

Granger, Nigel

From: Wedmaier, Tim
Sent: 22 November 2005 16:09
To: Granger, Nigel
Cc: Catherall, Nigel
Subject: Camden High St_159-165

RE: 2005/4266/P

Nigel,

Transport Planning do not raise any objections subject to the following:

- car-free housing required given that the scheme does not meet the parking standard as set out in TR17 and would otherwise lead to overspill parking contrary to TR11.
- construction management plan via S106 to ensure all construction scheduling is agreed and approved by TfL and Camden as necessary to ensure the safety and efficiency of pedestrian and bus movement in particular in the vicinity of the site.
- a servicing management plan is required via s106, requiring all deliveries to the site to be made from Underhill street and through servicing doors on Underhill Passage and the rear carparking area. The type of vehicle making the deliveries needs to be managed such that it can service the site in accordance with the plan. No deliveries to the site to be received from Camden High Street given the limited availability of Loading space and the disruption that servicing of 500m2 of A1 floorspace would cause to pedestrians along this busy footway. This is to overcome objections in relation to lack of on-site servicing for a retail development greater than 500m2, contrary to TR23, and also to protect the amenity and efficiency of the footway and highway in line with policies TR21 (pedestrians) and TR20 (traffic management), *TfL. Dept*
- highways works are required via s106 (cost currently being calculated) to repair and widen the footway along Underhill passage in line with the proposed new setback building line;
- a Grampian condition is further required stating that the applicant must enter into a contract with Transport for London (Directorate of Road Network Development) to make good and enlarge the area of footway directly in front of the scheme, on Camden High Street (TfL prefer to enter into contract directly with applicant rather than seek s106 moneis via the LPA)
- a further condition required notifying the applicant that they must seek an "Overhang License" from TfL for the section of building proposed to overhang the Camden High Street Footway.
- an additional condition requiring the applicant to provide for enhanced street/ footway lighting and CCTV coverage (?) within Underhill Passage attached to the proposed building to ensure adequate levels of safety and visibility etc
- cycle storage is acceptable but should be conditioned such that details of the means of storage are reserved for approval and must be then maintained as such in perpetuity to ensure compliance with TR22 etc, ✓

Tim Wedmaier
Senior Transport Planner
Forward Planning and Projects
London Borough of Camden

p: 020 7974 5896
f: 020 7974 1930
e: tim.wedmaier@camden.gov.uk

Culture and Environment Department
Camden Town Hall Extension
Argyle Street
London
WC1H 8ND

www.camden.gov.uk

049604.ss.lbc.09
Thomas Smith
Planning Department
London Borough of Camden
Town Hall
Argyle Street
London WC1H 8EQ

31st March 2006

Dear Thomas,

159,161,163 & 165 Camden High Street

With response to your letter dated 22 March 2006, we have amended the proposal as follows:

Design

As a response to the over glazed ground floor, we have added a solid framework around the glazing emphasising the weight of the ground floor and eliminating the 'floating' appearance and giving a stronger degree of delineation to the land uses. The fascia panels have been reduced in size to keep in with the proportions.

The windows have been recessed by 100mm and therefore add a subtle degree of depth to the elevation.

The central 'spine' is recessed by 150mm, which is increased from the previous design, but still less what it was originally.

The materials proposed for the scheme are render and London stock brick for the centre 'spine'. For the balcony framework the material is to match with the roofing to visually complete the 'spine' elements.

Coping stones have been added to the parapet level to strengthen the termination.

Energy

In response to the UDP policy SD9 we have investigated different systems to achieve this. The proposal consists of 14 units that average as two bedroom flat. A 2 bedroom flat with gas-heated boiler requires 2800kWh annually. The required 10% from renewable sources for 14 units adds up to 3920 kWh.

This can be achieved for example adding 16m² of Solar Water Heating system on the roof providing 4500kWh. These can be selectively coated flat plate collector panels that can be integrated to the roof structure reducing the visibility of the system.

Also photovoltaic panels can be added to the roof structure together with Solar Water heating system. A 2kWp system of 16m² provides 1500 kWh a year.

As demonstrated, 10% of the energy demand can be achieved from the renewable sources. We need to conduct further studies to find the most appropriate system for the proposed scheme and would like this issue to be included in the planning conditions. In addition, we propose to reduce the energy consumption in the flats by designing them to make use, as far as possible, of natural light and ventilation where possible.

Energy efficient lighting is proposed as well as controls to avoid unnecessary use, waste of energy and light pollution.

The accommodation will be fitted with individual thermostatic time controls to reduce the heating supply. This will enable temperatures to be controlled according to need and ease of use for occupants.

Emphasis will be placed on light coloured finishes to improve lighting conditions and reduce the intention of light required.

Mobility

The scheme provides a level access to the communal entrance hall and to the lift. The flats can be made to fit the Lifetime homes standards. This can also be addressed in the planning conditions.

Biodiversity

The scheme provides terraces that can accommodate planting boxes for the required species. Also with different elements on the roof level, nesting spaces can be incorporated where suitable. These measures will increase habitats for wildlife and improves the microclimate and visual amenity of the area.

