

Date:
22.03.2021



PROJECT: 14- 19 TOTTENHAM MEWS

SCHEDULE OF RESPONSES TO COMMENTS RECEIVED

The following table outlines our response by theme to the comments received by Planning Direct on behalf of the Owners of Tottenham Mews listed within the objection ¹

I.D	COMMENT	COMMENTS
1.	<p>Process I and II (page 6)</p> <p>The objectors believe it should be known that this webinar was not interactive and, unfortunately, did not provide any opportunity for the residents to ask responsive questions, make any comments or provide any input. The objectors feel, overall, that the applicants have been somewhat disingenuous as to the extent of consultation undertaken with the local community; and</p> <p>ii. The objectors are concerned that the impact of the Covid-19 Pandemic has not been taken into proper account when consulting the local community. Of particular concern, the objectors are aware of several properties with local businesses in close proximity of the application site. Nos. 7 and 8 Tottenham Mews¹ and no. 12, at the perpendicular end between 11/12 and the subject site, are all affected, but are “dark”, currently unoccupied, presumably as a result of the Covid Restrictions. As a result, it is highly unlikely that these owners or occupants will have been made aware of the major application currently under consideration on the plot directly adjacent to them. Bearing in mind the substantial impact of this site’s development (as currently proposed), the objectors consider that greater efforts should be made to find these owners and to offer them the opportunity to comment on the proposals.</p>	<p>Following the impact of the COVID-19 pandemic and the Government’s lockdown restrictions the nature of community consultation has evolved. The inability to hold face-to-face consultation events has meant that a digital first model of engagement is now the accepted industry practise. This has largely been seen as a success across the industry, local authorities and most communities.</p> <p>During the course of this application, the Applicant has held a full and open consultation with the community in which it operates.</p> <p>Engagement with the community began well in advance of the scheduled public consultation. This started in July 2020 which included a letter issued to 110 residents surrounding the Tottenham Mews site to introduce the project team, provide contact details and notify residents of the intention to demolish the existing building and the intended redevelopment. The letter (which was addressed and sent via the Royal Mail) encouraged residents to contact the project team should they have any queries, which a number did - their comments/questions were answered by email. Nos 7, 8 and 12 Tottenham Mews would have received this letter</p>

¹ NB: Not all the text in the objection has been copied into the table due to length but all responses by the consultant team have considered the full objection when responding to comments

Date:
22.03.2021



PROJECT: 14- 19 TOTTENHAM MEWS

SCHEDULE OF RESPONSES TO COMMENTS RECEIVED

	<p>Elected representatives and key stakeholders were also provided a copy of the letter and introduced to the project team.</p> <p>Following this there was continuous engagement and meetings with elected representatives and local stakeholders. This included digital briefings on initial principles as well as a site visit with local ward councillors.</p> <p>The launch of the consultation in October 2020 consisted of the delivery of 1,745 letters to the local community to notify them of the consultation website and encourage them to leave feedback and register for the scheduled webinar. Residents who did not have access to the internet were also provided with a telephone number to request hard copies and ensure they were able to contribute – there were no requests for this. Nos 7, 8 and 12 Tottenham Mews would have received this and would be the second time we contacted them directly.</p> <p>In addition to this, elected representatives and a number of key stakeholders were separately notified about the consultation launch and encouraged to promote the consultation to their networks.</p> <p>As part of the consultation the project team hosted a webinar where viewers were able to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Watch the project team present the proposals;• Ask questions or make comments throughout the presentation using the 'Question' function in Zoom;• Engage in a live Q&A session with the project team where viewers could submit questions and comments to the team during a moderated open discussion.
--	--

