

Date: 25/11/2016
Our ref: 2016/5400/PRE
Contact: John Diver
Direct line: 020 7974 6368
Email: john.diver@camden.gov.uk

Joe Haines
Savills
33 Margaret Street
London
W1G 0JD
By email



Planning Solutions Team
Planning and Regeneration
Culture & Environment
Directorate
London Borough of Camden
2nd Floor
5 Pancras Square
London
N1C 4AG

www.camden.gov.uk/planning

Dear Joe,

Re: 45 - 46 Red Lion Street, London, WC1R 4PF

Thank you for submitting a pre-planning application enquiry for the above property which was received on the 03 October together with the required fee of £1,200. These notes were informed by a site visit with planning and conservation officers completed on the 04 November 2016.

1. Drawings and documents

1.1. The following documentation was submitted in support of the pre-application request:

- Pre-App Covering Letter (dated 03 Oct 2016)
- Pre-App Heritage / Design & Access Statement (dated Sept 2016)
- Existing Basement Plan (030_E_09)
- Existing Ground Floor Plan (030_E_10)
- Existing 1st Floor Plan (030_E_11)
- Existing 2nd Floor Plan (030_E_12)
- Existing 3rd Floor Plan (030_E_13)
- Existing Roof Plan (030_E_14)
- Proposed Basement Plan (030_P_09)
- Proposed Ground Floor Plan (030_P_10)
- Proposed 1st Floor Plan (030_P_11)
- Proposed 2nd Floor Plan (030_P_12)
- Proposed 3rd Floor Plan (030_P_13)
- Proposed Roof Plan (030_P_14)
- Existing E Elevation (030_E_20)
- Existing S Elevation (030_E_21)
- Existing AA Section (030_E_30)
- Existing BB Section (030_E_31)
- Existing CC Section (030_E_32)
- Proposed E Elevation (030_P_20)
- Proposed S Elevation (030_P_21)
- Proposed AA Section (030_P_30)
- Proposed BB Section (030_P_31)

- Proposed CC Section (030_P_32)

2. Proposal

- 2.1. Advice is requested in relation to alterations to pair of Grade II listed properties including rear extension at 3rd floor level, replacement mansard roof as well as various internal alterations to facilitate the conversion of the upper floors from no.5 into no.4 self-contained flats (C3). This would include the replacement of the roof structure to no.45 as well as a third floor rear extension above the existing closest wing at no.46.

3. Site description

- 3.1. The application site relates to a pair of circa mid-18th century 4 storey (including habitable roofs) dwellinghouses, re-fronted in the 19th century facing Red Lion Street, within the Holborn and Covent Garden ward of the Borough. The pair of properties are Grade II listed, having been added to the list in November 1990 (List entry: 1245494). The application site is also located within the Bloomsbury Conservation Area.
- 3.2. The ground floors of both properties have historically been combined and converted into a restaurant. No permission was found for the sub-division of the upper floor into the existing no.5 units as existing (see below), however during the site visit it was clear that the layout as existing had been in situ for some time meaning that it is likely to be exempt from planning enforcement action due to the passage of time. Although the upper floor feature a number of interventions which would have required listed building consent (many of which are unsympathetic to the historic buildings), it is difficult to determine whether these would have been completed prior to the listed status being applied (Nov 1990).

4. Relevant planning history

- 4.1. The following planning history is relevant to this site:

TP/83837/NW/22440 – Planning permission granted at No. 45 Red Lion Street for the ‘The erection of additions to the ground floor of No. 45 Red Lion Street, Holborn, for use as lavatories and W.Cs.’ on the 07/03/1960

31315 - Established Use Certificate was refused at 45/46 Red Lion Street for the ‘Use of first floor as offices’ on the 16/10/1980

32118 - Established Use Certificate was granted at 45/46 Red Lion Street for the ‘Use of the 1st floor of 45/46 Red Lion Street as an office ancillary to the use of the ground floor for retail and wholesale purposes’ on the 28/05/1981

