		LONDON BOROUGH OF CA	MDEN		
<u> </u>	<u> </u>	PLANNING			
	CO	NSERVATION AND URBAN	DESIGN		
Proposed Develop London NW1 7JY	ment at:	159 161 163 and 165 Can	nden Higl	n Street	
and cycle store en (condition 3), meth renewable energy (condition 6), section 8) and biodiversity 3, 4, 5, 6, 8, and 9 (2006/0776/P) for dand the redevelops storey plus basem	trance (part lod of storal provision (durity measuration of the plannal lemolition of ment of the ent level bu	al entrance, refuse store entrated tondition 2), external mated ge and waste removal (condition 5), cycle storage ares on Underhill Passage (conditions 2) pursuant to conditions 2 and permission dated 16/05/of existing 3 and 4 storey built site through the erection of a uilding, with retail (Class A1) evels, and 14 self-contained to	rials lition 4), ondition (part), 06 ildings a five-	Case No: 2008/5898/P	
Case Officer:	Sharon	O Connell		Date: 23/01/09	
			<u></u> -	Conservation Area	ΙΥ
				Listed Building	+
				Adjoining Listed	+
				Building	
				TPO	
				Local Design Policy	┼──
				Local Doolgh Folloy	J

OBSERVATIONS:

Condition 9 requires the applicants to provide "measures to improve the biodiversity of the site". The Planning Officers report states that there are potential biodiversity gains through the incorporation of green or brown roofs and nest space in the building design and planting boxes on the terraced areas.

No details have been provided of nest spaces. Details of these should be included with the current submission.

A list of plant species has been provided for a green roof however no indication has been provided for its location or extent. Details of these along with construction details of the roof and a management plan for the planting should be submitted with the proposals.

No details of terraced planting have been provided. The terraces are private spaces. In some respects any planters on these spaces is incidental to their use. Any biodiversity gains are likely to be limited. It is not considered to be expedient to pursue these details.

Relevant UDP Policies N5 Biodiversity

Negotiate	Υ
Approve	
Refuse	

Signed Kevin Fisher

Date 23/01/09

LONDON BOROUGH OF CAMDEN		
PLANNING		
CONSERVATION AND URBAN DESIGN		
Proposed Development at: 159 161 163 and 165 Camden High	Street	
London		
NW1 7JY		
Proposal:	Case No:	
Amendments to planning permission granted 16/05/2006)	2009/3719/P	
(2006/0776/P) "for the demolition of existing 3 and 4 storey		
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)" including amending the approved		
basement (reduction in size), amendment to the approved side		
and rear elevation to ensure they are consistent with the		
approved 3rd floor plan, inclusion at roof level of a lift shaft, vrv		
units including acoustic screen, solar panels and the raising of each residential storey by 50mm and amendments to the		
approved design of the front, side and rear elevation. Discharge		
of conditions elevational details (condition 2), external materials		
(condition 3), method of storage and waste removal (condition 4),		
renewable energy (condition 5), cycle storage (condition 6),		
security measures on Underhill Passage (condition 8), and		
biodiversity (condition 9) of planning permission 2006/0776/P.		
Case Officer: Gavin Sexton	Date: 04 May 10	
	Conservation Area	X
	Listed Building	
	Adjoining Listed	ŀ
	Building	<u> </u>
	TPO	
	Local Design Policy	

OBSERVATIONS:

I have commented on the conditions previously when I raised the issue that the design had changed. Please refer to these previous comments.

The design changes are certainly a backward step in terms of design quality. Corner windows have been lost and pane sizes reduced. Proportions and details have become less convincing.

Of principal concern is the ground floor. This is a High Street. Floor levels have been increased in the residential which has lowered the shop floor height. This has pushed the shop front and its facia board down below the prevalently level in the street. This must be reinstated. The design has also become clumsier with solid elements introduced in the ground floor façade. We should accept no changes on the ground floor street frontage

The windows should be as before or an alternative quality approach.

ı	Negotiate	X
ı	Hicaoliale	1 1

Approve		
Refuse		•
Reason:	•	
	Edward Jarvis	04 May 10
Signed		Date