



Date: 02/02/2017
Our ref: 2016/6376/PRE
Contact: John Diver
Direct line: 020 7974 6368
Email: john.diver@camden.gov.uk

Konrad Romaniuk
Milan Babic Architects Ltd
Bickel's Yard
151B Bermondsey Street
London
SE1 3UW

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

By email

Dear Konrad,

Re: 6 Stukeley Street, London, WC2B 5LQ

Thank you for submitting a pre-planning application enquiry for the above property which was received on 21/11/2016 together with the required fee of £960.00. This advice has been informed by a site visit completed on the 20/12/2016 as well as discussions between planning, conservation, highways and building control officers.

1. Drawings and documents

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

- 841/L01 (Site location and block plan)
- JDD/SS-E1 (Existing ground floor plan)
- JDD/SS-E3 (Existing elevations and section)
- JDD/SS-E4 (Existing opposite elevation)
- PP841-MB-00-100 (Proposed ground and lower ground floor plan)
- PP841-MB-00-101 (Proposed first and second floor plan)
- PP841-MB-06-400 (Proposed section)
- Proposed materiality & massing diagram
- Design Statement prepared by Milan Babic Architects
- Afternoon light section diagrams x2

1.2. Following the onsite meeting, the following additional files were sent on the 16 January 2017 for further discussion:

- Revised materiality & massing diagram w. streetscene sketches
- Images of the existing property

2. Proposal

- 2.1. Advice is requested in relation to the demolition of the existing dwelling and its replacement with a part two, part three storey building to contain two self-contained units. The proposed scheme is a re-design of the scheme which was assessed and refused during planning application 2016/1445/P in which the materiality, bulk/massing and rhythm have all been altered in an attempt to address the previous reasons for refusal.
- 2.2. Following discussions on site, a set of sketches illustrating a 3rd variation of the scheme was submitted for comment. This scheme involves the retention of the existing single storey front elevation and the addition of a translucent glazed brick extension set back behind the shoulder of the front elevation. As a full set of plans for this scheme was not provided it will be discussed towards the end of the report below; however, full comment cannot be made.

3. Site description

- 3.1. The site is a single storey terrace building hosting a self-contained residential unit fronting Stukeley Street, a narrow pedestrian only street off Drury Lane within the Seven Dials Conservation Area.
- 3.2. The site has been considered to be an important component of an ad hoc agglomeration of humble, somewhat higgledy-piggledy structures of commercial origins, which seems to have evolved throughout the 19th century. The site is part of a group of small scale buildings of differing heights between No 4 -14 Stukeley Street that as a group are designated within the Seven Dials (Covent Garden) Conservation Area Statement as making a positive contribution to the conservation Area.
- 3.3. The site lies within the 'Central London Area', the 'Archaeological Priority Area' and is identified as lying within an area of underground development constraints (slope stability and groundwater flow).

4. Relevant planning history

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

No.6 (Application Site)

2016/1445/P: Planning permission was refused on the 10/08/16 for the 'Demolition of an existing single storey house and erection of two four storey, 2 x bedroom dwelling houses including basement excavation'

24248: Planning permission was granted on the 20/04/1977 for the 'Use as a 4 person flat'

15206: Temporary planning permission was granted on the 05/02/1973 for the 'Change of use to offices from storage for a limited period of ground floor'

9670: Temporary planning permission was granted on the 22/10/1970 for the 'Change of use to offices for professional use for a limited period of ground floor of 6 Stukeley Street, previously used for storage'

No.8 & 10 Stukeley St.

2015/7028/P: Planning permission was Granted Subject to a Section 106 Legal Agreement on the 31/01/2017 for the 'Erection of replacement mansard roof extension at no. 8 and installation of new mansard roof extension at no. 10; excavation of a single storey basement extension including lightwell to create additional Class B1 office floorspace; change of use of the ground floor of no. 8 from office to residential associated within the enlargement and reconfiguration of the two 1 bed residential units to create two 2 bed flats; alterations to the ground floor front and rear elevations; erection of first floor rear extension, and creation of external terrace at basement and first floor levels at no. 10.'

