

Public Document Pack  
LONDON BOROUGH OF CAMDEN  
PLANNING COMMITTEE  
THURSDAY 26<sup>TH</sup> OCTOBER 2017

**SUPPLEMENTARY AGENDA**

**ITEMS ON THE AGENDA**

**Item 7(2): Building H, Coal Drops Yard Lower Stable Street, Kings Cross Central, London N1C 4PW**

Supplementary information (**Pages 5-6**)

**Item 7(4): Stephenson House, 75 Hampstead Road, LONDON NW1 2PL**

Supplementary information (**Page 7**)

**Item 7(5): 52 - 53 Russell Square, LONDON, WC1B 4HP**

Supplementary information (**Page 8**)

**WRITTEN SUBMISSIONS**

**Item 7(7): 7 Daleham Mews, London, NW3 5DB**

A written submission has been received from Malcolm and Kathleen Moore, residents of Belsize Crescent (**Page 11**)

**Item 7(8): Railway Club, College Lane, London, NW5 1BJ**

A written submission has been received from Jim Beggs, local resident (**Pages 12-13**)

**DEPUTATION REQUESTS**

**Item 7(7): 7 Daleham Mews, London, NW3 5DB**

Deputation requests have been received from the following objectors to the application:

- Richard Fletcher, resident of Belsize Crescent (**Pages 17-18**)
- Chris Knight, resident of Belsize Crescent (**Pages 19-20**)

A deputation request in support of the application has been received from Cameron Hales on behalf of Simon Tart, applicant (**Page 21**)

Cheryl Hardman  
for the Borough Solicitor

Issued on Wednesday 25<sup>th</sup> October 2017

**Please note that any views expressed or statements made in the written submissions or deputation statements are personal to the maker of the representation and do not represent the views of the Council. The Committee will however take these representations into account to the extent that they are relevant to planning issues being considered at the meeting.**

# **SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION ON ITEMS ON THE AGENDA**



## Supplementary Information for Planning Committee

26 October 2017

---

Agenda Item: 2

Application Numbers: 2017/4639/P

Address: Building H, Coal Drops Yard Lower Stable Street, Kings Cross Central, London N1C 4PW

---

### 1.0 Amendments

- 1.1 The use class of the proposed public toilets has been changed from Sui Generis to ancillary A1, and the floorspace figure amended from 209m<sup>2</sup> to 92m<sup>2</sup>.

Land Use Details:			
	Use Class	Use Description	Floorspace (m)
Existing		Vacant Site	1,385 m <sup>2</sup>
Proposed		A1/A3 - Retail, Restaurants and Cafes	117 m <sup>2</sup>
		<b>Public Toilets (ancillary retail)</b>	<b>92 m<sup>2</sup></b>
		Granary Square Public Realm	1,385 m <sup>2</sup>
	<b>Total</b>		<b>1,594 m<sup>2</sup></b>

- 1.2 The development description has been amended to refer to the south-west corner of Granary Square rather than the Coal Drops Ramp.

*Reserved matters relating to Plot H for erection of single storey development (Class A1/A3) within **south-west corner of Granary Square** including provision of permanent public washrooms, installation of external public lift linking Granary Square with Lower Stable Street and revisions to Granary Square public realm as required by conditions 6, 9,10,12, 14, 16-22, 27, 28, 31, 33-36, 45, 46, 48, 51, 56, 60, 64-67 of outline planning permission reference 2004/2307/P granted 22/12/06 (subject to S106 agreement) for a comprehensive, phased, mixed-use development of former railway lands within the King's Cross Opportunity Area.*

1.3 On review, it is not considered feasible in this instance for bird and bat boxes to be accommodated within the Building H development given its location, design and predominant use of metal and glass for the external facades. Therefore, it is no longer considered necessary to impose this condition (below), particularly given the significant amount of bird and bat box provision that has been included within the majority of new buildings across the Kings Cross Central site.