Crime Prevention

The proposed seeks to improve the appearance of the Underhill Passage and upgrade it with safety measures. We will propose to add good lighting and CCTV security equipment. Underhill passage is well-used as a thoroughfare linking the properties and the parking lot to the Camden High Street. Adding the well-lit access to the residential part will increase the natural surveillance and upgrades the passageway to populated, well-trafficked and attractive walkway discouraging criminal activity.

The proposal will also include entry phone panel access control and with the design defining the public and private areas.

Bin stores, boundary walls and bicycle storage have been designed to eliminate the opportunity for unauthorised access and climbing.

Should you have any queries or require any further information or assistance, please do not hesitate to contact us.

Yours sincerely,

Susanna Salmela

For and on behalf of Neale and Norden Ltd

RECEIVED 03 APR 2006

049604.ss.lbc.09
Thomas Smith
Planning Department
London Borough of Camden
Town Hall
Argyle Street
London WC1H 8EQ

31st March 2006

Dear Thomas,

159,161,163 & 165 Camden High Street

With response to your letter dated 22 March 2006, we have amended the proposal as follows:

Design

As a response to the over glazed ground floor, we have added a solid framework around the glazing emphasising the weight of the ground floor and eliminating the 'floating' appearance and giving a stronger degree of delineation to the land uses. The fascia panels have been reduced in size to keep in with the proportions.

The windows have been recessed by 100mm and therefore add a subtle degree of depth to the elevation.

The central 'spine' is recessed by 150mm, which is increased from the previous design, but still less what it was originally.

The materials proposed for the scheme are render and London stock brick for the centre 'spine'. For the balcony framework the material is to match with the roofing to visually complete the 'spine' elements.

Coping stones have been added to the parapet level to strengthen the termination.

Drawings numbers enclosed are as follows:

4 copies of drawing nos. P10, P21,P22,P23, P24, P25, P26 and P29.

Energy

In response to the UDP policy SD9 we have investigated different systems to achieve this. The proposal consists of 14 units that average as two bedroom flat. A 2 bedroom flat with gas-heated boiler requires 2800kWh annually. The required 10% from renewable sources for 14 units adds up to 3920 kWh.

This can be achieved for example adding 16m² of Solar Water Heating system on the roof providing 4500kWh. These can be selectively coated flat plate collector panels that can be integrated to the roof structure reducing the visibility of the system.

Also photovoltaic panels can be added to the roof structure together with Solar Water heating system. A 2kWp system of 16m² provides 1500 kWh a year.

As demonstrated, 10% of the energy demand can be achieved from the renewable sources. We need to conduct further studies to find the most appropriate system for the proposed scheme and would like this issue to be included in the planning conditions. In addition, we propose to reduce the energy consumption in the flats by designing them to make use, as far as possible, of natural light and ventilation where possible.

Energy efficient lighting is proposed as well as controls to avoid unnecessary use, waste of energy and light pollution.

The accommodation will be fitted with individual thermostatic time controls to reduce the heating supply. This will enable temperatures to be controlled according to need and ease of use for occupants.

Emphasis will be placed on light coloured finishes to improve lighting conditions and reduce the intention of light required.

Mobility

The scheme provides a level access to the communal entrance hall and to the lift. The flats can be made to fit the Lifetime homes standards. This can also be addressed in the planning conditions.

Biodiversity

The scheme provides terraces that can accommodate planting boxes for the required species. Also with different elements on the roof level, nesting spaces can be incorporated where suitable. These measures will increase habitats for wildlife and improves the microclimate and visual amenity of the area.

Crime Prevention

The proposed seeks to improve the appearance of the Underhill Passage and upgrade it with safety measures. We will propose to add good lighting and CCTV security equipment. Underhill passage is well-used as a thoroughfare linking the properties and the parking lot to the Camden High Street. Adding the well-lit access to the residential part will increase the natural surveillance and upgrades the passageway to populated, well-trafficked and attractive walkway discouraging criminal activity.

The proposal will also include entry phone panel access control and with the design defining the public and private areas.

Bin stores, boundary walls and bicycle storage have been designed to eliminate the opportunity for unauthorised access and climbing.

Should you have any queries or require any further information or assistance, please do not hesitate to contact us.

Yours sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to be 'Susanna Salmela', written in a cursive style.