No 4 Stukeley St

8900576 – Planning permission was refused on the 06/06/1990 for the 'Change of use from a 3 room dwelling unit to use for studio/workshop (Class B1c Uses)'

5. Relevant policies and guidance

5.1. The relevant policies that would apply to this proposal are taken from the London Borough of Camden Local Development Framework (Core Strategy and Development Policy documents) as adopted on 8th November 2010, The London Plan 2016 and the NPPF (2012). The following policies will be taken into consideration:

- **National Planning Policy Framework (2012)**
- **London Plan (2016)**
 - Policy 3.3 – Increasing housing supply
 - Policy 3.14 – Existing housing
 - Policy 7.4 – Local character
 - Policy 7.5 – Public realm
 - Policy 7.6 – Architecture
 - Policy 7.8 – Heritage assets and archaeology
- **Local Development Framework**
- **Core Strategy (2011)**
 - CS1 - Distribution of Growth
 - CS5 – Managing the impact of growth and development
 - CS6 – Providing quality homes
 - CS14 – Promoting high quality places and conserving our heritage
- **Development Policies (2011)**
 - DP2 (Making full use of Camden's capacity for housing)
 - DP5 (Homes of different sizes)
 - DP6 (Lifetimes homes and wheelchair homes)
 - DP16 (The transport implications of development)
 - DP17 (Walking, cycling and public transport)
 - DP18 (Parking Standards and limiting the availability of car parking)
 - DP19 (Managing the impact of parking)
 - DP20 (Movement of goods and materials)
 - DP21 (Development connecting to the highway network)
 - DP22 (Promoting sustainable design and construction)
 - DP23 (Water)
 - DP24 (Securing high quality design)
 - DP25 (Conserving Camden's heritage)

- DP26 (Managing the impact of development on occupiers and neighbours)
- DP27 (Basements and Lightwells)
- DP29 (Improving access)

- **Supplementary Guidance**

- CPG 1 – Design
- CPG 2 – Housing
- CPG 4 – Basements and lightwells
- CPG 6 – Amenity
- CPG 7 – Transport
- CPG 8 – Planning Obligations

- **Seven Dials (Covent Garden) Conservation Area Statement (adopted 1998)**

- **Emerging policy:**

It should be noted that the Camden Local Plan will replace the Core Strategy and Development Policies in 2017 and is currently reaching its final stage of public examination. Consultation on the final modifications to the Submission Draft Local Plan formed in response to Inspector's comments during examination will take place from 30 January to 13 March 2017 and will seek to ensure that the Inspector can find the plan 'sound'.

The Local Plan is at this stage a material consideration for decision making which is granted limited weight. Following the publication of the Inspector's report into the examination which is expected in April, the Local Plan policies will be afforded substantial weight.

Adoption of the Local Plan by the Council is anticipated in June or July (depending on Cabinet and Council meeting dates). At that point the Local Plan will become a formal part of Camden's development plan, fully superseding the Core Strategy and Development Policies, and having full weight in planning decisions.

At this stage the Plan has limited weight in decision making but 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](#). The policies likely to be of particular relevance include:

- Policy G1 - Delivery and location of growth
- Policy H1 - Maximising housing supply
- Policy H3 - Protecting existing homes
- Policy H6 - Housing choice and mix
- Policy C5 - Access for all
- Policy A1 Managing the impact of development
- Policy A4 Noise and vibration
- Policy A5 Basements and Lightwells
- Policy D1 Design
- Policy D2 Heritage
- Policy CC1 Climate change mitigation
- Policy CC2 Adapting to climate change
- Policy T1 Prioritising walking, cycling and public transport
- Policy T2 Car-free development and limiting the availability of parking

6. Assessment

6.1. The main issues to consider in assessment of the proposed development are as follows:

- Land Use
- Design and the impact on the Conservation Area
- Principle of Basement
- Neighbouring amenity
- Standard of proposed residential accommodation
- Transport considerations
- Access
- Community Infrastructure Levy

Previous planning application

6.2. This pre-application advice request follows a previous planning application (2016/1445/P) for similar works to those hereby proposed. In the assessment for the previous application (as set out in the officer's report); issue was not raised with regard to the principal of the increase of housing floor space / number of units in the local area. The principle of the development was therefore not objectionable in land use terms. The previous proposal was also not found to be objectionable in terms of the standard of accommodation provided for future occupants or residential unit mix proposed (2x 2bedroom units).

6.3. During the previous planning application, the Council did however take issue with the impact that the development might cause upon the character and appearance of the group of buildings and wider conservation area; the impact upon the residential amenities of neighbouring residents; the level of cycle parking provided as well as impacts upon traffic conditions of the local area by virtue of a lack of a legal agreement. As such the planning permission was refused, with 6 reasons for refusal given.