Date:
22.03.2021



PROJECT: 14- 19 TOTTENHAM MEWS

SCHEDULE OF RESPONSES TO COMMENTS RECEIVED

	<p>The ability to engage 'live' with the project team in this way was explained at the outset of the webinar. It was also clearly outlined in the consultation letter that was issued to local residents noting "As part of the consultation we will also be hosting a live webinar where you will be able to watch a presentation regarding the scheme and ask the project team any questions you may have." During the discussion 8 questions were asked by viewers and the project team responded to these - opportunities for follow up questions and comments were also provided. Towards the end of the webinar, viewers were encouraged to contact the project team should they wish to continue the conversation. A recording of the webinar was also made available on the consultation website after the event. Following this, the webinar received a further 141 views and there were a further three online surveys completed.</p> <p>In addition to this there were 278 visits to the consultation website. The consultation website included:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Details of the applications including exhibition boards;• Surveys to gather feedback;• A 'Contact' section for any further comments;• Proposed timeline;• Information about the project team; and• FAQs <p>The Applicant also took the decision to leave the consultation website live to ensure that the project team can still receive comments, respond to feedback and incorporate suggestions where possible. Following submission of the application there have been a further 175 visits the consultation website.</p>
--	---

Date:
22.03.2021



PROJECT: 14- 19 TOTTENHAM MEWS

SCHEDULE OF RESPONSES TO COMMENTS RECEIVED

	<p>Nos 7, 8 and 12 Tottenham Mews have had the opportunity from July 2020 to comment on the proposals and (with the consultation website still live today) continue to have the opportunity to contact the project team and discuss any comments they may have. In addition to the two letters sent to their address the proposals also featured in two Fitzrovia News articles (October and December 2020). Fitzrovia News is a free, community newspaper and the articles published on their website included clear links to the applicant's consultation website and the Council's own public consultation.</p> <p>A simple search of 'Tottenham Mews' using Google's news function provides the two aforementioned articles as the top results. The consultation page also appears on the first page of results when 'Tottenham Mews' is Googled. Any owners/occupiers who were not in the local area would have been able to find information on the proposals through Google and Fitzrovia News website with relative ease.</p> <p>Taking all this into account it is clearly not the case, as the objectors contend, that the impact of Covid-19 was not taken into proper consideration or that during the webinar residents were not provided the opportunity to ask any responsive questions, make any comments or provide any input. The above outlines the extensive steps the Applicant took to ensure there was a well-publicised and accessible digital exhibition for local residents, key stakeholders and elected representatives.</p>
--	--

Date:
22.03.2021



PROJECT: 14- 19 TOTTENHAM MEWS

SCHEDULE OF RESPONSES TO COMMENTS RECEIVED

<p>2. Principle of Use</p> <p>The developers suggest that the principle of the development proposed has already been confirmed by the council in pre-application meetings.</p> <p>However, current national planning guidance is clear that, “pre-application advice provided by the local planning authority cannot pre-empt the democratic decision-making process or a particular outcome, in the event that a formal planning application is made” (Paragraph: 011 Reference ID: 20-011-20140306).</p> <p>It is therefore considered that the principle of development is certainly not a “given” but must, instead, be carefully and thoroughly considered by both the applicants and the decision-maker, in the face and with the full knowledge of all concerned and affected parties. This does not appear, yet, to have occurred.</p> <p>The objectors consider this is firmly corroborated by the decision notice issued in respect of the recently approved application for the demolition of the on-site building. This notice explicitly provided the following:</p> <p>“It must be noted that the current proposals are for demolition purposes only, and not redevelopment for future uses. In the event that the site comes forward in due course for redevelopment, the proposed use(s) will be assessed against the relevant policy framework in place at the time, with this permission and the circumstances underpinning it being material considerations.”</p> <p>It is necessary to consider local policy C2 which is the relevant policy against which proposals entailing the loss of an existing community facility will be assessed. The relevant provision of this policy is that existing community facilities will be retained unless one of the following tests is met:</p> <p>i. A replacement facility of a similar nature is provided that meets the needs of the local population or its current, or intended, users;</p>	<p>The Applicant has not assumed that the principle of development is a “given” nor has the Council ever suggested that it consider it to be either. Nevertheless, the proposal is a mixed-use redevelopment of a brownfield site located in a highly accessible location by public transport in London and it is clearly supportable in policy terms. The existence of a prior permission reinforces this view.</p> <p>All services previously provided at 14-19 Tottenham Mews were relocated in their entirety to alternative accommodation on Kings Cross Road in 2012, and these services continue to be provided as follows, subject to organisational and structural changes which have occurred in the meantime:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Community Mental Health Teams – South Camden Services have subsequently been relocated to St Pancras Hospital South Wing, Camley Centre and Residence Building.• New 6 Bed Crisis House and Crisis Resolution Team – This was constructed in 2014 at St Pancras Hospital by refurbishing a former chapel/nursery building (Rivers Crisis House) South Camden Recovery Centre – This is provided at the Jules Thorn Day Centre, St Pancras Hospital.• Approved Mental Health Professional Duty Team – This is at St Pancras Hospital. <p>As such, it is considered that the proposed loss of D1 floorspace is acceptable in principle as it has been demonstrated that, in accordance with part ii of policy C2g, the existing premises are no longer required or viable in their existing use and there is no alternative community use capable of meeting the needs of the local area. The Applicant cannot fairly be penalised for procuring the</p>
---	---