**3. Prior to first occupation of the development a plan showing details of bird and bat box locations and types and indication of species to be accommodated shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. The boxes shall be installed in accordance with the approved plans prior to the occupation of the development and thereafter retained.**

**Reason: In order to secure appropriate features to conserve and enhance wildlife habitats and biodiversity measures within the development, in accordance with the requirements of the London Plan (2016) and Policies A3 and CC2 of the London Borough of Camden Local Plan 2017.**

**END**

## Supplementary Information for Planning Committee

26<sup>th</sup> October 2017

---

Agenda Item: 7(d)  
Application Numbers: 2017/3518/P  
Address: Stephenson House, 75 Hampstead Road, London NW1  
2PL

---

### 1.0 Clarification of Planning Obligations

#### Pedestrian, Cycling and Environmental Improvements

The last sentence of paragraph 12.19 of the officer report deleted and to be replaced with:

***'The financial contribution is being considered in further detail by the Council's Transport Officers and Engineering Service in combination with the highways contribution for repairs and tying in works specified in para 12.17 (above). A combined contribution is therefore subject to further consideration and the final figure will need to be negotiated and agreed by the applicant.'***

Under 'Heads of Terms' in para 23.1, 'Highways contribution (TBC) and 'Pedestrian, Cycling, Environmental, and Public Realm improvements - financial contribution of £350,165.06' deleted and replaced with:

***'Public Realm improvements and highways contribution – to be calculated and negotiated between the applicant and the Council's Highways and Engineering services'***

## Supplementary Information for Planning Committee

26<sup>th</sup> October 2017

---

Agenda Item: 5  
Application Number: 2017/2285/P  
Address: 52 - 53 Russell Square, LONDON, WC1B 4HP

---

### Proposed education use

#### **Additional paragraph following 6.33**

6.33.1 The school currently offers bursaries on a sliding scale of up to 93% of the school fees for students who meet the entry criteria. The strategic goal is to provide financial aid for 20% of the student body. 60 of the current 290 pupils are Camden residents (21%) and of the existing bursaries offered, 7 of these (12%) are given to Camden residents. If permission were granted for the school to expand, the intention is to maintain and increase the percentage of Camden residents on the roll.

### Amenity

#### **Paragraph 6.39 be amended to include reference to a condition limiting hours of operation. Amended text in italics.**

6.39 The proposed school would have a roll of 180 pupils aged 14-18 and 23 full time staff. The school would be open from 8.00am to 6.00pm, with a school day of 8.30am to 4.30pm, with no planned pre-school or after activities outside these hours. ***A condition will restrict opening hours to 7.30am to 6.30pm, allowing for additional half hour for setting up/clearing up.*** There are neighbouring residential uses at 54 Russell Square and 20 Bedford Place adjacent to the site and other residential uses nearby

### Conditions

The following condition shall be appended:

#### Condition 9

The use hereby approved shall not operate outside the hours of 07:30 hrs – 18:30 hrs Monday to Friday and at no times at weekends or public holidays.

Reason: To protect the amenity of adjoining occupiers on accordance it policy A1 of the London Borough of Camden Local Plan 2017.

**ENDS**



# **WRITTEN SUBMISSIONS**



To Evelyn Jones, planning officer, Camden Council.

We object to the planning application 2017/3743/P proposal for 7 Daleham Mews.

The rear elevation of No 7 Daleham Mews faces perpendicularly to the rear of 17a Belsize Crescent and is no more than 5 metres from the end of our garden and between 13 and 16 metres from our living and bedroom windows.

The proposed additional floor would add three more windows directly overlooking our garden, and living room and rear bedroom windows. The existing windows and terrace already overlook our flat and garden but are screened by foliage in our neighbours garden (No.19 Belsize Crescent). The extra three dormer windows of the proposed rear elevation would not be screened in any way and would have direct line of sight into our living room and rear bedroom.

We object to the proposed gross intrusion into the privacy of our garden and accommodation.

Further, the proposed alteration to the roof line at the rear elevation, as viewed from 17a Belsize crescent, would remove a considerable amount of sunlight from both our flat and garden during the important periods of spring and autumn.