6.4. The 6 reasons for refusal can be summarised as follows:

- (1) *The proposed demolition of the single storey building and replacement dwelling houses by virtue of their height, bulk, mass and detailed design would result in harm to the group of buildings which make a positive contribution to the Conservation Area, and harm the setting, character and appearance of the Conservation Area...*
- (2) *The proposed dwellings due to their height, bulk, mass and location would result in a harmful sense of enclosure and overbearing to adjoining residential occupiers on Goldsmith Court...*
- (3) *The proposed dwellings would result in direct overlooking of habitable room windows on Goldsmith Court thereby harming the privacy of adjoining occupiers...*
- (4) *The proposed dwellings would fail to provide four fully enclosed, secure and step free cycle parking spaces thereby failing to encourage cycling as a sustainable and efficient mode of transport...*
- (5) *The proposed development would fail to provide an acceptable standard of accessibility for wheelchair users...*

(6) The proposed development, in the absence of a legal agreement securing car-free housing, would be likely to contribute unacceptably to parking stress and congestion in the surrounding area...

- 6.5. It should also be noted that whilst it did not form a separate reason for refusal, the principle of the basement excavation works was also found to be objectionable as the submitted basement impact assessment (BIA) was not subject to an independent audit. The Council was therefore not confident that the development would have remained in accordance with policy DP27. In light of the previous determination as well as emerging policies regarding basement development, the client should be made aware that the lack of an independent audit of a submitted BIA would form a reason for refusal in any future submission unless a third party audit was completed.
- 6.6. Following the above determination, any submitted scheme involving a similar form of development would need to be shown to have overcome the previous reasons for refusal if the Council were to support the development. An assessment of the scheme hereby submitted for pre-application advice against the Council's previous reasons for refusal will therefore be outlined below:

Outstanding points of objection:

Reason for refusal 1 – Design and conservation

- 6.7. Within the officer's report for the previous application, attention was drawn to the fact that the Council considered that, whilst not listed, the existing building is important in its own right and makes a significant contribution to the character and appearance of the Seven Dials Conservation Area (CA). This was particularly due to its commercial character, small scale and the detailed fine grain that is contributed in townscape terms. As was discussed on site, its interest and contribution to the CA is also derived from its low height (which maintains the highest contrast within the streetscene) as well as the gentle sense of enclosure that the front elevation and its shoulder forms upon the street (similar to that of a perimeter / side wall).
- 6.8. As was discussed on site, it is acknowledged that the scheme initially submitted for comment was of architectural merit and interest. Notwithstanding this, it is the view of planning and conservation officers that this scheme would fail to retain those features of interest of the existing building outlined above, and that the resulting mass and height would remain harmful to the group of buildings and wider CA. The scheme would not only result in the addition of a considerable amount of additional bulk at first / second floor levels, forming a greater impact upon the street, but would also fundamentally alter the character of the site from one of modest, low and fine grain quality to a building which would be much more prominent and would disconnect the group of low rise buildings.
- 6.9. Whilst the rationale behind the glazed opening was discussed in terms of its fragmentation of massing, without historic plans to demonstrate that an access way to the courtyard behind had at some stage been present in this location (which could be addressed via the submission of a full heritage report); this element is not considered appropriate as it would cause a punctuation and loss of uniformity within the group of buildings (nos. 4 -14). It was also noted that glazing of this scale would inevitably give rise to light spill during the evening as it would serve habitable spaces and the character of the existing low rise 'perimeter wall' would be drastically altered.