34024 – Planning permission was refused at 45-46 Red Lion Street for the ‘Change of use of the ground floor and basement from shop to restaurant or the wine bar, the change of use of the 1st, 2nd, and 3rd floors of No. 45 to offices and the conversion of the 1st floor of No. 46 to a self-contained flat’ on the 19/07/1982

34686 – Planning permission was granted at 45-46 Red Lion Street, for the ‘Change of use of basement and ground floors of nos.45-46 and first floor of no.45 from fish merchants to restaurant or wine bar’ on the 18/10/1982

8800214 – Planning permission was granted at 45-46 Red Lion Street for the 'Formation of fire escape door on rear elevation' on the 14/06/1988

9200249 – Planning permission was refused, but allowed at appeal at the R/O 45-46 Red Lion Street for the 'erection of a single storey extension to the existing restaurant' on the 07/01/1993

5. **Relevant policies and guidance**

5.1. The following policies will be taken into consideration:

- **National Planning Policy Framework (2012)**
- **London Plan (2016)**
 - Policy 3.3 – Increasing housing supply
 - Policy 3.4 – Optimising housing potential
 - Policy 7.4 – Local Character
 - Policy 7.6 – Architecture
- **Local Development Framework**
- **Core Strategy (2010)**
 - CS5 – Managing the impact of growth and development
 - CS6 – Providing quality homes
 - CS14 – Promoting high quality places and conserving our heritage
- **Development Policies (2010)**
 - DP2 – Making full use of Camden's capacity for housing
 - DP16 – The transport implications of development
 - DP17 – Walking, cycling and public transport
 - DP24 – Securing high quality design
 - DP25 – Conserving Camden's heritage
 - DP26 – Managing the impact of development on occupiers and neighbours
- **Supplementary Guidance**
 - CPG 1 – Design
 - CPG 2 – Housing
 - CPG 6 – Amenity
 - CPG 7 – Transport
 - CPG 8 – Planning Obligations
- **Bloomsbury Conservation Area Appraisal and Management Strategy (2011)**
- **Emerging policy:**

It should be noted that the Camden Local Plan will replace the Core Strategy and Development Policies in 2016/17. The submission draft has now been approved by Cabinet and Full Council after a period of public consultation. The Local Plan and associated documents were formally submitted to the Secretary of State for public examination along with copies of all representations received on 24 June. In accordance with Section 20 of the Planning & Compulsory Purchase Act 2004, Inspector Katie Child, was appointed to conduct an examination to determine whether the Plan is sound. The public hearings for the Examination were held at the Camden Town Hall during October 2016.

The submission draft is a material consideration in planning decisions. At this stage the Plan has weight in decision making and is a statement of the Council's emerging thinking. Emerging policy is therefore a relevant consideration to this pre-app advice. A copy of the draft Local Plan can be found on our website [here](#).

6. Assessment

6.1. The main issues to consider in this case are as follows:

- Principal of the conversion & residential mix;
- Design and heritage;
- Standard of accommodation;
- Impact on the amenity of adjoining occupiers;
- Transport / Planning Obligations.

Principal of the loss of unit & residential mix;

6.2. As outlined in your submitted covering letter, Development Management policies DP2 states that the Council will act to minimise the loss of housing in the borough by resisting developments that would involve the net loss of two or more homes, unless the works would enable sub-standard units to be enlarged to meet residential space standards. The Dwelling Size Priority Table accompanying Policy DP5 identifies two bedroom market units as being of 'Very High Priority', three bedroom market units as being of 'Medium' priority and one bedroom market units as 'Lower' propriety.

6.3. At present the upper floors of the combined properties contain no.5 self-contained flats arranged into 1x 2 bedroom duplex and 4x 1 bedroom units. The proposed works would result in the loss of one unit, and alterations to provide a mix of units including 1x 3 bedroom (across three floors) and 3x 1 bedroom units. The proposed development would therefore not only lead to a loss of a unit but would also lead to a loss of a high priority unit size and its replacement with a unit size of medium property.