Susanna Salmela

For and on behalf of Neale and Norden Ltd

Enc



Development Control
Planning Services
London Borough of Camden
Town Hall
Argyle Street
London WC1H 8ND

Tel: 020 7278 4444
Fax: 020 7974 1975
Textlink: 020 7974 6866

env.devcon@camden.gov.uk
www.camden.gov.uk/planning

Susanna Salmela
Neale & Norden Ltd
34 Osnaburgh Street
London
NW1 3ND

Your Ref:
My Ref: 2006/0776/P
Contact: **Thomas Smith**
Tel: 020 7974 5114

Date: 22 March 2006

Dear Ms Salmela

**Re. Planning Application 2006/0776/P
159, 161, 163 & 165 Camden High Street, London**

I refer to the above application and have a number of concerns about the proposal as follows:

Design

Whilst it is acknowledged that the current scheme has made some key changes, particularly with respect to reducing the number of competing planes on the front elevation, there are still a number of outstanding design issues, which are detailed below (in no particular order):

- It is considered that clearer definition is required, across the front elevation, to better delineate between land uses, (ie. retail verses residential above), so as to reduce the over glazed ground floor, which still predominates. More particularly, there is a need for a stronger degree of delineation introduced at the parapet/facia level of the shopfronts addressing Camden High Street;
- On the upper floors of the front elevation, it is considered that the proportions of the narrowest windows proposed, need to be slightly widened, to better balance the overall scale of the front elevation. Similarly, all windows proposed for this elevation will need to be further recessed (ie. minimum of 10 cms - preferably somewhat greater), to add a subtle degree of depth to this elevation;



- Whilst a revision of the materials palette is welcomed, it is considered that the predominance of white render is not indicative of the High Street character and thus not appropriate to the local context. Similarly, I am not satisfied that this choice of facing material will weather well, especially given the high levels of pollution in this location and as such would soon compromise the appearance of the building, particularly given the prominent location on the High Street. A more durable material is therefore required, red or stock brick being an obvious choice, given the context;
- It is considered that the central 'spine' of the front elevation would benefit from a differentiation of materials, such as the use of glazed tiles. In relation to the two facade components flanking it, it is considered, that as an overall composition, a greater degree of definition is required through the introduction of a greater recess, between the three elements, but obviously not as much as was advocated in the original scheme;
- The enclosed balcony feature, proposed at third level, central to the front facade, is considered to be a token feature and again, not indicative of the High Street character. The frame, including the glazed panel balustrade, delineating this balcony feature, is considered too weak and would require revision, before it could be deemed acceptable;
- A stronger termination at parapet level is necessary. It is considered that the proposed roof profile at the third level, is visually weak and needs to be strengthened;
- It is considered that the fourth floor has not been recessed enough (currently setback by a minimum of 1.5 metres and a maximum of 3.3 metres – the latter of which, is effectively negated by a roof overhang) and as such is not subordinate to the overall building mass. In streetscape terms, it is considered that it renders the proposal too tall/bulky and as such would require that this upper floor be further setback;

The Crime Prevention Design Advisor has raised serious concerns about the communal entrance to the residential dwellings being located in the side alley. The area of Camden Town remains the 'hottest spot' for crime in the borough and this configuration could potentially increase the chance of criminal victimisation for future residents and visitors. On the grounds of reducing the potential for crime, he has suggested that the proposal be amended so that the entrance fronts the wider public realm of Camden High Street. Whilst I agree that this would be preferable, you may seek to address this objection by other means. However, please be aware that Members are likely to place significant weight on this objection when the scheme is referred to Committee.

Energy

Replacement UDP policy SD9 was considered to have little weight at the time of the previous submission. It expected applicants to demonstrate the energy demand of their proposals and to demonstrate, where feasible, how they would generate a proportion of 10% of demand on-site from renewable sources.

The Council has received and responded to the Inspector's Report on the Replacement UDP, and this process gives significant weight to the objectives of this policy for applications submitted after 11 January 2006. The Inspector recommended that the Council should change the expectation to a requirement. This policy now needs to be addressed and guidance is given in the London Renewables toolkit "Integrating renewable energy into new developments" as to how this might be achieved.

Open Space

Adopted policies HG13 and EN54 state that the Council will seek the provision of accessible garden space and public open space as part of new developments.

Emerging policy N4 requires the provision of 9sqm of open space per person. This replacement UDP policy was considered to have little weight at the time of the previous submission but now carries greater weight.

The consultation draft SPD "Provision of Public Open Space" (October 2004) has limited weight, but does give guidance on how to convert development size into the number of occupiers, and in turn to calculate open space requirements and costs.

There is limited opportunity to provide open space on site and as such a contribution will be sought instead for improvements to and maintenance of nearby open space and this will need to be included within the Section 106 agreement. I am in the process of identifying suitable open space and clarifying the level of contribution which would be required.

Mobility

Replacement policy H7 now carries significant weight and requires that all new dwellings should be designed to lifetime homes standard. Generally 10% of homes should be designed as wheelchair housing or easily adaptable, but that may be inappropriate in this location due to the lack of potential to site a dedicated parking bay close to the entrance.

Biodiversity

Similarly, Emerging policy Nnew also needs to be addressed and this expects schemes to have considered conserving and enhancing biodiversity, including the creation of wildlife habitats. These measures include the use of green and brown roofs, the provision of nest spaces and boxes that meet the need of specific species and by planting species. The proposal may have potential to incorporate several of these measures, especially on terraces and roofs.

Whilst the 13-week expiry date is 16th May 2006, the application would need to be referred to Development Control Sub-Committee on 20th April as there is no Committee meeting in May, due to local elections. My report would need to be completed by 5th April 2006 to make this agenda and therefore you need to have satisfied the above concerns by 31st March 2006 in order to receive a favourable recommendation.