- 6.10. As such it was advised that the initially submitted scheme was not considered to have overcome to first reason for refusal for the previous application and would therefore be unlikely to be supported in a formal application.
- 6.11. Following the onsite meeting and discussion of the initially submitted scheme, a sketch of a second revised scheme was submitted in light of the above feedback. These sketches illustrate a scheme whereby the existing front elevation of the building is retained, with the addition of a number of openings with glazed brick infill as well as a single storey 'translucent glazed brick' extension which would be set back behind the 'shoulder' of the existing front elevation with a width of approximately two thirds of the building.
- 6.12. Whilst full comment cannot be given at this stage on the basis of two sketch drawings alone, it is the view of planning and conservation officers that this revised sketch is a marked improvement regarding certain factors in terms of design and conservation. The revised scheme would involve the retention of the existing front façade and the only increase in height/bulk would be recessed from the front shoulder and would be of a height which would correspond to the rest of the group. This revised scheme would also maintain, and possibly enhance the fine grain detailing of the site without the need for major intervention into the property's frontage. The proposed openings and doors within this elevation would remain in keeping with the industrial heritage of the site and surroundings and are found to be appropriate (subject to further detailing). This revised scheme appears to have addressed concerns relating to mass and bulk within the streetscene, the general openness of the street, views to the sky and the retention of contrast in heights.
- 6.13. Notwithstanding the above, comment cannot however be given at this stage regarding the details of materiality and its interface with the existing building without further details. Further details/samples regarding this matter would be crucial in the consideration of quality, character, and perceived bulk/scale from the street and such it is advised that careful consideration is paid to this element of the design. From the outline of details submitted in this regard, the design approach is considered to be much more sensitive to the context of the site than previously proposed and that the translucent glazed brick proposed could be appropriate in mitigating against the visual impact of the additional bulk and has the potential to be of very high quality. As aforementioned the success of the design would depend upon the fine detailing and materiality.
- 6.14. Overall it is considered that subject to further work, detailing and full justification, a variation of the submitted revised sketch may be considered to have addressed the first reason for refusal.

Reasons for refusal 2&3 – Residential amenities

- 6.15. Notwithstanding the above, even if a scheme were submitted which was considered to have addressed the first reason for refusal it would additionally need to demonstrate that those other issues raised had also been addressed and resolved. Reasons for refusal 2 and 3 objected to the previous scheme due to the impacts caused upon the residential occupiers of the opposite building at Goldsmith Court and the protection of the amenities of these, as well as all other neighbouring occupiers remains a key priority for the Council.
- 6.16. The initially submitted scheme would still include the addition of significant height, mass and bulk at the front of the site which would directly oppose residential units at first and second floor levels, separated by only the narrow width of the street (approx.6 - 6.5m). Without the submission of further justification, it is considered highly likely that this increase in height and bulk would remain harmful to the opposite neighbours in terms of outlook and the

formed sense of enclosure / visually overbearing impact to facing habitable room windows. The alignment of the proposed first floor window is also such that it would be highly likely to afford direct views into the habitable rooms opposite. This impact is illustrated by the perspective CGI given on page 08 of your design statement document. On this basis this scheme was not considered to have overcome reasons 2 or 3 of the previous decision and would therefore not be supported on this basis.

- 6.17. The submitted revised sketch scheme has reduced the additional height proposed, has pushed this additional mass away from the front elevation of the building and proposes a material which would appear more lightweight and would allow for greater light permeation. As aforementioned, it is not possible to comment in full based upon these sketches alone but it would appear that the likely impacts caused by this revised scheme would be much lower than that of the previous schemes. This is also true of the materiality of the proposed extension which, depending on the exact specification of the glazed brick, could ensure that no direct views across to habitable room windows are afforded whilst maintaining good levels of natural light. It should however be noted that if a terrace were proposed adjacent to the glazed brick extension (as illustrated on the second page of sketched plans), issues regarding privacy would be of particular concern. If it was not possible to screen a terrace at this level in a manner which did not result in a cluttered roof form or cause disruption to the streetscape then this element may be found objectionable.
- 6.18. It is recommended that further work is done to justify the development in these terms, including sections across the street indicating views from habitable room windows at first and second floors as well as a daylight / sunlight report and full details of the level of opacity to the proposed glazed bricks. Subject to adequate demonstration of these issues, the scheme may be found to have overcome reasons 2 and 3; however, at this stage this cannot be confirmed.

Reason for refusal 4 – Cycle parking

- 6.19. As outlined in the previous officer's report, the Council expects cycle parking at new developments to be provided in accordance with the standards set out in the London Plan. For 2 bedroom residential units this requires the provision of 2 spaces per unit, which gives a requirement for 4 spaces for this development. The failure to provide cycle parking previously formed a reason for refusal of the previous planning application at this site (2016/1445/P) and options for providing cycle parking in accordance with the London Plan standards would therefore need to be fully explored.
- 6.20. At present, no cycle parking is shown on the submitted plans for either scheme. There are cycle stands located outside the site on the pedestrianised section of Stukeley Street which could be used by residents of the proposed development should planning permission be granted. However, whilst reference is made to these on the submitted plans there is no supporting text to justify why cycle parking has not been included in the design of the flats. As such the development would still be considered contrary to Policy on this basis. It is therefore recommended that this is either rectified, or fully justified in supporting documents before a full planning application is submitted.