6.4. As observed on site, the existing no.5 units are of sub-standard condition, featuring contrived access arrangements and with 3/5 of the units being below the minimum requirement of the Nationally Described Space Standards (2015). Although, as will be outlined in the following sections, further work needs to be done in order to justify the size of the proposed units in terms of bed spaces in accordance with the above national standards, it is acknowledged that the proposed development (including the provision of a 3 bedroom unit across three floors) would lead to significant benefits in terms of the restoration of historic form to the properties. As it is also acknowledged that the Council would wish to avoid unnecessary intervention into the historic fabric of the properties, the proposed loss of no.1 unit and the proposed residential unit size mix is not considered objectionable in this instance.

6.5. Although the existing units are sub-standard, they are self-contained and as such it is not considered that the development would result in any loss of bedsit or other shared accommodation. The development is therefore not objectionable in principle.

Design and heritage

6.6. The Council's design policies are aimed at achieving the highest standard of design in all developments. The following considerations contained within policy DP24 are relevant to the application: development should consider the character, setting, context and the form and

scale of neighbouring buildings, and the quality of materials to be used. Policy DP25 'Conserving Camden's Heritage' states that within conservation areas, the Council will only grant permission for development that 'preserves and enhances' its established character and appearance. In order to preserve or enhance the borough's listed buildings, DP25 additionally states that the Council will only grant consent for alterations or extensions to a listed building where it considers this would not cause harm to the special interest of the building; and will not permit development that it considers would cause harm to the setting of a listed building.

6.7. The Council's design guidance (CPG1) states that when assessing proposals involving listed buildings, we will consider the impact of proposals on the historic significance of the building, including its features, such as:

- original and historic materials and architectural features;
- original layout of rooms;
- structural integrity; and
- character and appearance (para 3.22)

6.8. The CPG continues to state that the Council would expect original or historic features to be retained and repairs to be in matching materials; and that proposals should seek to respond to the special historic and architectural constraints of the listed building, rather than significantly change them (para 3.23).

External alterations

6.9. In terms of external alterations the proposed development would include the following:

- (1) demolition of the existing valley roof to no.45 and its replacement with a mansard roof, maintaining the same front and rear dormer structures but with replaced windows (slimline steel);
- (2) the erection of a third floor rear extension above the existing outrigger to no.46, clad in standing seam zinc;
- (3) the replacement of no.2 rear uPVC windows to the rear of no.45 with timber sashes;
- (4) the replacement / repair of slates to the roof of no.46;
- (5) the removal of redundant services to rear elevation of both properties; and
- (6) localised repairs and repointing of mortar.

(1) Roof replacement

6.10. With regard to the replacement roof to no.45; your submitted planning and heritage statement suggested that the existing roof is a later addition and features tiles with no heritage value. During the site visit it was noted that the existing roof was clearly a later addition, however officers were not able to confirm its exact age. Were it to be demonstrated with evidence that the existing roof is not of historic value to the property, its removal and replacement with a traditional mansard form would not be objectionable. This is however subject to the provision of further evidence and as such it is recommended that any formal submission is accompanied by a full heritage report which investigates this element in greater depth.

6.11. Should it be possible to demonstrate this, as was discussed on site the replacement of the roof form would provide the opportunity to additionally reconfigure the existing front and rear dormer window structures which currently appear unsympathetic to the facades below, feature inappropriate materials and generally detract from the character of the property. Subject to sensitive detailing, this would allow for a marked improvement to the existing situation in terms of the appearance of these elements as well as the unity of the pair of former dwellings which would provide greater justification for the overall development. Further guidance

regarding the sensitive design of dormer windows can be found in Chapter 5 of CPG1, of copy of which can be downloaded [here](#).