Date:
22.03.2021



PROJECT: 14- 19 TOTTENHAM MEWS

SCHEDULE OF RESPONSES TO COMMENTS RECEIVED

<p>ii. The existing premises are no longer required or viable in their existing use and there is no alternative community use capable of meeting the needs of the local area. Where it has been demonstrated to the Council's satisfaction there is no reasonable</p> <p>Policy C2 is clear that, where there is no reasonable prospect of a community use (which has not been demonstrated here), the preferred alternative will be for the maximum viable amount of affordable housing.</p> <p>Whilst the application might appear at first glance to be an affordable housing scheme, the reality is very different, as set out below (further text 8&9)</p> <p>(Page 9) The objectors do not agree that any of these reasons stand up to scrutiny and would respond as follows:</p> <p>There is no dispute that offices are of strategic importance in this location. However, there is no risk that this would be undermined by the provision of a high-quality mixed commercial/residential scheme - of which there are many examples in the locality and central London areas. The scheme would still entail a net addition of commercial floorspace which would directly support the strategic importance of the area;</p> <p>Given the size and opportunities presented by the site, it is disputed that residential units would necessarily require to be single aspect;</p> <p>The housing requirement is for market housing in addition to affordable housing. Provision of the required minimum of market housing would greatly assist with the financial viability of the scheme overall; and</p> <p>The appropriateness of mixing commercial and residential units in this location is confirmed by the Local Plan, particularly policy H2 and its supporting text. The developers also present themselves as "one of London's most innovative office and mixed-use property regenerators and investors". Various examples are provided in</p>	<p>relocation of services well ahead of when a relocation was needed. In addition, in accordance with policy, it has been demonstrated that there is no reasonable prospect of a community use, and the preferred alternative route has therefore been provided which is the maximum viable amount of affordable housing.</p> <p>As to provision on site or off-site the Council has considered properly whether on-site provision is feasible and has reasonably concluded that it is not. In doing so it has followed the policy requirements to consider as a first preference on-site provision.</p> <p>The building is c. 41m long by 11m wide. With a core in the middle this would naturally lend the southern and northern end for dual aspect, with some single aspect apartments in the middle.</p>
---	---

