

Date: **27/10/2016**  
Your ref:  
Our ref: 2016/3374/PRE  
Contact: David Peres da Costa  
Direct line: 020 7974 5262  
Email: david.peresdacosta@camden.gov.uk

**Development Management  
Regeneration and planning**  
London Borough of Camden  
5 Pancras Square  
London N1C 4AG

Tel: 020 7974 4444  
Fax: 020 7974 1680  
[planning@camden.gov.uk](mailto:planning@camden.gov.uk)  
[www.camden.gov.uk/planning](http://www.camden.gov.uk/planning)

Dear Mr Horne,

**Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended)**  
**Re: 1 Triton Square, Regent's Place, NW1 3DX**

Thank you for your pre-application enquiry regarding the proposed development at the above property. The proposed works would include: 3 storey extension at roof level including infill of existing atrium, reconfiguration of ground floor, infill of public route through the ground floor (Triton Square Mall) and reconfiguration of office entrance to provide approximately 15,000 sqm of additional office (B1) floorspace. The existing rooftop plant level would be removed and replaced on top. The proposal would re-provide a gym (D2) at ground floor level and 1000sqm of affordable workspace (B1).

An initial pre-application response dated 21<sup>st</sup> July 2016 has already been provided. Since this response the proposed development has been reviewed by Camden Design Review Panel (DRP) (22<sup>nd</sup> July 2016) and their report was issued 5<sup>th</sup> August 2016. Following the DRP we have discussed a revised scheme including a 'garden square' approach to the public realm in Longford Place. We have also had a series of technical meetings to discuss:

- Townscape views
- Daylight and Sunlight
- Transport
- Sustainability

The purpose of this response is to provide formal feedback on the revised scheme and the subsequent meetings. This response should be read alongside the previous response. A revised site plan has been provided with St Anne's RC Church within the red line to include approximately 2784sqm of housing (all affordable).

**Mixed use development and affordable housing**

Policy DP1 seeks to provide a mix of uses within developments in order to facilitate sustainable development and reduce the need to travel between

homes, services and jobs. In the Central London Area where more than 200 sqm (gross) additional floorspace is provided, we require up to 50% of all additional floorspace to be housing such that additional floorspace in residential use matches all the additional floorspace in non-residential use. The requirement to provide housing (policy DP1) combines with the affordable housing requirements of policy DP3 so that a proportion of the housing provided is affordable in accordance with the sliding scale. The Council will require housing to be provided on site, particularly where 1,000sqm (gross) of additional floorspace or more is proposed.

Following the inclusion of St Anne's RC Church within the red line boundary of the site you have asked for reconfirmation of the Council's requirement for housing / affordable housing. I can confirm that it would have no effect on the level of housing that would be expected or the currently estimated shortfall. In accordance with policy DP1 we require up to 50% of all additional floorspace to be housing such that additional floorspace in residential use matches all the additional floorspace in non-residential use (paragraph 1.10). Further guidance on the application of DP1 is set out in CPG2: Housing (see p.36-41 in particular).

The proposed uplift of floorspace at 1 Triton Square is c.14,900sqm. This however includes 3610sqm of infilled atrium, within the existing building envelope. Therefore the net uplift at 1 Triton Square would be 11,290sqm<sup>1</sup>.

If this were the development site in isolation applying policy DP1 would generate a housing requirement of 5645 sqm or 50% of this uplift to be housing. However, as the proposed 11290sqm is all non-residential this instead generates a housing target of 11290sqm (on or off-site) to match the non-residential uplift.

Paragraph 1.16 of DP1 goes on to say:

"1.16 In the Central London Area..... if an offsite contribution to housing is appropriate, the Council will take into account *all related sites* when assessing the level of housing provided. The Council will seek additional housing floorspace *to match the net addition to non-residential floorspace across all sites*, taking into account any non-residential floorspace removed in conjunction with the off-site housing contribution (but also seeking replacement of any existing housing lost as part of each development)."

The inclusion of the related church site means the net non-residential uplift across the application site becomes 10890 sqm<sup>2</sup>.