I appreciate that this is a tall order and it is probably sensible to withdraw this application and resubmit at a later date once the above matters have been satisfactorily addressed.

Please contact me on the above number should you wish to discuss any of these matters further.

Yours sincerely

Thomas Smith
Senior Planner
Development Control

For Director of Environment and Culture

Smith, Thomas D

From: Patrick.Cogan@met.pnn.police.uk
Sent: 13 March 2006 13:53
To: thomas.d.smith@camden.gov.uk
Subject: RE:2006/0776/P...159-165 Camden High Street, NW1 7JY.

Dear Tom,

As per our phone conversation...With regard to the proposed application I have serious concerns about the communal entrance to the residential dwellings being located in the side alley. On the grounds of reducing the potential for crime, I would ask that this proposal be amended so that the entrance fronts the wider public realm of Camden High Street.

The area of Camden Town remains the 'hottest spot' for crime in the borough and this configuration could potentially increase the chance of criminal victimisation for future residents and visitors.

As the proposals are negotiated with yourself and the applicant, please keep me up to speed with the amendments so that I can comment further with regard to reducing opportunities for crime at this location.

regards

Pat COGAN

Patrick Cogan MSc
Crime Prevention Design Adviser
Camden Borough Police

E mail : Patrick.Cogan@met.police.uk
Direct Phone : (020) 8733 6324
Fax : (020) 8733 6329

Partnership Office
Camden Police HQ
10 Lamb's Conduit Street
London
WC1N 3NR

NOT PROTECTIVELY MARKED

WARNING If you are not the intended addressee of this e-mail, you must not copy or deliver it to anyone else or use it in any unauthorised manner.

It is the policy of the MPS that:

MPS personnel (or agents working on behalf of the MPS) must not use MPS systems to author, transmit or store documents such as electronic mail (e-mail) messages or attachments:

- * containing racist, homophobic, sexist, defamatory, offensive, illegal or otherwise inappropriate material;
- * for other than official or semi-official MPS purposes;

13/03/2006

Memo



Environmental Health Team
London Borough of Camden
Town Hall
Argyle Street
London WC1H 8EQ

Phone: 020 7974
Fax: 020 7974 6955/5517
E-mail: env.health@camden.gov.uk

Date: 27th February 2006

To: Thomas Smith

From: Michael James Baker

Our Ref: EH/E07/MJB/082748

Your Ref: 2006/0776/P

Re: Planning Application – 159 - 165 Camden High Street, London, NW1 7JY

Thank you for consulting this section regarding the above development.

The former uses of the site including a warehouse, and adjacent uses such as oil and colour storage, unknown industrial, timber merchants, and an electrical substation, could have potentially led to contamination at this site.

As such, I recommend that the Council impose a planning condition requiring an appropriate site investigation to be undertaken and a report including any recommendations for remediation to be **submitted prior to any construction works taking place**.

The condition should additionally state that should any remediation measures be required, they must be agreed with the Council prior to the commencement of any works.

We would also request that wherever possible, reports provided in conjunction with a planning application be submitted to this section in a digital format for inclusion on the corporate GIS. Should you need clarification on any of the above please contact me on extension 5657.

Regards

Michael James Baker
Contaminated Land Support Officer
Environmental Health Team



Awarded for excellence



INVESTOR IN PEOPLE

Director: Peter Bishop

049604.pr.lbc.06

Planning Department
London Borough of Camden
Town Hall
Argyle Street
London WC1H 8EQ

13th February 2006

Dear Nigel Granger

159,161,163 & 165 Camden High Street

Please find enclosed our resubmission of the planning application no.2005/4266 in respect of demolition of the existing buildings at the above and the erection of a new five storey building comprising fourteen flats and 715m² of A1 use. The documents attached are as follows:

1. Four copies of the planning application form together with five copies of our Planning Drawings P01, P02, P03, P04, P05, P06, P07, P08, P09, P10, P21, P22, P23, P24, P25, P26, P27, P28, P29, P30 and P31.
2. Four copies of Conservation Area Consent form together with six copies of Drawings No. P01, P02, P03, P04, P05, P06, P07, P08, P09, P10, P21, P22, P23, P24, P25, P26, P27, P28, P29, P30 and P31.

Should you have any queries or require any further information or assistance, please do not hesitate to contact us.

Yours sincerely,



Susanna Salmela

For and on behalf of Neale and Norden Ltd

Smith, Thomas D

To: Susanna Salmela
Subject: RE: 159-165 Camden High Street

Dear Suzanna,

I agree that the loss of the existing office space should be taken into account and that 105sqm should be discounted from the public open space requirement.

However, the SPD is clear that it deals with **public** open space from the definition at para 2.1 and by the description of the options for new provision in para 8.1. Indeed, if that were not so, the presumption would be that residents of developments of 4 or fewer homes and occupiers of other developments of 999 sq m or less were not entitled to any amenity space at all which is clearly not a correct approach. The terraces provide **private** open space and therefore cannot count towards offsetting the public open space contribution which is used for active recreation space, community gardens, play facilities etc.