The proposed new roofline would increase the angle of elevation of the roofline (measured from the foot of the rear wall of 17a Belsize Crescent) from the current 25 degrees to 33 degrees, and (considerably more measured from the middle of the garden). Referring to the UK Hydrographic Office Astronomical Information Sheet 58 one can see that after the alterations we would lose direct sunlight at about 2pm completely, from about 24 September until 28 March (currently from about 23 October to 27 February). As the sun takes about one and a half hours to traverse the roofline of 7 Daleham Mews we would lose about one and a half hours per day of sunshine for two more months of the year.

This would be a gross loss of amenity.

One last observation is that the proposed drawings show an improbably low second floor ceiling height and roof height. We suspect that the eventual build height would be higher than shown.

Please reject the application.

Yours sincerely,

Malcolm and Kathleen Moore.

17a Belsize Crescent (the garden flat)

London NW3 5QY

## Hardman, Cheryl

---

**From:** jim beggs [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** 23 October 2017 16:31  
**To:** PlanningCommittee  
**Subject:** Written Response to NOTIFICATION OF COMMITTEE DATE; email received 18 October 2017

**Follow Up Flag:** Follow up  
**Flag Status:** Flagged

### Railway Club College Lane London NW5 1BJ.

From Jim Beggs, 10 Little Green Street, NW5 1BL  
Street Representative

Dear Sirs,

This application continues to ring alarm bells concerning both content and processing.

#### Content.

1. The application results from a boundary error in the original application which included land on the East side, not in the ownership of the applicant as had been stated, nor had the owner of that land been consulted. The documents attached to the Notification Of Committee Date, contain a site plan repeating the same error on the east side, and a new discrepancy within the documents to the boundary on the north side.
2. Neither the original nor this latest revised application considered the dynamic traffic movement in Little Green Street (LGS), only that it was 'narrow'.
3. Land registry confirm that Little Green Street is a Cul-De-Sac, terminating against College Lane. This has now been expressed in the revised streetscape. We believe the land east of college Lane to the emergency gate and adjacent site entrance has been named 'Wiblin Mews' as noted on the recently amended street sign on No 1&2 LGS
4. No reference to a vehicular crossing of a pedestrian route is addressed in the revised documents describing traffic issues arising from access to the site.
5. Owing to the narrow footpath on the north side of LGS and the even narrower, dysfunctional, footpath on the south side, LGS acts as a shared surface by pedestrians and vehicles.
6. Additional residences on this site will only exacerbate the traffic situation and increase the risk to pedestrians, especially school children and the elderly, who still prefer to continue in the use of the carriageway.

#### Processing

1. The original boundary error was missed by the architect, the developer, his agent, and The London Borough of Camden. It is not the responsibility of surrounding residents to check, but this was the source of identifying the error, noted by the officers simply as being 'subsequently discovered'. Clearly, a failure by those involved, and whether unintentional or not, the cause of much time and cost to others.
2. The removal of the bollards on the north side of LGS (re-instatement awaited) removed without any consultation the needed visual enclosure to the only functioning but narrow footpath. Increased traffic from additional dwellings increases the risk to pedestrians
3. Apart from uncertainty over access areas and names, the Tarmac streetscape east of College Lane differs enormously from the developers 'slower' and more appropriate granite setts as he had illustrated, and which we expected. Again, the Tarmac was laid without any consultation and in the face of the stated objective that the route past the gate should not appear as a through route, which it now most certainly does.
4. The termination of LGS against College Lane has now been expressed in revised streetworks in line with the findings of Land Registry.
5. The original application stated that there should be no reversing in either direction in LGS. Since occupation has commenced, many instances of vehicles reversing in LGS have been witnessed and in some cases, registration number, date and time, have been recorded. Service vehicles accessing the Former British Rail Staff Club site, frequently mount the footpath at the junction with Highgate Road. LBC vehicles however, are normally accompanied by a banksman, whereas other service vehicles are not. It is not our duty to monitor this situation. Councillors have been notified.

6. The 'keep clear' road markings on the east side of the emergency access gate at the junction of Wiblin Mews and Ingestre Road have not been replaced, and vehicles are often left parked unattended in front of it, however residents have queried the need for these markings by way of eliminating 'clutter'.