Date:
22.03.2021



PROJECT: 14- 19 TOTTENHAM MEWS

SCHEDULE OF RESPONSES TO COMMENTS RECEIVED

	<p>the submitted Design & Access Statement of their successful mixed commercial/residential schemes</p> <p>In these respects, the application here objected cannot be assessed as though it were an affordable housing scheme, or its approval were “in the public interest”. On the contrary, in failing to meet the minimum housing requirements triggered by policy, the scheme is of overwhelming public disbenefit</p> <p>Returning to the “principle” of the application here objected, it is clear that there is an overriding conflict with local policy C2.</p>	<p>While two-core options have been explored to minimise the need for single aspect units, this would result in very inefficient floor layouts, and a larger number of windows/bedrooms facing west (Middlesex House), raising overlooking concerns and loss of daylight to these rooms. The existing core and staircase locations also limits the number and location of windows facing west.</p>
3.	<p>FVA (PAGE 12)</p> <p>The FVA appears to include the cost of demolition of the existing building. As discussed elsewhere in this document, this building already has extant permission for its demolition. As confirmed in the planning documents submitted by the applicants, the demolition is required to facilitate the development of an adjacent site. Its demolition cannot, therefore, form part of the current application or be included in its costs;</p> <p>The FVA goes to great lengths to justify the shortfall in affordable housing provision. However, it remains silent on the issue of market housing provision. The applicants have confirmed (see Affordable Housing Statement) that the scheme must provide a minimum of 3524 sqm of market housing. This could be provided on-site or off-site, on as many plots as necessary. No justification, financial or otherwise, has been provided for the lack of any inclusion of market housing; and</p>	<p>The presence of an extant consent for the demolition of the existing building does not mean it should be excluded as a reasonable development cost that would need to be incurred to bring forward the development. Given the policy link between them the development costs of the two sites should be considered in aggregate. This no different from other historic development costs that might have been occurred (e.g. buying in leases, tenant compensation or site surveys) prior to the submission of the application, but which are all considered reasonable and acceptable development costs. Please refer to RICS guidance note, Financial Viability in Planning (GN 94/2012).</p> <p>The viability assessment has demonstrated that the current provision of affordable housing is in excess of what the applications can viably support. These conclusions have been verified by the Council’s independent consultant. In this context, the introduction of market housing would have to come in one of three ways could 1)</p>

Date:
22.03.2021



PROJECT: 14- 19 TOTTENHAM MEWS

SCHEDULE OF RESPONSES TO COMMENTS RECEIVED

<p>iii. The lack of any consideration of market housing provision renders the FVA null and void. It is understood that the provision of 3524 sqm would materially assist with the financial viability of the scheme and should generate sufficient profits to enable provision of the full quantum of affordable housing floorspace. It is not understood why the required provision of market housing has been abandoned. It is certainly unjustifiable from a financial standpoint.</p>	<p>through the conversion of affordable homes off-site at Tottenham Mews to market homes, or 2) through additional height at Tottenham Mews or 3) through the conversion of office space on-site at Network Building to market residential.</p> <p>In relation to 1), the replacement of affordable homes with market homes would mean that the level of affordable housing would reduce further. The suggestion that market homes would increase the provision of affordable is clearly contradictory in this context. In context of the viability position the Applicant has opted to maximise the amount of affordable housing that they can provide, rather than market housing, given that there is an identified pressing public need for affordable housing,</p> <p>In relation to 2) market housing could be provided through additional storeys at Tottenham Mews, however, additional height is not considered appropriate in townscape or design terms and further understand that this would not be an acceptable option to objectors given other objections made in relation to the Tottenham Mews development.</p> <p>In relation to 3), the Applicant has carried out a thorough options testing exercise with the Council during the pre-application period where the provision of market housing was tested on-site at Network Building. This was tested in various forms (e.g. vertical arrangement, horizontal arrangement) however it was found to have a detrimental impact on the scheme as a whole, both qualitatively and quantitatively. The Network Building is located in one of the most valuable office locations in London, and the capitalised value of the office space is actually broadly similar to the value of market residential housing. However, it is not as simple as</p>
---	---