Therefore the public open space requirement is $378\text{sqm} - 105\text{sqm} = 273\text{sqm}$

And the public open space contribution is $273 \times 89 = \text{£}24,297$

Could you please confirm that this is acceptable to your client by the end of the day as the engrossments need to be served in order to complete the agreement within 13 weeks. I remind you that if the Agreement is not signed within 13 weeks then the application will be refused.

Regards

Thomas Smith
Senior Planner
Development Control
Regeneration and Culture
London Borough of Camden

Tel. 020 7974 5114
Fax. 020 7974 1975

-----Original Message-----

From: Susanna Salmela [mailto:susanna@nealeandnorden.co.uk]
Sent: 02 May 2006 17:47
To: Smith, Thomas D
Subject: Re: 159-165 Camden High Street

Dear Thomas,

We would like to discuss the Open Space contribution with you. The calculations didn't take into consideration the proposed private amenity spaces. I have calculated the private amenity spaces and subtracted these from the total figures and the total left is $278.5\text{m}^2 \times \text{£}89 = \text{£}24786.50$ (see below for calcs)

Also the existing area used as office (705m^2), should be taken into consideration. Since we have taken these people away from the area, their use of open space should be deducted from the calculations as well. At 50 persons/1000m², makes 705m^2 to accommodate 35 people. Their use being 1/3 of the occupied hours, $35 \times 9\text{m}^2 = 315\text{m}^2/3 = 105\text{m}^2$. This taken out from our remaining total of 278.5m^2 , leaves us 173.5m^2 for contribution. $173.5\text{m}^2 \times \text{£}89 = \text{£}15441.50$.

I look forward to hearing your comments with regards this matter.

Kind regards,

03/05/2006

Susanna Salmela
Neale and Norden Ltd.
Architects
34 Osnaburgh St.
London NW1 3ND
Tel: 0207 874 1500 Fax: 0207 874 1501
www.nealeandnorden.co.uk

The content of this email and any attachments are only for the use of the intended recipient. If you have received this in error then please notify the sender immediately.

Flat 1, 3 people x 9m² = **27m²** required
Flat 2, 3 people x 9m² = **27m²** required
Flat 3, 3 people x 9m² = 27m² required, terrace provided 59m², no contributions required
Flat 4, 3 people x 9m² = 27m² required, terrace provided 59m², no contributions required
Flat 5, 3 people x 9m² = **27m²** required
Flat 6, 3 people x 9m² = **27m²** required
Flat 7, 3 people x 9m² = 27m² required, balcony provided, 3.5m², space req. **23.5m²**
Flat 8, 3 people x 9m² = 27m² required, balcony provided, 3.5m², space req. **23.5m²**
Flat 9, 2 people x 9m² = 18m² required, 3m² balcony provided, **15m² req.**
Flat 10, 3 people x 9m² = 27m² required, 3m² balcony provided, **24m² req.**
Flat 11, 3 people x 9m² = 27m² required, balcony provided, 3.5m², space req. **23.5m²**
Flat 12, 4 people x 9m² = 36m² required, balcony + terrace provided, 14.5, space req. **21.5m²**
Flat 13, 2 people x 9m² = **18m²** required
Flat 14, 4 people x 9m² = 36m² required, balcony + terrace provided, 14.5, space req. **21.5m²**
TOTAL: 278.5m²

----- Original Message -----

From: [Smith, Thomas D](#)
To: [Susanna Salmela](#)
Cc: [Rossetto, Lee](#) ; [Farnsworth, Robert](#)
Sent: Thursday, April 27, 2006 4:04 PM
Subject: RE: 159-165 Camden High Street

Susanna,

Based on the Draft SPD on open space we have calculated that the public open space contributions for the above proposal as follows:

- 2x1 bed implies 4 occupiers
- 10x2 bed implies 30 occupiers
- 2x3 bed implies 8 occupiers

(SPD assumes 1 x double bedroom per unit)

Total 42 occupiers

Requirement per occupier is 9 sq m.

Notional average cost of space per sq m is £89 (this is in fact a heavily discounted figure).
That would suggest a contribution of £33,642

St Martins Garden (off Pratt Street) is the closest open space to the application site and is most likely to be used by occupiers of the development. Improvement works have recently been carried out to St Martins as part of a Liveability Programme scheme. However, there are some outstanding works within the programme which have not been funded and these have been costed at £60,000.

We can get match funding for these works from alternative sources and therefore a contribution of **£30,000** is considered to be appropriate.

Please can you confirm that this is acceptable to your client so that the Section 106 Agreement can be completed.

Kind Regards

Thomas Smith
Senior Planner
Development Control
Regeneration and Culture
London Borough of Camden

Tel. 020 7974 5114
Fax. 020 7974 1975

This e-mail may contain information which is confidential, legally privileged and/or copyright protected. This e-mail is intended for the addressee only. If you receive this in error, please contact the sender and delete the material from your computer.