(2) Third floor rear extension

- 6.12. The proposed third floor rear extension (approx. 2.4m depth, 3.1m width, 3.7m height) would project above the rear closet wing of no.46 to be in line with the rear elevation of this element and would be set down by less than 1m (approx. 800mm) from the rear parapet level of the main roof of the property. Although the building line of properties along Red Lion Street wraps around the corner along Lamb's Conduit Passage to form a rear lightwell enclosure, the rear elevation of no.46 remains fairly prominent in views from the public space to the rear of the site along Lamb's Conduit Passage and so particular concern is raised with regard to this element.
- 6.13. Regardless of the listed status of the property, the Council's CPG1 states that in order for new extensions to be subordinate to the original building, their heights should respect the existing pattern of rear extensions, where they exist; and that in most cases, extensions that are higher than one full storey below roof eaves/parapet level, or that rise above the general height of neighbouring projections and nearby extensions, will be strongly discouraged (pg.33). The proposed extension would consequently be contrary to this design guidance. By virtue of its scale and prominence from the public realm, in its current state it would be considered that the rear extension would appear too visually dominant to the rear elevation of the property and as such is unlikely to be supported in a formal application.
- 6.14. During the site visit it was however noted that the existing built form along the rear of the row is very busy, with a lack of uniformity in the pattern of development. It was also discussed that the addition of this element would be fundamental to the overall development aims within the property. Given that the overall refurbishment of the properties could result in significant benefits in terms of the enhancement of the listed buildings (which will be expanded upon in later sections), it may be possible to justify some harm (i.e. a small rear extension), however this would need to be reduced in bulk as much as feasibly possible. On site it was suggested that if it were possible to reduce the height to be no higher than the railing of the rear terrace on the adjacent property, and perhaps set back behind a parapet; the visual impact of this element could be considerably reduced. It is considered that the design of window however would need to be readdressed to ensure that this element is visually inconspicuous.
- 6.15. Overall it is advised that, when considering the planning and heritage balance of the overall development, it may be possible to justify the additional of a modest rear extension despite the conflict to design guidance regarding heights if it would allow for the other works to the property to commence. This would however require full justification within a heritage statement alongside any formal submission.

(3) Replacement windows

- 6.16. At present a number of the existing windows to no. 45 feature insensitive UPVC double glazed windows/frames. Although submitted documents highlight these as being the two windows to the rear, during the site visit it was also found that the front elevation of the property at upper floors also featured uPVC windows which detract from the overall character of the property.
- 6.17. Overall the replacement of these existing windows, insensitive additions with timber framed sash windows would be welcomed and, as discussed on site, if this were to be extended to also include those to the front elevation, the benefit derived from the proposal would be greatly increased. Including the replacement of these windows within the proposal would

greatly improve the perception of the historic significance of this building and would help to justify the overall works.

- 6.18. It should be noted however that the use of double glazing to listed buildings is not usually supported by the Council, even when this involves the replacement of unauthorised windows. The use of double glazing would thus require full justification within a full heritage statement, taking into consideration matters such as the resulting frame size and proportions and the prominence of necessary features such as trickle vents. Detailed drawings of the replacement windows should be submitted alongside any formal application, or would otherwise be conditioned for later submission.

(4-6) Repairs, repointing and replacement tiles

- 6.19. Where historic buildings have become damaged over time or feature redundant services, the sensitive removal / repair of these elements would always be welcomed; however in order to ensure that these works are completed appropriately greater details should be submitted alongside any formal application. It is therefore advised that your Heritage statement is expanded to include details such as the extent to repair works (i.e. likely number of tiles needing replacement / area of repointing required), greater evidence of the need for replacement, as well as details for the proposed materials (i.e. slate type and lime mortar composition). Subject to the submission of these details it is likely that these elements would be supported, and the overall enhancement to the properties would act to help justify the overall scheme.

Internal alterations / layout

- 6.20. In terms of internal alterations the proposed development would include the following:
- (1) Blocking up of party wall at 1st floor level and the conversion of upper floors at no.45 into a single unit (Flat 1) including alterations to internal partitioning.
 - (2) Conversion of first, second and third floors at no.46 into 1 bed units with the same general plan at each floor and entrance ways from common stair.