As the net addition to non-residential floorspace and the net addition to residential floorspace should match, a shortfall of 8106sqm<sup>3</sup> remains, taking into account the proposed 2784sqm of housing.

---

<sup>1</sup> Your email of 26/10/16 now refers to 11,923 non-residential at Triton Sq, but the principle remains the same)

<sup>2</sup> 11290 – 400 (or whatever the confirmed GEA of the proposed non-residential and church are)

<sup>3</sup> Of which c. 2700 sqm of this shortfall would be expected to be affordable to bring the total to 50%

The Council welcomes the proposed provision of all of the current housing floorspace as affordable housing. However, the shortfall in the policy requirement still needs to be addressed. If you cannot provide the required level of housing then justification should be provided in accordance with the criteria ('a' to 'i') set out in policy DP1. It is understood that you are currently examining off-site options further afield and such details will need to be submitted as part of any planning application. Options being explored include purchase of other sites and converting market units to affordable units. If you are able to robustly demonstrate that on-site provision is not feasible and no alternative sites are available in the area then the Council will as a last resort accept a payment in lieu in accordance with CPG8: Planning Obligations (see paragraphs 6.11-6.16).

Where a proposed development falls short of the Council's requirements in terms of the contribution to housing and affordable housing (whether on-site, off-site, or in the form of a payment-in-lieu), the Council will expect submission of a financial viability appraisal to justify the scale of the housing proposed. The Council will also seek an independent verification of the appraisal funded by a developer.

#### On site housing

You have provided details of a scheme with a vertically stacked arrangement, in the south-west corner of the building (16/8/16). A number of constraints were identified and the most significant have been highlighted below.

- The massing of the building and corner cores would result in single aspect dwellings with the residential core positions affecting the quality of the internal layouts.
- Introducing external amenity balconies and removing the external screen zone in front of the dwelling would affect the consistent overall architecture of the building.
- The aspect/ outlook to the lower floor south facing single aspect units (floors 01 to 06) would be constrained by the Santander building
- The existing ramp and wall would compromise the access / entrance to dwellings accessed from the western elevation with a 1.4m pinch point for residents and bicycles.
- Large deliveries and moving in / out would require basement access resulting in higher service charges.
- Refuse store at basement level would result in higher service charges.
- Impacts on the existing office floorspace.

Officers consider there would be clear benefits from the introduction of housing to the heart of Regent's Place however it is understood that the south-west corner stack option would not be practicable due to the constraints identified. Likewise, other residential options have previously been studied and it is accepted these would also not be practicable. It is therefore accepted

that the St Anne's RC Church part of the site would be the most appropriate option.

The total floorspace which can be accommodated on the Church site is still being finalised. While the residential floorspace would fall well below the policy DP1 housing target, the residential that is coming forward is entirely affordable and this is a significant consideration when weighed against the shortfall on the overall housing target.

### **Loss of community facilities**

The Council resists the loss of community facilities (Policy DP15) unless:

- a) a replacement facility that meets the needs of the local population is provided; or,
- b) the specific community facility is no longer required in its current use.

Where this is the case, evidence will be required to show that the loss would not create, or add to, a shortfall in provision for the specific community use and demonstrate that there is no demand for any other suitable community use on the site.

You have advised that the existing occupier, the Ethiopian Orthodox Church, draws its catchment from whole of north London and has previously been located in various sites in North London. You should provide further details of why the existing occupier is vacating the building and evidence of where they are relocating to. Importantly, you should also demonstrate that the loss would not create a shortfall for this type of community facility for alternative users and that there is no demand for any other suitable community use on the site.

The proposal includes the loss of the existing crèche from the ground floor of 1 Triton Square. The existing crèche provides 500sqm of D1 floorspace and was scheduled to close in February due to lack of demand. You have explored whether there is demand for another suitable community use on this site and there are ongoing discussions with local health care providers. You have also presented an option of providing affordable workspace (use class B1). The Council's Economic Development team is supportive of the proposal to provide affordable workspace. However, if the proposal involves the loss of the existing D1 floorspace this would need to be justified against policy DP15. You would need to demonstrate that the loss would not create a shortfall for this type of community facility and that there is no demand for any other suitable community use on the site.