Date:
22.03.2021



PROJECT: 14- 19 TOTTENHAM MEWS

SCHEDULE OF RESPONSES TO COMMENTS RECEIVED

		<p>comparing end values. In the context of this development the inclusion of market housing would require an additional lift core and entrance, creating a less efficient building, which in turn reduces viability. As such, the provision of market housing would not necessarily assist in the viability of the scheme, and given the current viability context, would not “enable the provision of the full quantum of affordable housing”. In relation to this last statement, we note that no viability evidence is provided to support this claim.</p>
4.	<p>Commercial Floorspace (Page 13)</p> <p>The obligation is to provide both market and affordable housing. The obligation arises due to the considerable amount of additional commercial floorspace proposed to be added to the Network Building site.</p> <p>Accordingly, the objectors fail to understand the incentive or reasoning behind the applicants’ decisions to:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none">Provide far less than the minimum amount of housing floorspace required; ANDAdd further commercial floorspace at 14-19 Tottenham Mews. <p>The addition of further commercial floorspace on the Tottenham Mews site not only increases the overall amount of residential floorspace required by the scheme (see paragraph 3.55 of the Local Plan), it also materially increases the height and scale of the building required to be sited on this small and sensitively located plot.</p> <p>Removal of the affordable commercial floorspace would enable the building to be reduced in height by at least one storey. Alternatively, it could be replaced with</p>	<p>Whilst the replacement of the affordable workspace with the residential accommodation may reduce the height of the building, the quality of the residential accommodation within the northern end of the building would be compromised, due to;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Poor natural daylight into any accommodation within the lower ground floor.• Proximity of no.13 Tottenham Mews and the opportunity of windows within the N-E section of the building.• The ground floor of potential apartments facing north would be located directly opposite a commercial entrance at the Middlesex Annex Hospital site development <p>It is the Applicant’s view that the commercial workspace is the most appropriate land use in this instance. This has been confirmed by the Council during pre-application discussions.</p>

Date:
22.03.2021



PROJECT: 14- 19 TOTTENHAM MEWS

SCHEDULE OF RESPONSES TO COMMENTS RECEIVED

	<p>market housing which would, at least, bring the scheme slightly closer in line with the relevant local policies.</p> <p>The addition of further commercial floorspace on the Tottenham Mews site not only increases the overall amount of residential floorspace required by the scheme (see paragraph 3.55 of the Local Plan), it also materially increases the height and scale of the building required to be sited on this small and sensitively located plot.</p> <p>Removal of the affordable commercial floorspace would enable the building to be reduced in height by at least one storey. Alternatively, it could be replaced with market housing which would, at least, bring the scheme slightly closer in line with the relevant local policies.</p>	
5.	<p>Pages 15-17 (Impact on the locality)</p> <p>It is quite clear, therefore, that the application depends heavily upon the 2012 scheme, claiming this to set an agreed “baseline” from which the current scheme ought to be judged. The appropriateness of such an approach is emphatically disagreed by the objectors.</p> <p>The 2012 application proposed the provision of a community MHRC, this entailing substantial public benefits which would have weighed very heavily in the balancing exercise undertaken by the planning department.</p> <p>By contrast, the current scheme is entirely commercial in nature and its inherent public benefits are, therefore, considerably more limited. For this reason alone, it is simply not reasonable or possible to draw the comparisons between the two schemes which the developer attempts to draw. A public health building, approved in 2012, simply cannot provide the design/amenity “baseline” against which a residential building, comprising part of a commercial, for-profit scheme, in 2021 should reasonably be assessed.</p>	<p>The Application is not considered to ‘rely heavily’ on the 2012 consent but as with every planning application, the planning history of the site has been taken into account, referred to within the application, and should be a material consideration in the determination of any planning application. In addition, this assessment has been undertaken against new policy that was not in place at the time of the 2012 consent. The weight to be attached to that material consideration is a matter for the Council as decision-maker.</p> <p>As outlined within the planning statement, the building on the site (which has since been demolished) was vacant for over 6 years as the existing facilities within have been relocated elsewhere and the existing premises are no longer required or viable in their existing use. The most appropriate use for the site is therefore affordable</p>