#### Conclusion

These aspects of the current situation, as identified by the residents of LGS, should be reason enough to refuse any further development on the former British Rail site. We therefore fully support the Officer's Statement that, had they been able to determine the application within the specified timescale, their conclusion would have been **'TO REFUSE'**

That they were unable to do so, is another matter, and residents note the result has been an expensive, unrequested and time-consuming transfer of their duties to others at short notice - costs to be deducted from Council Tax?

Jim Beggs



# **DEPUTATION REQUESTS**





Our Ref FC/lc/Deputation  
24<sup>th</sup> October 2017



aragon LAND AND PLANNING LTD

London Borough of Camden  
Town Hall  
Judd Street London  
WC1H 9JE

The Old Coalhouse  
28a Rosamond Road  
Bedford  
Bedfordshire  
MK40 3SS

Dear Sir/Madam

t: [REDACTED]  
f: [REDACTED]  
e: [REDACTED]  
w: aragonland.co.uk

**Town & Country Planning Act 1990 as Amended  
7 Daleham Mews London NW3 5DB**

**DEPUTATION Letter Re Application Ref 2017/3743/P To be Presented to  
Committee by Richard Fletcher of 19A Belsize Crescent**

The applicant proposes to add 15% to an already substantial Mews house and in doing so would cause offensive, direct, intrusive and uninterrupted overlooking of gardens and living areas in the flats at the rear of Belsize Crescent, and an unacceptable loss of sunlight and daylight.

(Members will be aware that the report justifies the extension comparing to 5 Daleham Mews because this is an unlawful extension and cannot legitimise the scheme or concept. It would be perverse to rely on that extension).

The proposal would significantly breach Camden guidelines on residential amenity with respect to overlooking and rights to light and sunlight. The bulk and height of the building would provide intrusive and oppressive dominance from the rear. It would also upset the unique character and balance of the Belsize Mews area, a densely built area of interlocking sensitive structures.

**Overlooking**

CPG6 states that good practice is for windows to have a distance of 18m from habitable rooms that face directly into each other. In this instance the distance to 17 Belsize Crescent is 12m and to 19 Belsize Crescent, 10m. It is a matter of law that Camden must have regard to its own policies and advice; it not relevant whether the new overlooking is "new" or "perceived". By anyone's judgement overlooking from 12m and 10m is highly invasive, is a substantial breach to established planning policy, and should not be approved. [Note. 6.15 The 1m terrace was added unlawfully in the 1980's]

**Sunlight**

Amenity is also harmed as a result of the reduction in sunlight. In conjunction with the above policies the SPD - Camden Policy Guidance 6 is also a material consideration. . SPD - Camden Policy Guidance 6 defines how to access light and the 25<sup>o</sup> test. The prima facie data is as follows. The boundary wall of 7 Daleham Mews is 9m away from the rear of 19 Belsize Crescent. The wall rises 4m. If we



allow 3m for the first floor, and 3m for the proposal mansard, and assume 10m from the rear of Belsize Crescent it gives an angle of 45 degrees from the garden amenity area and the living spaces in 19 Belsize Crescent.

Mr Bowen of Urban Building Surveyors filed a letter as part of this application stating " my inspection and calculations also lead me to the view that there is likely to be an actionable right to light injury. Whilst this is not a planning matter in itself, a reduction in daylight sufficient to be actionable is further evidence of the loss of amenity that would be caused if the proposal were to be approved and proceed"

This Committee should not usher through a proposal when there is substantial prima-facie evidence that the sunlight guideline will be breached by a wide margin, particularly when the applicant has not filed a sunlight report to substantiate the application.

### **Conservation**

The extension is legitimised by *limited visibility*. (para 6.9). This simply not a cogent way of assessing or concluding as to whether proposals preserve or enhance the Conservation Area. The conclusion at para 6.11 is simply incorrect in law. The decision is one of enhancement or preservation, not one is harm caused. The report applies a lesser standard than the act (s72) and this is a fundamental error with the report. It is respectfully requested that planning permission is refused on the grounds of failure to preserve the conservation area and harm to residential amenity.