Smith, Thomas D

To: Susanna Salmela
Cc: Drum, Louise
Subject: RE: 159-165 Camden High Street

Susanna

I generally welcome the changes made to the ground floor to reduce the overglazed appearance through the introduction of a stallriser type feature. It is considered that the vertical components of the overall ground floor 'frame', will now read as traditional pilasters. However it is considered that the fascia panels are too big and would need to be reduced in depth, so as to better proportion the overall ground floor level, now that a stall riser element has been introduced.

I welcome the introduction of glazing bars to the fenestration and I am now satisfied that these windows do not also need to be widened. Proposed degree of recessing (ie. 120mm) is satisfactory, however, it would be useful to see a revised section (ie. Section A-A/P29 as was previously lodged), to assess the overall degree of recessing, of both the ground floor shopfront elements and upper level openings.

You have not shown the degree to which the central 'spine' is recessed behind the rendered elevations to either side and this needs to be clarified as it is unclear from the 3D visual.

The combination of London Stock brick and render for overall front elevation material is deemed acceptable.

I do not accept that the proposed balcony framework should be detailed in render, but instead, suggest use of a matte finish of the same roofing material proposed or similar - so as to provide more visual synergy with the rest of the fenestration pattern on the front elevation.

I would strongly suggest that the coping extend across the whole elevation, rather than confined to the central 'spine' element.

I consider the proposed setback of the upper level to be acceptable, based on the 3D visual submitted today (30/03/06). A colour perspective would be useful particularly both for assessment and when presenting the scheme to Committee.

Whilst it seems that we are closer to resolving the design issues, I must emphasise that all of the other matters contained within my letter of 22nd March also need to be fully addressed (ie. police concerns, energy, mobility and biodiversity). My Committee report must be finalised by 5th March and therefore it is imperative that I have amended plans and all additional information by Monday 3rd March in order to make a recommendation for approval.

I will hopefully confirm the open space contribution requirement tomorrow.

Regards

Thomas Smith
Senior Planner
Development Control
Regeneration and Culture
London Borough of Camden

Tel. 020 7974 5114
Fax. 020 7974 1975

-----Original Message-----

From: Susanna Salmela [mailto:susanna@nealeandnorden.co.uk]
Sent: 30 March 2006 14:51
To: Drum, Louise

30/03/2006

Cc: thomas.d.smith@camden.gov.uk
Subject: Re: 159-165 Camden High Street

Hi Louise,
here's the 3D looking from the street level. It's in a wireframe (not fully colour rendered), but it's shows the bulk of the proposed and the adjoining buildings pretty well. I hope it gives an idea what it'll be like.

Regards,

Susanna Salmela
Neale and Norden Ltd.
Architects
34 Osnaburgh St.
London NW1 3ND
Tel: 0207 874 1500 Fax: 0207 874 1501
www.nealeandnorden.co.uk

The content of this email and any attachments are only for the use of the intended recipient. If you have received this in error then please notify the sender immediately.

----- Original Message -----

From: Drum, Louise
To: Susanna Salmela
Sent: Thursday, March 30, 2006 10:33 AM
Subject: RE: 159-165 Camden High Street

Hi Susanna,
many thanks for your call yesterday and for the latest revisions - I will have a look at them today and get back to you asap.
cheers
Louise

-----Original Message-----

From: Susanna Salmela [mailto:susanna@nealeandnorden.co.uk]
Sent: 29 March 2006 16:20
To: louise.drum@camden.gov.uk
Cc: thomas.d.smith@camden.gov.uk
Subject: 159-165 Camden High Street

Dear Louise,
please find attached the amended street elevation. As a response to the over glazed ground floor, we have added a solid framework around the glazing emphasising the weight of the ground floor and eliminating the 'floating' appearance and giving a stronger degree of delineation to the land uses.

The windows have been recessed by 120mm to add depth to the elevation. The widening of the windows distorted the proportions of the render and glazing and therefore we would rather not widen them. The example attached is with windows widened by 20%. (from 1000mm to 1200mm)

Instead of widening the windows, we have introduced more detailing to them, now if you feel these amendments are not appropriate we can take the glazing bars off and maybe condition them for further detail or we can design them differently.

The material the central spine is of brick (stock) and the render will be coloured to keep the building in its context. Colour to be approved perhaps at later stage, so we can provide a proper sample of it.

To the balcony we have added a frame to make the feature stronger, the material of the frame can be of render to link it to the adjoining elevation panes or of the same roof material to visually complete and link these elements together.

Coping stones have been added to the parapet level. It might only be needed at the central spine, what do you think?

We are still working on the 3d of the street view to demonstrate the set back being appropriate, and I will send this as soon it's ready, but what i have seen so far, it does look suitable.

We hope you find these amendments as an improvement, and look forward to hearing from you soon.

Kind regards,

Susanna Salmela
Neale and Norden Ltd.
Architects
34 Osnaburgh St.
London NW1 3ND
Tel: 0207 874 1500 Fax: 0207 874 1501
www.nealeandnorden.co.uk

The content of this email and any attachments are only for the use of the intended recipient. If you have received this in error then please notify the sender immediately.