Date:
22.03.2021



PROJECT: 14- 19 TOTTENHAM MEWS

SCHEDULE OF RESPONSES TO COMMENTS RECEIVED

		housing. Whilst the public benefits differ from the previous consent, we disagree with the Objectors that the public benefits are more limited. As set out in policy H1, the Council is seeking to exceed targets for additional homes, particularly self-contained homes which Camden consider to be a <i>“priority land-use of the Local Plan.”</i>
6.	<p>Page 21 -25 Comparison to existing consent</p> <p>As per the officer report, the building approved for the site in 2012 had a height of 16.3 metres excluding the rooftop plant enclosure. By reference to the below drawing extract, it is estimated that the total height of the building from pavement level, including plant enclosure, was approximately 18 metres:</p> <p>By reference to the above drawing extract, it can be seen that both nos. 10 and 11-12 Tottenham Mews reach total heights of approximately 12 metres.</p> <p>Accordingly, the main bulk of the building approved in 2012 (2012/4786/P) rose under 4 metres above its mews neighbours. It was also articulated such that the storey rising above its mews neighbours appeared reasonably well set-in (approx. 2 metres) from the front elevation.</p> <p>The other elements on its roof were sufficiently modest and well set-back that their practical impact on Tottenham Mews, and the buildings there located, was negligible.</p> <p>Such an assessment appears to have been agreed by the council in the context of their officer’s report on the 2012 scheme. For example, paragraph 6.3.9 of the report finds that, “due to the typically narrow nature of the mews the setback attic storey will not have significant presence from street level in front of the building.”</p>	<p>The proposed building keeps within the existing building line and is set back significantly when compared with the 2012 scheme, on which the facade facing Tottenham Mews was 1.3m closer to the existing buildings opposite. The distance in comparison between the 2012 scheme and our proposals is 8m vs 9.3m, (c. 14% greater).</p> <p>The 4th floor set back is 700mm from the primary building facade line. The setback very close (c. 0.1m difference), to the 3rd floor of the 2012 scheme as shown on the diagram below. The proposed 4th floor takes the shoulder height from its neighbouring buildings.</p> <p>The 5th (top) floor of our proposals is set back is a further 1.3m, which minimises the impact it has from street level views. Reduction on the 5th floor facade line would compromise the area of the top floor apartments, resulting in rooms that do not meet with the minimum required dimensions.</p> <p>In contrast, at the Camden Design Review Panel review, a member suggested we widen the 5th floor to create more generous</p>

Date:
22.03.2021



PROJECT: 14- 19 TOTTENHAM MEWS

SCHEDULE OF RESPONSES TO COMMENTS RECEIVED

	<p>Whereas the 2012 building stepped back notably as it overtook the height of its neighbours (by approx. 2 metres), the current building only sets itself back by approximately 0.75 metres at this same point, a material difference.</p> <p>The current building also proposes an additional storey over and above that secured by the 2012 scheme. Whilst this additional storey is set in from the storey below, the set- back is minor at just over 1 metre.</p> <p>Not only is the current scheme materially taller, overall, than the scheme approved in 2012, it also places considerably greater bulk both at roof height and at the frontage onto the mews.</p> <p>Furthermore, the additional storey achieves a total height of approximately 3.4 metres which is in excess of that achieved by any of the lower storeys forming the building (at approximately 3.1 metres each).</p> <p>As a result of both its mass and positioning, this additional storey does not read as a minor or incidental rooftop element and clearly forms, instead, part of the main bulk of the building. It is incomparable, in these respects, to those perceptibly modest rooftop</p> <p>The building currently proposed for the site does not make the same efforts to maintain this important contrast of scale. As indicated by the extract of drawing 303 inserted above, the currently proposed structure bears very little relation to its mews neighbours in terms of either its scale or its height. The massing of the building at its higher levels no longer steps back perceptibly towards the rear of the site as it did in 2012.</p>	<p>apartments. London Borough of Camden have not expressed concern on the overall height and massing of our proposals.</p> <p>Please refer to the section drawing at Appendix 1</p>
--	---	---