Reason for refusal 5 – Wheelchair accessibility

- 6.21. Reason for refusal 5 for the previous determination found that the scheme was contrary to the Council's policy DP6 (Lifetimes homes and wheelchair homes) due to a failure to provide an acceptable standard of accessibility for wheelchair users.

- 6.22. Were the proposal to include the full demolition of the existing property and the erection of new a building hosting 2x residential units, this requirement would remain and it would be expected that the units were designed to a minimum level of accessibility in accordance with Building Regulation Approved Document M M4(2). If this was not possible due to site constraints, then full justification would be expected within supporting documents. Without relevant justification the Council would retain its objection if this standard was not to be met.
- 6.23. If the scheme were to proposed the retention and extension/conversion of the existing building (as indicated on the second revised scheme revised), the proposals would not be expected to meet the standards set out in Approved Document M M4(2) or M4(3) due to site constraints. In this instance the scheme would however be expected to meet minimum requirements set out in Approved Document M M4(1) (Visitable dwellings).
- 6.24. Detailed floorplans have not been submitted for the second revised scheme but it should be noted that the scheme initially submitted for advice would not meet the criteria of M4(1) due to some of the door widths not meeting the criteria set out in table 1.1 of this document (pg.8). The floor plan would also not include a ground floor WC with an outward opening door and 750mm in front of the WC pan in order to avoid impeding access.
- 6.25. It is therefore recommended that further work is completed with regard to this design consideration of the scheme and that any subsequent formal application is accompanied by a full justification of the proposed scheme in this regard. A copy of the relevant Approved Document can be found [here](#).

Reason for refusal 6 – Transport Issues

- 6.26. The final reason for refusal for the previous application was in relation to the expected level of impact caused upon parking stress and traffic congestion in the surrounding area.
- 6.27. The site has a PTAL score of 6b, the highest achievable, which indicates that it has an excellent level of accessibility by public transport. In line with Development Policy DP18 and Policy T2 of the emerging Local Plan, both residential units should be designated as being car free (i.e. the future occupants will be unable to obtain on-street parking permits from the Council). This arrangement would be secured by means of a Section 106 Agreement.
- 6.28. It should also be noted that, although not included as a reason for refusal in the previous application, the Council would also be likely to require a Construction Management Plan to also be secured via s106 agreement in order to support the proposals.
- 6.29. The Council's primary concern regarding construction impacts is in relation to public safety but it would also be necessary to ensure that construction traffic does not create (or add to existing) traffic congestion in the local area. Construction access to the site is likely to be difficult given that it is located on a pedestrianised section of street. Construction traffic flows to and from the site are likely to be fairly low; however, due to the amount of demolition, basement excavation and construction and the sensitive nature of the local streets, the proposed development has the potential to be highly disruptive.
- 6.30. The proposal is also likely to lead to a variety of amenity issues for local people (e.g. noise, vibration, air quality, temporary loss of parking, etc.) unless the construction is properly managed. The Council needs to ensure that the development can be implemented without being detrimental to amenity or the safe and efficient operation of the highway network in the local area. It is therefore advised that is it highly likely that a CMP we additionally need to be secured as a Section 106 planning obligation if planning permission is granted.

- 6.31. Subsequently, it is recommended that a draft CMP is submitted alongside any formal application for the site. The Council has a CMP pro-forma which must be used once a Principal Contractor has been appointed. The CMP, in the form of the pro-forma, would need to be approved by the Council prior to any works commencing on site. A CMP Implementation Support Contribution of £1,140 would also need to be secured as a Section 106 planning obligation if planning permission is granted. The CMP pro-forma and an advice note providing further information on this financial contribution are available on the Council's website [here](#).
- 6.32. As the proposed excavation works would be immediately adjacent to the public footway, the Council would also require the submission of an Approval In Principle report as well as Highways and Public Realm Improvements contribution in order to ensure that ensure the stability and condition of the public highway adjacent to the site is not compromised by the proposed development. Both of these transport obligations would need to be secured as part of a Section 106 legal agreement.