This e-mail may contain information which is confidential, legally privileged and/or copyright protected. This e-mail is intended for the addressee only. If you receive this in error, please contact the sender and delete the material from your computer

VALIDATION SHEET

Address: 159 161 163 and 165 Camden High Street London NW1 7JY		Application Number: 2006/0777/NEW		
Application Type: Conservation Area Consent		Associated App(s): A / L / (P) / C <i>2006/0776</i>		
Received Date: 14 February 2006				
Method: CHEQUE / CASH / OTHER Payee: AGENT / APPLICANT / OTHER				
Fee Due: £		Receipt Date:		
Fee Rec'd: £		Receipt Ref:		
Fee Exemption: DISABILITY / (RESUBMISSION) / OTHER				
Cert Type: (A) / B		Cert Signed: (Y) / N		App Signed: (Y) / N
Council's Own: Y / (N)		Nos. Plans Req: <i>(0)</i>		Nos Plans Rec'd: <i>(1)</i>
ADMIN CHECK	<i>to 15/2</i>			
PLANNING OFFICER CHECK	<i>NG 29/02 Comp.</i>			
C & UD CHECK				
SUPERVISOR CHECK				
FINAL ADMIN CHECK				

TARGET

COMPLEX

FAST

SMIT



REQUEST FOR COMMENTS/OBSERVATIONS FROM:

Camden Town CAAC

159 161 163 and 165 Camden High Street
London
NW1 7JY

Application ref: 2006/0776/P
Associated ref(s): 2005/4266/P
2006/0777/C

Date of consultation: 21 February 2006

Development Control
Planning Services
London Borough of Camden
Town Hall
Argyle Street
London WC1H 8ND

Tel 020 7278 4444
Fax 020 7974 1975
Textlink 020 7974 6866

env.devcon@camden.gov.uk
www.camden.gov.uk/planning

Proposal: Demolition of existing buildings and the redevelopment of the site through the erection of a five-storey plus basement level building, with retail (Class A1) at basement and ground floor levels, and 14 self-contained flats above (Class C3) with associated Conservation Area Consent application (Ref. 2005/0777/C).

Comments: OBJECT NO OBJECTION COMMENT
(Please tick as appropriate)
We would refer you to our comments regarding the earlier application which we looked at in November 2005. Many of our comments remain valid for this revised application, which we still regard as being a very inept design for this site. Our main concerns are around the fact that the developers have taken a 'four plot' width and by dint of their design they have turned it into a 'three plot' width. This has the unhappy result of giving us a building which is essentially 'horizontal' and as such is at odds with an essentially 'vertical' High Street.

If we are to avoid the creation of a canyon effect up the High Street it is essential that developers are encouraged to keep a varied skyline, with a roofscape that is more interesting.

Additional concerns include the fact that this site can be seen from three sides and yet the design is 'flat'. We should like to see proposals for a building which embraces the asymmetry of the site and 'takes the corner' properly.

Overall we are astonished that a proposal of this scale and design is being considered by the Council in view of the previous comments made by the CAAC.

RECEIVED
/ 3 APR 2006

Signed: *J. Mitchell*

Date: *20/03/06*

If you would like to discuss the above application in more detail, please telephone Thomas Smith of North East Team on 020 7974 5114.

All comments and **returned plans**, should be sent within 21 days to:
Thomas Smith, Development Control, Planning, Environment Department, Camden Town Hall, Argyle Street, London WC1H 8EQ.

Photomaps generated using plans as submitted attached - developer has the proper bulk and size of this building

LONDON BOROUGH OF CAMDEN	
PLANNING	
CONSERVATION AND URBAN DESIGN	
Proposed Development at 159, 161, 163 and 165 Camden High Street, London NW1 7JY	
Proposal: Demolition of existing buildings and the redevelopment of the site through the erection of a five-storey plus basement level building with retail (Class A1) at basement and ground floor levels and 14 self-contained flats above (Class C3) with associated Conservation Area Consent application (Ref. 2005/0777/C)	Case No: 2006/0776/P 2005/4266/P 2006/0777/C
Case officer: Thomas Smith	Date: 14/03/06

Conservation Area	
Listed Building	
Adjoining Listed Building	
TPO	
Local Design Policy	

OBSERVATIONS:

Proposal

The following observations have been prepared for the proposed demolition of existing buildings and the redevelopment of the site through the erection of a five-storey plus basement level building, with retail (Class A1) at basement and ground floor levels and 14 self-contained flats above (Class C3) with associated Conservation Area Consent application (Ref. 2005/0777/C), at No.s 159, 161, 163 and 165 Camden High Street, London NW1.

The site is within the Camden Town Conservation Area. The existing buildings are not listed and do not adjoin any listed buildings. Nor are they noted as buildings making a positive contribution.

The existing buildings (No.s 159 & 163 -165) appear post war and very utilitarian. No. 161 is earlier, but much altered in the C20th. On this basis, demolition and redevelopment are not opposed in principle.