Date:
22.03.2021



PROJECT: 14- 19 TOTTENHAM MEWS

SCHEDULE OF RESPONSES TO COMMENTS RECEIVED

<p>7.</p>	<p>Heritage (Pages 26 - 29)</p> <p>This is a significant omission which indicates a firm conflict with Section 16 of the NPPF and Section 66(1) of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990.</p> <p>The main shortcomings of the Heritage Assessment are as follows: At Section 1.3 (Summary Assessment of Significance), the Heritage Assessment states, “Due to the enclosed nature of Tottenham Mews, the site is only visible in public views from within Tottenham Mews and partially from Bedford Passage to the rear. The site is not visible from, and therefore has no impact on, the setting of the majority of the nearby listed building</p> <p>Evidently, the applicants have concluded that, as the site is not visible from nearby listed buildings, it has nil potential to affect their settings and so no further consideration of this impact is required. This is wholly inappropriate, having regard to the below, adopted Planning Practice Guidance:</p> <p>“The extent and importance of setting is often expressed by reference to visual considerations. Although views of or from an asset will play an important part, the way in which we experience an asset in its setting is also influenced by other environmental factors such as noise, dust and vibration from other land uses in the vicinity, and by our understanding of the historic relationship between places. For example, buildings that are in close proximity but aren’t visible from each other may have a historic or aesthetic connection that amplifies the experience of the significance of each. The contribution that setting makes to the significance of the heritage asset does not depend on there being public rights of way or an ability to otherwise access or experience that setting. The contribution may vary over time” (Paragraph: 013 Reference ID: 18a-013-20190723 Revision date: 23 07 2019).</p>	<p>The quoted policy guidance in the PPG has been fully respected in the Heritage Assessment.</p> <p>This objection is based on either a misunderstanding or incomplete reading of the analysis that takes place in the Heritage Statement. It confuses (a) the assessment of the significance of the existing building and site, and the contribution this makes to surrounding heritage assets, in Sections 1.3 and 4 of the Heritage Statement with (b) the assessment of the impact of the proposals which is in section 5 of the report, with a views assessment in Section 6.</p> <p>The quote from Section 1.3 of the Heritage Statement comprises only part of a longer paragraph. The full paragraph reads as follows:</p> <p><i>Due to the enclosed nature of Tottenham Mews, the site is only visible in public views from within Tottenham Mews and partially from Bedford Passage to the rear. The site is not visible from, and therefore has no impact on, the setting of the majority of the nearby listed buildings but does have an impact on the wider setting of the BT Tower (Grade II) in views from Tottenham Mews looking north and northwest, and on the rear setting of the Grade II listed Former Strand Union Workhouse. In these views the current building at 14-19 Tottenham Mews detracts from the wider setting of the two listed buildings.</i></p> <p>The Heritage Statement addresses the impact of the proposals on the setting of nearby listed buildings in Sections 5 and 6 and concludes that the proposed building would not result in any harm to and would enhance the setting of the BT Tower (Grade II) and</p>
-----------	--	---

Date:
22.03.2021



PROJECT: 14- 19 TOTTENHAM MEWS

SCHEDULE OF RESPONSES TO COMMENTS RECEIVED

<p>As set out previously, the built composition or townscape of the CA makes a notable contribution to its heritage significance, with Tottenham Mews itself providing an excellent and rare visual representation of this special townscape.</p> <p>There can be no dispute that the proposed development of 14-19 Tottenham Mews would alter the affected townscape. In this manner, it also has the clear potential to affect the settings of nearby listed buildings which are, of course, very much informed by the quality and character of the host townscape.</p> <p>The applicants' evidently inappropriate conclusion that there is no need for any assessment of the impact on nearby listed buildings due to a lack of views betrays their lack of attention to, or understanding of, important historic environment policy/guidance and must be redressed</p>	<p>Former Strand Union Workhouse (Grade II). Due to the location and enclosed nature of the mews the proposed building would have no impact on the setting of other nearby listed buildings.</p> <p>The nearby listed buildings that are not visible in views from or towards the site are located on Charlotte Street to the east and Tottenham Street, Goodge Place and Cleveland Street to the south and southwest. They are marked on the Heritage Assets map included at the beginning of the Heritage Statement. This response assumes that the listed buildings the objection refers to are those set out above, however, the objection does not specify which listed buildings are considered to be impacted, what this impact (if any) is considered to be or whether there is any perceived harm.</p> <p>All of the listed buildings referred to above that are identified on the Heritage Assets map in the Heritage Statement are located some distance away from the site with the enclosed townscape of the mews and the location and height of Arthur Stanley House and the development on the east side of Tottenham Mews completely blocking any views east and south. These listed buildings are unlikely to be impacted by non-visual factors due to this distance. The proposed use of the site would not result in excessive noise, dust or vibration and any such impact resulting during the construction phase would be temporary and a common part of the experience of the conservation area which is located in inner city London.</p> <p>There is a significant relationship between the character of the mews and that of the terraced streets, the mews has a more utilitarian and light industrial character that is juxtaposed with the more spacious setting and gentile character of the terraced streets. The redevelopment of the site at 14-19 Tottenham Mews would</p>
--	--

