearby listed buildings

6.1. The application site is located within the Bloomsbury Conservation Area, wherein the Council has a statutory duty to pay special attention to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character or appearance of that area, in accordance with Section 72 of The Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas Act) 1990.

6.2. Nearby Grade II listed buildings include 17 Duke's Road and The Lodge and attached railings on Flaxman Terrace. The Council has a statutory duty, under Section 66 of The Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990, to have special regard to the desirability of preserving a listed building(s) or its setting or any features of special architectural or historic interest which it possesses.

6.3. The application building is considered to be architecturally interesting by virtue of its horizontal emphasis, the Crittall windows, the bricks and render and its overall design. The building provides a typical example of 1950's architecture and it is considered that it fits in well with the "back street" character of this part of the Bloomsbury Conservation Area. The modest character and appearance of the host building also gives the building a subservience when viewed against the backdrop of grander buildings in the local area, such as the above-mentioned listed buildings. The roof of the older part of the building (the 1900's warehouse building at the rear of the site) is visible in long-range views of the building as the roof extends above the roof of the 1950's element; however, it is not possible to really discern what type of building lies at the rear of the site in most views of the application site.

6.4. The Bloomsbury Conservation Area Appraisal and Management Strategy (BCAAMS) notes that extensions and alterations to existing buildings within the conservation area can have a detrimental impact- for example, through the inappropriate design of extensions; the use of inappropriate materials or detailing; inappropriate roof level extensions, particularly where these interrupt the consistency of the prevailing scale and character of a block or are overly prominent in the street; or extensions of excessive scale, massing or height. The BCAAMS requires that development proposals must preserve or enhance the character and appearance of the Bloomsbury Conservation Area.

6.5. The proposal to extend the building upwards is considered to be acceptable in principle;

however, it is important to get the design right, so that the extension complements the existing building, and unifies the whole building, but at the same time allows the historical development of the building to be understood (i.e. the difference between the old and the new). It is recognised that extending the 1950's part of the building upwards would block views of the 1900's warehouse building at the rear, but this is considered to be acceptable on the basis that this part of the building is already relatively highly screened from public view and it has not previously been identified as making a positive contribution to the character and appearance of the Bloomsbury Conservation Area.

- 6.6. The existing building has a very defined 'top' (the overhang above the brickwork) and to a certain extent it already appears complete in design terms. Whilst the plans have been revised during the course of the application in order to try and address concerns raised by the Council's conservation and design officers, it is still not considered that the proposed extension would relate well to the existing building.
- 6.7. Although the existing overhang on the building would be retained (thereby indicating the top of the 'old' part of the building), it is not considered that the proposed extension would sit comfortably above. Instead, the extension would appear as an incongruous addition to the host building, and would give the building a top-heavy appearance.
- 6.8. From the visualisations provided, it appears that the proposed extension would dominate the host building and the increased height would detract from the horizontal emphasis of the building, which is considered to be important to its overall character and appearance.
- 6.9. The resultant building would have greater visual presence in the street, which is not in keeping with the aforementioned "back street" character of this particular street and this part of the conservation area. Contrary to the BCAAMS guidance, it is considered that the proposed extension would result in the host building being overly prominent in the street scene and the proposal would interrupt the consistency of the prevailing scale and character of the street, to the detriment of the character and appearance of the Bloomsbury Conservation Area.
- 6.10. The increased visual presence of the host building would also adversely alter the existing relationship between the application building and nearby listed buildings, insofar as the resultant building would no longer appear as subservient in scale, character and appearance as it currently does. Thus it would not preserve the setting of nearby listed buildings to their detriment.
- 6.11. Materials and detailing are also important considerations in a conservation area setting, and it is important that they are of a high quality and complement the character and appearance of the wider area. The use of buff brick is preferable to the original proposal to use large amounts of glazing at the top of the building, and the fact the windows would now relate to the windows on the lower floors is welcomed; however, the overall detailed design of the extension is not considered to be of sufficiently high quality. The existing building features a mixture of different facing materials (brickwork, render, glass block banding), and it has a coherent overall design. As already noted, it is not considered that the proposed extension above the existing building would relate well to the existing building and it is considered that the resultant building would lack the same coherence that it currently exhibits. This would be to the detriment of the character and appearance of the host building, the street scene along Flaxman Terrace and also the wider conservation area.
- 6.12. To conclude, the proposed roof extension, by virtue of its siting, size, detailed design and appearance, would cause harm to the character and appearance of the host building, the street scene along Flaxman Terrace and the Bloomsbury Conservation Area, as well as the

setting of nearby listed buildings (17 Duke's Road and The Lodge on Flaxman Terrace). The proposal is therefore contrary to Policies CS14, DP24 and DP25 and the application is recommended for refusal on this basis.