History

Refer original C&UD obs dated 29/11/06 with respect to application 2005/4266/P and 2005/4267/C. This application was subsequently withdrawn on the basis of the concerns raised with respect to the proposed design. The current scheme has been revised in response to these comments. The following obs are in response to these revisions.

Observations

The replacement scheme has been assessed against relevant UDP principles, namely, EN1 – General Environmental Protection and Improvement, EN 13 – Design of New Development, EN 16 – Site Layout, EN 18 – Design of Infill Development, EN 31 – Character and Appearance of Conservation Areas and EN 32 – Demolition of Unlisted Buildings in Conservation Areas.

Policy B1 of the Revised Deposit Draft as amended by the Proposed Modifications agreed by the Council's Executive on 11th January 2006 has also been considered in the assessment of this application.

The eastern side of Camden High Street (opposite the site) is characterised by typically consistent building lines, first floor setbacks, parapet lines and building heights. Whilst it is acknowledged that there are some variations in building height on this side of Camden High Street, there are fairly consistent groupings of buildings of similar heights.

Whilst the western side of Camden High Street, is not as consistent with regards to the aforementioned characteristics, the overall area is, nonetheless typified by narrow plot widths, sheer frontages, appropriately scaled ground floor openings, a strong sense of verticality and a generally limited materials palette, comprising mainly of red or stock brick, with some rendered facades.

The Camden Town Conservation Area Statement (section 4.15) states that, "the typology of the original buildings continues to underlie the character of both Camden High Street and Parkway, even though alterations and extensions have introduced, over time, some diversity to the original homogeneity of design".

Whilst the Camden Town Conservation Area Statement acknowledges that "at the northern end of Camden High Street, on the west side of the street, between Parkway and Delancy Street, the character is rather varied with some two storey buildings introducing an interesting variation to the general scale of the CA. There is no consistency in their appearance and their value resides in their appearance rather than any architectural merit".

Whilst it is acknowledged that the current scheme has made some key changes, particularly with respect to reducing the number of competing planes on the front elevation, including the omission of the overhang, on Camden High Street, there are still a number of outstanding design issues, each of which are detailed below.

- It is considered that clearer definition is required, across the front elevation, to better delineate between land uses, (ie. retail verses resi above), so as to reduce the over glazed ground floor, which still predominates. More particularly, there is a need for a stronger degree of delineation introduced at the parapet/facia level of the shopfronts addressing Camden High Street;

- On the upper floors of the front elevation, it is considered that the proportions of the narrowest windows proposed, need to be slightly widened, to better balance the overall scale of the front elevation. Similarly, all windows proposed for this elevation will need to be further recessed (ie. minimum of 10 cms - preferably somewhat greater), to add a subtly degree of depth to this elevation;
- Whilst a revision of the materials palette is welcomed, it is considered that the predominance of white render is not indicative of the High Street character and thus not appropriate to the local context. Similarly, officers are not satisfied that this choice of facing material will weather well, especially given the high levels of pollution in this location and as such would soon compromise the appearance of the building, particularly given the prominent location on the High Street. A more durable material is therefore required, red or stock brick being an obvious choice, given the context;
- It is considered that the central 'spine' of the front elevation could benefit from a differentiation of materials, such as the use of glazed tiles. In relation to the two facade components flanking it, it is considered, that as an overall composition, a greater degree of definition is required – that the facade as a whole, either be completely flat, rising sheer, as one plane or that more of a recess is introduced, between the three elements, but obviously not as much as was advocated in the original scheme – strike a better balance, respective of context;
- The enclosed balcony feature, proposed at third level, central to the front facade, is considered to be a token feature and again, not indicative of the High Street character. The frame, including the glazed panel balustrade, delineating this balcony feature, is considered too weak and would require revision, before it could be deemed acceptable;
- A more decent termination at parapet level is necessary. It is considered that the proposed roof profile at the third level, is visually weak and needs to be strengthened;
- It is considered that the fourth floor has not been recessed enough (currently setback by a minimum of 1.5 metres and a maximum of 3.3 metres – the latter of which, is effectively negated by a roof overhang) and as such is not subordinate to the overall building mass. In streetscape terms, it is considered that it renders the proposal too tall/bulky and as such would require that this upper floor be further setback;
- It is considered that the detailing of the proposed side and rear elevations is acceptable.

Recommendation

In considering applications for Conservation Area consent and planning permission, the proposal should demonstrate that it will be of more or equal

benefit to the special character and appearance of the conservation area, than the existing building.

A high quality, contemporary replacement scheme, on this site, is acceptable in principle. However, it is considered that the elevational design proposed, in its current form, is not an appropriate response to the redevelopment potential of this site and would not preserve or enhance the character and appearance of the conservation area.

Once revisions have been received and are deemed acceptable, a positive recommendation could be made, at that time. I am therefore unable to recommend this proposal for approval on the basis of the current scheme, but would be pleased to assess a revised scheme, that addresses the issues I have raised.

Negotiate	Y
Approve	
Refuse	

Signed *Louise Drum* Date 14/03/06
Louise Drum

Erin Bird 14/3/06