(1) Flat 1 at no.45

- 6.21. As highlighted in the listing description, the application properties would have originally been individual dwellings at upper floors above the ground floor commercial unit. The historic layout of these properties has however been considerably diminished over time; with one of the most obvious losses of historic form being at first floor levels where the two properties have been combined. Overall, the proposal to infill the opening between nos.45 and 46 and formally separate the two properties is thus a considerable improvement to historical significance of each property. The need to retain a recess in this location is however questioned, and it would be the view of officers that were it possible to fully infill this opening it would be preferable.

- 6.22. Furthermore in listed building terms, the conversion of no.45 back into a single larger unit (3 bed, 6 person) split over 3 floors combined with alterations such as the opening up of the base of the stair at first floor level; and removal of partitioning, bathroom and stair enclosure at 2nd floor level all act to restore more of the historic plan form as well as room function to this property. In order to ensure that the kitchen and living rooms maintain two separate volumes which can be read independently, it is however advised that a down stand should be retain/included along the lateral partition between these rooms. It should also be noted that the survey of the property appears to be inaccurate in this location; this should be addressed prior to a formal submission. The scheme would also involve the variation to layout at 3rd floor

level however as this floor is a later addition no concerns are raised, subject to aforementioned evidence of age and detailing of the servicing to the new bathroom (as well as all other services to this unit). It is therefore recommended that any formal submission includes full details of service routing where alterations are proposed.

- 6.23. Subject to the submission of further evidence / greater details, it is considered that the proposed internal alterations to no.45 would likely be supported by officers.

(2) Flats 2, 3 & 4 at no.46

- 6.24. In terms of the listed building assessment; the conversion of each floor into a self-contained unit accessed by a common stair would not be objectionable in principle, however it is considered that the design of this subdivision could be amended to reduce the impact upon the historic plan form of the property. The proposed installation of a second bathroom to each floor would involve the infilling between two chimney breasts and the disruption to the front and rear room plan and volumes at each floor. It is advised that these changes would not be supported in their current form, and that combined with the points outlined in the following section, the layout could be better designed.
- 6.25. Firstly, it is considered that it would be preferable and viable to maintain /reinstate the lateral partition at each floor as shown on the existing 2nd floor plan drawing, with a single leaf door to separate these front rooms. This would require the rotation of the new bathrooms by 90° (if these are to be retained) and also a reduction in bedroom, lobby and wardrobe size at each floor. This would however allow the room volumes to be better expressed, would enhance the plan of the property considerably and would allow for the front fire places at each floor to be fully revealed. Combined with the fact that these alterations would help to address the concerns outlined in the 'Standards of Accommodation' section, it is considered that these amendments would considerably improve the scheme in heritage terms. It is therefore advised that greater analysis into this is completed and that your final scheme is fully justified in heritage terms within your heritage statement.
- 6.26. Secondly, it is noted that on both existing and proposed plans the fire place is shown to have been lost at third floor level at no.46. If this is the case then it is advised that this is outlined in submitted documents, however it should be noted that the Council would not support the loss of any fireplace where they currently exist. It is also assumed that the proposed services for the new bathrooms would utilise an existing service riser. If this is the case then no objection is raised however further information is requested.
- 6.27. Finally it was noted during the site visit that the ground floor side elevation of the entrance way into no.46 still features the historic tiling of the former commercial unit. Although painted over, these appear to remain in good condition and so it would be recommended that the paint is carefully removed and the tiles repaired.
- 6.28. Subject to the submission of further information as outlined above as well as the amendment to plan form, it is considered that the subdivision of no.46 into three units could be supported by officers.

Standard of residential accommodation

- 6.29. Policy DP26 requires that developments provide an acceptable standard of accommodation in terms of internal arrangements, dwelling and room sizes and amenity space. Developments are also required to provide facilities for waste storage, bicycle storage and outdoor amenity space.