Other comments

- 6.33. The above comments have been based upon the previous reasons for refusal. As outlined in para.6.2 above, the Council did not previously take issue with the proposed development in terms of the standard of residential accommodation and proposed unit mix. Notwithstanding the above comments, any formal submission would need to demonstrate that any revised scheme was still compliant with minimum standards of accommodation in line with national standards. The submission of a revised light report to demonstrate that any habitable rooms at ground/lower ground floor levels were to still benefit from acceptable levels of natural light would also be recommended.
- 6.34. It should also be noted that the comments given above regarding the second revised scheme have not included an assessment of the proposed unit mix for this scheme. As the proposed additional massing has been significantly reduced in this scheme it is noted that this may cause a knock-on effect for the resulting gross internal floor areas provided. In this case attention should be paid to the impact that this might cause to the size of units provided. It is advised that whilst the dwelling priority table outlined in DP5 defines 2bed market units as being of 'very high' priority; 1 bedroom units are of 'lower' priority. If the second revised scheme were to proposed 2x 1 bedroom units, the public benefit derived from the development in terms of unit provision would thus be lower. If the resulting scheme were to result in an extension of the dwelling alone, then the public benefit derived from the scheme would be negligible. Consideration of the above should be given in the formation of any subsequent application.
- 6.35. As outlined in para.6.5, it is also advised that a BIA report with audit instruction form (sections B and D completed) would be a validation requirement of any subsequent application involving excavation works to the site.
- 6.36. It is also noted that the site is located within an archeologically priority area. As basement excavation works are proposed, you are advised to contact the Greater London Archaeology Advisory Service (GLAAS) to discuss the proposals further with view to ascertaining whether a desk based assessment should be undertaken and when. The Council would consult with this group as part of the consultation however it would be beneficial to engage with this group at an earlier stage so that, if necessary, an Archaeological Assessment can be submitted alongside the application. Contact details for GLAAS are as follows:

Email: glaas@HistoricEngland.org.uk

Address:
 Historic England
 1 Waterhouse Square
 138-142 Holborn
 LONDON
 EC1N 2ST

7. Conclusion

- 7.1. Overall the scheme submitted for initial comment was found to remain contrary to the Council's policies and would not have been considered to have overcome the previous reasons for refusal (in particular reasons 1 – 3).
- 7.2. The revised sketched scheme submitted following discussions is considered to represent a marked improvement to previous proposals and it is the view of officer's that there is greater scope for support with this scheme. This is however subject to the provision of a considerable amount of more details and justification in relation to all points discussed above. Further pre-application advice regarding this scheme would thus be recommended.

8. Planning obligations

- 8.1. As outlined in the assessment section of the report, were a subsequent application received which was considered to have addressed all previously reasons for refusal and was broadly supported by the Council, it would be expected that the following planning obligations would be necessary:
- Both residential units to be secured as Car Free;
 - Construction Management Plan;
 - CMP Implementation Support Contribution (estimated at £1,140);
 - Approval in Principle Contribution (estimated at £1,800); and
 - Highway works (footway repaving adjacent to the site) ()

9. Planning application information

- 9.1. If you submit a planning 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 permission]
 - 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'
 - Elevation drawings at a scale of 1:50 labelled 'existing' and 'proposed'
 - Section drawings at a scale of 1:50 labelled 'existing' and 'proposed'
 - Demolition plans demonstrating extent of works
 - Design and access statement
 - Archaeological Assessment
 - Basement Impact Assessment
 - Draft Construction Management Plan
 - Sample photographs/manufacturer details of proposed glazed brick
 - Please see [supporting information for planning applications](#) for more information.

- 9.2. 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 and, advertise in a local newspaper. The Council must allow 21 days from the consultation start date for responses to be received.
- 9.3. Dependant on the scale of demolition proposed, it is likely that that a proposal of this size would be determined under delegated powers, however, if more than 3 objections from neighbours or an objection from a local amenity group is received the application will be referred to the Members Briefing Panel should it be recommended for approval by officers. For more details click [here](#).
- 9.4. If the scheme were to involve 'substantial demolition' then, as the application property is situated with a conservation area and is designated as a positive contributor, the application would need to be determined at the Planning Committee. This process of making a decision involves an area team manager and a Development Control Service Manager (on behalf of the Director for Culture and Environment) reviewing the report produced by the planning officer (recommending whether permission should be granted or refused). The report is then considered at a public meeting of the Development Control Committee. These meetings are held every three weeks.

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