7. The impact on the amenities of the occupiers of neighbouring properties

- 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: overlooking; 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 plans have been revised during the course of the application to omit the proposed extension to the rear part of the host building, which reduces the impact on neighbouring properties in Grafton Mansions (directly to the west) in terms of overlooking, outlook, sunlight and daylight. Whilst the proposed extension might be visible from these properties, it would now be viewed at an angle; the part of the host building closest to these properties would remain unaltered. It is not considered that the proposed extension would cause undue harm to the outlook or sunlight/daylight levels at these properties. Furthermore, there would be no windows facing these properties, and therefore overlooking would not pose a problem either.
- 7.3. The proposed extension would be visible from 22 Dukes Road, the adjacent property to the south-west. In particular, it would be visible from the windows on the eastern elevation of this building, which face towards Flaxman Terrace. Nevertheless, this building is an office building and any loss of outlook from the windows on the eastern elevation is considered to be acceptable. This is because these windows would not lose their pleasant, long-range outlook onto Flaxman Terrace; they would only lose some outlook in a specific direction towards the sky. Furthermore, it is not considered that this building would suffer undue loss of light because the host building is located towards the north-east. There would be no windows facing this property, and therefore overlooking would not pose a problem either.
- 7.4. A Daylight and Sunlight Report has been submitted with the application; however, because No. 22 is an office building, it has not been tested. Nevertheless, because the application building is located to the north-east of No. 22, loss of sunlight would not be an issue. With regards to daylight, No. 22 is an irregular shape, with 3 elevations facing outwards onto the street, and 1 towards the application building, with a gap of about 4 metres between the two. The internal layout of No. 22 is unknown; however, whilst there may be some loss of daylight to the rear-facing windows on the property (in particular the lower ones), this is unlikely to be significant. The building is fortunate in that the area to the south-east is open in character, which is likely to further reduce any loss of daylight that might be felt within the building as a result of the proposed works. Overall, the impact on this building is judged to be acceptable.
- 7.5. Concerns were also raised about additional comings and goings to the building as a result of the increased floor space; however, despite Flaxman Terrace itself being a relatively quiet street, it is located in Central London, where the Council considers it appropriate to focus further development of this kind. Overall, the impact of the increased floor space in terms of general activity at the application site is not considered to be so sufficient as to warrant a refusal of the application on this basis.
- 7.6. Concerns were also raised about the proposed bin store and the impact on properties to the rear. If the application was otherwise considered to be acceptable, it is considered that this issue could be satisfactorily overcome through the use of an appropriate planning condition.

7.7. Policy DP28 notes that the Council will seek to minimise the impact on local amenity from the demolition and construction phases of development. If the application was otherwise considered to be acceptable, the Council would look to secure the submission of a Construction Management Plan (CMP) through the legal agreement. The applicant has failed to enter into a section 106 legal agreement to secure this, and the application is recommended for refusal on this basis.

8. Transport considerations

- 8.1. The application site has a Public Transport Accessibility Level (PTAL) of 6b (the highest rating), and is within a Controlled Parking Zone. Policy DP18 expects development, including non-residential development, to be car free in the Central London Area and the proposal complies in this respect.
- 8.2. The London Plan 2016 requires 1 long-stay cycling space per 90 square metres of floor space and 1 short-stay cycling space per 500 square metres of floor space, which equates to a requirement to provide 4 spaces (to serve the additional 226sqm of floor space). The proposal provides 20 cycle parking spaces to serve the whole building (1614sqm), which is welcomed.
- 8.3. All cycle parking facilities should be fully enclosed, secure and covered, which is not clear from the submitted information. Nevertheless, if the application was otherwise considered to be acceptable, a suitable planning condition could require full details of cycle parking to be submitted to and agreed in writing by the Council prior to the commencement of development.
- 8.4. Policy DP20 seeks to minimise the impact of the movement of goods and materials by road. Given the constraints of the application site and the nature of the proposed works, if the application was otherwise considered to be acceptable, the Council would look to secure the submission of a Construction Management Plan (CMP) through the legal agreement. The applicant has failed to enter into a section 106 legal agreement to secure this, and the application is therefore recommended for refusal on this basis.

9. Sustainability considerations

- 9.1. Policy CS13 notes that the Council will require all development to take measures to minimise the effects of, and adapt to, climate change and the policy encourages all development to meet the highest feasible environmental standards that are financially viable during construction and occupation. Policy DP22 requires development to incorporate sustainable design and construction measures and it requires the incorporation of green or brown roofs, wherever suitable.
- 9.2. The applicant has provided an Energy & Sustainability Statement as part of the application; however, it does not adequately demonstrate compliance with Policies CS13 and DP22. Furthermore, the proposal does not include a green or brown roof and no justification is provided for the lack of such features. The application is therefore recommended for refusal based on the lack of satisfactory evidence to demonstrate that the proposed development would take measures to minimise the effects of, and adapt to, climate change through sustainable design and construction measures.

10. Planning obligations and CIL

- 10.1. The proposal would 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. The Camden CIL rate for office development in Zone A is £25/sqm. Based on the information provided (net additional gross internal floor space of 226sqm), the CIL payments

are likely to be £11,300 (£50 x 226) and £5650 (£25 x 226). This will be collected by Camden after the scheme is implemented and could be subject to surcharges for failure to assume liability, submit a commencement notice and late payment, and subject to indexation in line with the construction costs index.

Recommendation: Refuse planning permission.