6.30. Since the introduction of the Nationally Described Space Standards in 2015; all new residential units are expected to be in accordance with these minimum standards. These standards state that in order to provide two bedspaces, a double (or twin bedroom) must feature a floor area of at least 11.5sqm and for a single bedspace, 7.5sqm. On this basis, the minimum space standards for new development, as set out within the nationally described space standards (GIA), alongside those proposed (outlined in submitted documents) are set out in the table below:

Unit No.	Location	Unit Type	Proposed Size (sqm)	Minimum requirement (sqm)
1	1 st , 2 nd & 3 rd floors No.45	3 bed 5person	118.1	99
2	1 st floor (no.46)	1 bed 1person	43.1	39
3	2 nd floor (no.46)	1 bed 1person	43.6	39
4	3 rd floor (no.46)	1 bed 1person	40.0	39

6.31. As the table above indicates, all of the proposed units would meet the minimum gross internal areas required by National Technical Standards. This would however depend on units 2-4 being for sole occupancy, as the minimum requirement for a 1 bedroom, 2 person unit increases to 50sqm. All three flats within no.46 would thus fail the minimum provision if they were to be 2 person units and as such the slight reduction to the bedroom size in order to address the layout issues outlined above would not be objectionable, provided that an area of at least 7.5sqm was retained.

6.32. In terms of light and outlook, it is noted that all units would be dual aspect and would feature a good level of glazing. Outlook or natural light is therefore not anticipated to be an issue for future occupants of the proposed units. Overall it is not considered that any privacy issues would result from the proposed layout, however it is noted that the main bathroom to flat 4 would feature a window onto common parts which would require obscure glazing.

6.33. In terms of noise and disturbance, the proposed units within no.46 would be uniformly stacked to ensure that there would be no disruption to sensitive rooms. Details of noise insulation would usually be expected, however if this would involve significant intervention into any historic flooring, then this may not be considered necessary. Further investigations are therefore recommended into the historic nature of the flooring of no.46 and of the first floor level floor of no.45.

6.34. Overall, the proposed accommodation is considered to provide an adequate standard for future occupants and it is not considered likely that the scheme would be found objectionable in these terms.

Neighbouring Amenity

6.35. Policy DP26 seeks to protect the quality of life of occupiers and neighbours by only granting permission for development that does not cause harm to amenity. Factors to consider, and which is particularly relevant to this case, include sunlight, daylight, artificial light levels, and visual privacy and overlooking.

6.36. Due to the siting and scale (particularly in following paras.6.12-6.15) of the proposed external alterations / extensions, it is not considered that the residential amenities of any neighbouring occupier would be detrimentally impacted upon. The proposed subdivision

would not lead to an increase in the level of activity likely to be contained within the upper floors and thus the development is not considered to lead to a rise in noise or disturbance. It should however be noted that the proposed roof replacement would likely necessitate the alteration to the extraction ducting to the ground floor restaurant and that this element should be discussed with these freeholders and included alongside any formal submission. If this would include the replacement of any plant, then a noise survey should be submitted alongside any formal application.