### **Design**

#### **1 Triton Square**

The scheme has been substantially revised following the DRP, although we have yet to see the final submission version. The elevation of the affordable workspace has been pulled back to the building line and to maintain to same quantum of affordable workspace some of the gym space has been relocated

to basement level. The design approach has explored and evolved the original building concept which emphasized consistency of proportion and 'solidity and transparency'. The horizontal language of the existing building would be emphasized with the whole of the glazed screen lifted to provide a more strongly defined active base below and a top above (the upper screen recessed behind a grid). The consistency of proportion is reflected in each of these elements. The south east corner main entrance elevation would now also have a glazed screen with recessed glass with views out of the building framed by limestone fins. The 2 terraces at 5<sup>th</sup> and 6<sup>th</sup> floor have been replaced by a larger (7.5m) single terrace at 6<sup>th</sup> floor level. The cores would now have limestone panels to match the floors below with glazing (with horizontal fins) to the upper levels of the stair core. The revised design is considered to be more coherent and the cores have an improved appearance. You have also provided more solidity to the south east corner elevation which is welcomed.

The existing public route through 1 Triton Square, whilst it has some shortcomings, has always played an important role in aiding permeability through this part of Regent's Place and therefore officer's preference has been for the retention of a public route through the building. It is understood that the existing pedestrian route through the building was a response to the specific conditions that existed at that time which included two basement access ramps (to the east and west) and a single lane taxi route alongside each ramp. Some of the vehicular routes have been removed and basement access has been reduced to a single ramp to the west. This proposal would further enhance the pedestrian routes to the east and west of the site. It is unclear how the loss of this public route will be received locally. However officers acknowledge the loss of the route needs to be considered as part of the overall package of improvements to public routes and spaces on and around the site

#### The church site (residential)

The church site is bounded by Longford Street to the south, Laxton Place to the west, a 3 storey residential terrace (1-4 Laxton Place) to the north and open space to the east of the site (associated with Westminster Kingsway College to the north east). Immediately to the west of the church site is the 5 storey residential building 8-9 Laxton Place.

Immediately to the east of the church site is the Regent's Park Conservation Area (the boundary is on the west side of Laxton Place). Opposite (to the north west) the church site is the Grade II\* Church of St Mary Magdalene. The listing description notes the stained glass east window is of special interest as 'being one of Augustus Pugin's last designs, made by Hardman'. This window faces towards Laxton Place.

You have responded to many of the issues that were previously raised, however the arrangement of the ground floor remains a concern. The ground floor would have a congested layout with transformer, plant and generator rooms. These uses alongside the cycle and bin store would result in a large

proportion of 'dead' ground floor frontage. You should continue to investigate whether any of this plant can be relocated. A larger residential lobby area would also improve access for residents and create a more pleasant ground floor environment – particularly at night time. A further session on the housing block will be required so that these matters can be fully explored.

If the building is pulled back at ground floor level, we would need to know if this space would be maintained as private land or if the applicant is looking for the Council to adopt and maintain it.

### Public realm

While the estate is currently permeable it is not widely used outside of office hours. The public realm has therefore been a key focus of our meetings and the introduction of ground floor active frontages and landscaping are key components of the opportunity to broaden the appeal of the estate to a more diverse population. The alterations to the substation and the proposed mini square adjacent to the south west corner are both welcomed. The 'garden square' design for Longford Place represents a real improvement on the initial public realm proposal and would provide an intimate garden space for the wider community as well as a greener, softer space for the occupants of Regent's Place. The provision of unstructured playspace in the form of rocks is also welcomed. You should investigate whether any further greening of the site can be achieved by narrowing the routes through this area.

### Townscape Views

You have provided a townscape views study which demonstrates that the proposed extension to 1 Triton Square and the residential block would have an acceptable impact on the wider area (including views from the conservation area) and would not harm views from Fitzroy Square to the south.