Mr Bowden also made the observation that "the application shows a 2m ceiling height in his roof extension. Whilst there is no longer a minimum set in the building regulations, this is very low, 2.1m normally being regarded as a minimum and 2.4m as reasonable". Hence once construction starts the height is likely to creep upwards having further light and conservation impacts.

It is noteworthy that the statutory consultee, The Belsize Conservation Area Advisory Committee rejected the proposal outright. "Object to all proposed changes to front and rear of this Mews cottage"

Taken together the close proximity of the proposal, its height, dominance, and overlooking will cumulatively be oppressive for this space and threaten my client's amenity and others to an unreasonable level. Quite reasonably the Committee should refuse this application.

Yours faithfully

[Redacted Signature]

Francis Caldwell

**BA (Hons) M.Phil MRTPI**

Objection.

## 7 DALEHAM MEWS

Loss of Amenity, loss of direct sunlight, overshadowing, overlooking of habitable rooms.

Loss of direct sunlight due to the increase in .25 height and the rear dormer edge moving some 2.8m to 3m closer Belsize Crescent. The report from Mr Bowen of Urban Building Surveyors is clear on this matter.

The report makes mention of 9 Belsize Park Mews which was correctly refused by Camden but was granted at appeal, what the report does not tell you is the main reason for granting the appeal was that Camden failed to support its main reason for its refusal Loss of Sunlight by not providing a Light Assessment. I live at 13 Belsize Crescent the property most blighted by this development and can assure you that during the winter months direct light to our amenity has been sadly reduced.

Overshadowing must follow the direct loss of sunlight.

Overlooking will additionally occur due to the change in levels the proposed dormer floor level being raised by 2.8m above the terrace floor level will provide uninterrupted views in the habitable rooms and rear gardens of Belsize Crescent, distance is also a major factor being 12m & 10m respectively from 19 & 17 Belsize Crescent, the proposed roof extension falls dramatically below the 18m guideline of CPG6.

There are a number of questions to be asked in this application.

The ceiling heights quoted on the drawings is 2m therefore falling short of the 2.14m recommended level, which in turn alters the overall height of the building.

Drawings are not to scale which is an omission from the report pack, the architect quotes on the Councils web drawings

“NOTE

1. THESE DRAWINGS ARE NOT TO BE SCALED
2. ALL DIMENSIONS AND LEVELS TO BE CHECKED ON SITE PRIOR TO SETTING OUT OR MANUFACTURE ANY DISCREPANCIES BETWEEN SITE DRAWINGS OR SPECIFICATION TO BE REPORTED TO THE ARCHITECT IMMEDIATELY “

The fact here is that this leaves application wide open for interpretation by the architects to adjust dimensions & angles as they see fit rendering accurate enforcement impossible if it were needed.

Existing roof drawing has no relevance to what is on site and again is open to interpretation.

This committee is being asked to approve a open ended and poorly prepared application an we would asked for it to be refused.

Thank you for reading this objection.

Christopher Knight  
13 Belsize Crescent  
London NW3 5QY

[REDACTED]

Tel [REDACTED]  
Mob [REDACTED]



## Hardman, Cheryl

---

**From:** Cameron Hales [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** 24 October 2017 18:52  
**To:** PlanningCommittee  
**Subject:** Planning Committee Thursday 26/10/2017

**Follow Up Flag:** Follow up  
**Flag Status:** Completed

Cheryl Hardman,

Dear Chery,

I understand that tomorrow is the deadline for objectees to register. On behalf of the applicant I wanted to email, enquiring whether any objectees have registered with regards to 7 Daleham Mews. If so I would like to reserve the right to respond and follow this email with a phone call tomorrow to confirm.

Kind Regards,

Cameron

Cameron Hales MArch Bsc (Hons)

Architectural Assistant

[ALEX TART ARCHITECTS](#)

[www.alexstartarchitects.com](http://www.alexstartarchitects.com)

T: [REDACTED]  
M: [REDACTED]

The Old Boathouse

1a Putney Embankment

Putney  
London  
SW15 1LB

This page is intentionally left blank