Transport / Planning obligations

- 6.37. Although it is acknowledged that the property already features self-contained units and that the proposal would lead to a reduction of units, as the units would be formalised it is the officers opinion that the Council's policies regarding transport would apply.
- 6.38. In line with Policy DP18 the Council will expect development to be car free in areas of high accessibility. Paragraph 5.9 of CPG7 defines highly accessible areas as those that have a PTAL rating of 4 and above. As identified above, the application site has a PTAL rating of 6b meaning that it is considered likely that the proposed units would need to be car free. It would thus be expected that a car free agreement was formed under a Section 106 Legal Agreement prior to a planning approval.
- 6.39. Furthermore, although it is acknowledged that the proposed works are not of a great scale, because of the access to the site and the potential disruption to a large number of nearby occupiers and residents, it is advised that a draft construction management plan should be submitted alongside any formal submission. Please use the Council's pro forma to produce this document [CMP Pro Forma](#). It is advised that this document should include the following:
- details of control measures for dust, noise, vibration, lighting;
 - delivery locations and routes;
 - restriction of hours of work and all associated activities audible beyond the site boundary to 0800-1800hrs Mondays to Fridays and 0800 -1300hrs on Saturdays;
 - advance notification to neighbours and other interested parties of proposed works and public display of contact details including accessible phone contact to persons responsible for the site works for the duration of the works.
- 6.40. If this information was provided upfront during the application stage, it could be passed to the Highways and Transport department for comment during the life of the application. This may mean that this document is able to be conditioned rather than secured via a section 106 agreement, however this would require the assessment from Highways officers.
- 6.41. In terms of cycle storage; development is usually expected to provide storage in line with the minimum requirements set out in Chapter 6 of the London Plan 2016. As the development would involve the conversion of a listed building, and the site has a PTAL score of 6b (the best); the lack of provision is in this instance not objectionable.

7. Conclusion

- 7.1. The principle of the loss of no.1 unit and proposed unit mix would not be objectionable in principle as it would lead to the formalisation of the current situation, benefits in conservation terms and would remain in accordance with policy DP2/DP5.

- 7.2. Further work is however required in terms of the justification in heritage terms of the proposed replacement roof, internal layout and servicing. It is advised that the scale of the rear extension (particularly the height) is reduced as much as possible and that this addition is fully justified in the planning and heritage balance. It is also advised that the scheme is expanded to include the redesign of the dormer windows to no.45 as well as to include the replacement of the existing uPVC windows to the front elevation of this property as replacing these elements would significantly improve the appearance of the property within the conservation area as well as its architectural importance.

8. Application information

- 8.1. If you submit a planning and listed building consent application which addresses the outstanding issue detailed in this report satisfactorily, I would advise you to submit the following for a valid planning application:

- Completed form – [full planning and listed building consent]
- An Ordnance Survey based location plan at 1:1250 scale denoting the application site in red.
- Floor plans at a scale of 1:50 labelled 'existing' and 'proposed'
- Roof plans at a scale of 1:50 labelled 'existing' and 'proposed'
- Demolition plans at a scale of 1:50
- Elevation drawings at a scale of 1:50 labelled 'existing' and 'proposed'
- Section drawings at a scale of 1:50 labelled 'existing' and 'proposed'
- Detailed drawings at a scale of 1:20 of proposed replacement windows
- Full heritage statement which addresses the points raised within the report
- Design and access statement
- Planning Statement
- Sample photographs/manufacturer details of proposed replacement tiles
- Full details of methodology for repairs and repointing
- Draft CMP
- Please see [supporting information for planning applications](#) for more information.

- 8.2. We are legally required to consult on applications with individuals who may be affected by the proposals. We would notify neighbours by putting up site notices on or near the site, sending out e-alerts and, advertising in a local newspaper. The Council must allow 21 days from the consultation start date for responses to be received.

- 8.3. The Council's scheme of delegation states that any application involving any demolition (other than minor demolition) of any listed building should be reported to the development control committee. Although demolition plans were not forthcoming, a view as to whether the works would constitute minor demolition would need to be taken.

- 8.4. It is considered that proposal would be of a size which could be determined under delegated powers, if more than 3 objections from neighbours or an objection from a local amenity group is received the application would still be referred to the Members Briefing Panel should it be recommended for approval by officers. For more details click [here](#).

This document represents an initial informal officer view of your proposals based on the information available to us at this stage and would not be binding upon the Council, nor prejudice any future planning application decisions made by the Council.

If you have any queries about the above letter or the attached document please do not hesitate to contact me direct.

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

Yours sincerely,

John Diver
Planning Officer
Regeneration and Planning
Supporting Communities
London Borough of Camden
Telephone: 02079746368
Web: camden.gov.uk