### **Affordable housing**

We would recommend that the applicants consider at this early stage which Registered Provider (RP) will be managing the units. Origin Housing manage the affordable units across the British Land site, and we would be happy for them to take these units on. However, should the applicants be considering other RP's you should be aware the Council are moving towards an approved provider list in Camden, where the Council formally approves any RP's who are looking to acquire s106 units in the borough. Officers and members favour early involvement of an RP to ensure that all aspects of the affordable housing can be delivered as shown on the plans. Therefore we would welcome a statement or commentary from an RP on this scheme.

### Tenure

The top 3 floors would be intermediate rent whilst the remainder would be social rented. This would equate to:

6x2 bed as intermediate;  
5x2 bed as social rented (1 of which is a wheelchair unit);  
10x3 bed as social rented; and  
1x1 bed (wheelchair unit) as social rented.

Council policy no longer supports shared ownership and the provision of intermediate rent would be in line with our recently adopted Intermediate Housing Strategy (see attached). We can also recommend RP's who have delivered this product in the borough (one of whom is Origin). You should provide details of rent levels to ensure that they are affordable to our target income groups.

The proposed mix focuses the larger units in the social rent, and the smaller units in the intermediate. This is considered appropriate. If there is scope to make these 2-beds genuine 2-bed 4-person units then there may be scope to develop them as intermediate rent for sharers. The details of this should be discussed with the Council's affordable housing officer (Neil Cleary) before the application is submitted.

The intermediate and social rent units would share the same core. In normal circumstances officers would seek separate cores in order to mitigate service and management charges on the social rent units. If this is not possible here you should consider how this might be managed. Again this is something that could be covered by getting an RP on board at an early stage.

### **Quality of residential accommodation**

The proposals for the church site have been revised following officer's earlier comments. The revised proposal is for a nine storey building to provide 22 flats with a gross external area of 3014sqm (1 x 1-bed, 11 x 2-bed and 10 x 3-bed). This includes two wheelchair units (1 x 1-bed and 1x 2-bed). The delivery of this scheme as 100% affordable housing is welcomed.

Overall we would welcome a unit mix which brings forward such a large proportion of family sized housing given the overall need for such accommodation within the social rented tenure. The provision of larger 2b/4p units on the scheme is also welcomed. DP5 seeks 50% of units within the social rented tenure to be larger, 3-bed+ units and the scheme would exceed this level of provision. Whilst 1-bed units are not a priority in this tenure, the provision of these units at ground floor level would be preferable given the constraints of the site.

The layouts on the upper floors are generous and provide for dual and even triple aspect units, which is welcomed in a central location such as this. We would encourage the provision of separate kitchen/dining areas in the 3-bed units, in line with CPG 2 requirements. This could be achieved by introducing a half-height partition/breakfast bar.

On the upper floors the scheme allows for inset private terraces and a communal roof-top space at 6<sup>th</sup> floor roof level. This is welcomed in principle however it does raise some potential management issues, particularly with regard to potential noise/disturbance to the residential units further up the building. The block has been designed so that the stair core immediately adjoins the roof space, which in turn means the majority of the units sit away from this space. However the relationship between the roof space and the units that have window openings facing north will have to be carefully considered to ensure that there is no disturbance to those bedrooms. This should be discussed in detail with the selected RP, as it is likely that effective management of the space could overcome any potential issues.

Part of the sixth floor roof garden would now have a dedicated safe and enclosed soft play-space. It is unclear how inviting this space would be and the current designs are unconvincing.

### **Wheelchair Housing**

The wheelchair units would be secured via legal agreement. It is understood that two wheelchair car parking spaces could be provided on the street opposite the building on Laxton Place (adjacent to an existing disabled parking space) should they be required. It is very difficult to match wheelchair units with potential occupiers if parking spaces are not in place. Therefore the presumption is the proposed wheelchair units will come with 2 parking spaces and the required Traffic Management Order will be secured by legal agreement.

### **Amenity**

You have prepared a daylight, sunlight and overshadowing study. You have identified that habitable rooms within 8-9 Laxton Place (immediately to the west of the church site) would be affected by the proposed residential block. The rooms affected are kitchens (on each floor of the east elevation) which are inset to allow for a terrace. You have advised that the existing levels of daylight for these rooms is poor and it is therefore likely that artificial lighting is already required in these rooms. Given this context the reduction in daylight may be considered acceptable. The report also addresses the impact of the 3 storey office extension on the public spaces around 1 Triton Square including Longford Square and Regent's Place Plaza. You have advised that impact on the public spaces would be relatively limited. The study also explores the impact on the Grade II\* Church of St Mary Magdalene and specifically the impact on the east window. The study finds that any impact would be limited. You should ensure the daylight, sunlight and overshadowing report includes a commentary which sets out the findings and provides a clear understanding of the impacts and why these would be acceptable.

### **Transport**

#### Cycle Parking 1 Triton Square



Parking for employees (and other long stay parking) should be provided either within the building, or otherwise protected from the weather. Consideration should be given to providing lockers and showers for cyclists. You should provide secure and covered cycle storage for the staff of the gym and flexible business space.

#### Disabled parking 1 Triton Square

One space should be provided per disabled employee or, 1 space per 20,000sqm or part thereof whichever is the greater.

#### Removal of taxi drop off

Removing the Taxi rank from the front entrance of 1 Triton Square would be desirable however you would need to provide evidence in the form of a traffic survey showing its level of use. It would be helpful if you could explain how taxis will continue to service the site.

#### Removal of public route through the ground floor

You have advised that the route has not been in existence for more than 20 years and there is no established public right of way along it as it is closed on Christmas Day every year. The supporting transport assessment will need to address this in detail.

### **Sustainability**

You have indicated that the reduction in CO2 from renewable energy would be 2-3%. Camden expects developments to target at least a 20% reduction in carbon dioxide emissions through the installation of on-site renewable energy technologies (policy CS13). You should therefore investigate increasing the percentage reductions from renewable energy.

You are advised that London Plan policy 5.2 expects a 'zero carbon' target for residential development (from 1 October 2016).

### **GLA Referral**

The Town and Country Planning (Mayor of London) Order 2008 sets criteria for applications of potential strategic importance. These include (category 1C) development which comprises the erection of a building which is more than 30 metres high outside the City of London.

The criteria also include (Part 1D) development which comprises or includes the alteration of an existing building where —

- (a) the development would increase the height of the building by more than 15 metres; and
- (b) the building would, on completion of the development, be more than 30 metres high (outside the City of London).

The height of 1 Triton Square would be increased by 12.96m (less than 15m). The proposed height of the residential block (on the site of St Anne's RC Church) would be 29.7m AOD (less than 30m). Therefore the criteria would not be met and the application would not be referred to the Mayor.

## **Planning Obligations**

The following Heads of Terms would be sought:

- Employment and training
- Construction apprenticeships
- Local procurement
- Pedestrian, cyclist and environmental improvements
- Open space contribution
- Highways reinstatement contribution
- Level plans
- CMP
- Affordable housing
- Affordable workspace
- Car free
- Sustainability / energy
- TMO for disabled spaces

## **Conclusion**

The design of 1 Triton Square has improved considerably and may be considered acceptable. The provision of a 'garden square' in Longford Place would provide an intimate garden space for the wider community as well as a greener, softer space for the occupants of Regent's Place. The ground floor of the residential block still raises concerns and a further meeting is required to explore these issues. The details of the affordable housing should be discussed with the Council's affordable housing officer (Neil Cleary) before the application is submitted. A statement or commentary on this scheme from the chosen RP should be submitted with the application.

**Please note that the information contained in this letter represents an officer's opinion and is without prejudice to further consideration of this matter by the Development Control section or to the Council's formal decision.**

I trust this information is of assistance. Should you have any further queries please do not hesitate to contact me by telephone on 020 7974 5262.

It is important to us to find out what our customers think about the service we provide. To help, we would be very grateful if you could take a few moments to complete our [pre application enquiry survey](#). We will use the information you give us to monitor and improve our services.

Yours sincerely

David Peres da Costa  
Senior Planning officer  
Planning Solutions Team