Date:
22.03.2021



PROJECT: 14- 19 TOTTENHAM MEWS

SCHEDULE OF RESPONSES TO COMMENTS RECEIVED

	<p>have no impact on the settings of the terraced listed buildings, just as the current 1970s building on the site has no impact, because there is no direct visual relationship between the two. The overall character of the mews and its sense of enclosure would be preserved and thus the historic relationship between the narrow mews and the planned and separate character of the streets lined by terraced houses, some of which are listed, would be maintained.</p> <p>2. With reference to the claim that the Heritage Statement has inaccurately assessed the impact on the conservation area. The Heritage Statement notes that '[...] the site forms part of the wider setting of a number of listed buildings and the East Marylebone Conservation Area in the City of Westminster. However due to the enclosed nature of Tottenham Mews the site is only visible from within Tottenham Mews and partially from Bedford Passage to the rear and so has no impact on the setting of the conservation area or listed buildings.' The conservation area referred to here is not the Charlotte Street Conservation Area, in which the application site is located, but the East Marylebone Conservation Area and so the Heritage Statement is correct, there would be no impact on the setting of this nearby conservation area.</p> <p>Section 5 and Section 6 of the report concludes that the proposals would have an impact on the character and appearance of the Charlotte Street Conservation Area and concludes that 'the proposals would cause no harm to and would enhance the character and appearance of the Charlotte Street Conservation Area. Equally the wider setting of the Grade II listed BT Tower and Former Strand Union Workhouse would also be enhanced by the proposed development.' Others may disagree with this assessment but we stand by our judgement as experts in that regard. It is certainly not</p>
--	--

Date:
22.03.2021



PROJECT: 14- 19 TOTTENHAM MEWS

SCHEDULE OF RESPONSES TO COMMENTS RECEIVED

		<p>the case that we have omitted an assessment that should have been undertaken,</p> <p>3. The two-storey prefabricated building on the site dates from 1973 and replaced a taller building, a former metal foundry of three storeys. The objection notes that the proposal would be a considerable departure from the scale of the mews, however, the west side of Tottenham Mews includes Arthur Stanley House, of six storeys and currently under redevelopment, and adjacent to the site at 14-19 Tottenham Mews, Middlesex House which rises to five storeys. The proposed development of six storeys would therefore continue the scale of the townscape already in existence and reintroduce a sense of enclosure to the west side of the mews. The additional mass would be mitigated by setting back the fifth and sixth floor, with the four principal storeys reflecting the massing of the terraced buildings on the east side of the mews opposite, as set out in Sections 5 and 6 of the Heritage Statement.</p> <p>4. With reference to the height of the proposed building, as noted above the current 1973 building replaced a taller structure and the proposed height would be in keeping with the current character of the mews. The only clear view of the distinctive townscape is the view south to Tottenham Street, which would not be impacted by the development. This view and other conservation area views are assessed in Section 6 of the report. Equally, the view of the BT Tower is maintained, albeit the amount of the tower visible is reduced, however this is mitigated by the significant improvement in design of the proposed building, which concurrently would enhance the setting of the Grade II listed BT Tower.</p>
--	--	--

Date:
22.03.2021



PROJECT: 14- 19 TOTTENHAM MEWS

SCHEDULE OF RESPONSES TO COMMENTS RECEIVED

<p>8.</p>	<p>Quality of Development (pages 30 -36)</p> <p>There are also instances of upper floor dwellings having no access to any form of terrace, roof garden, winter garden, courtyard or balcony (see, for example, extract of drawing 104 below).</p> <p>Some units are provided with very modest Juliette balconies but, for the following reasons, these cannot seriously be considered to comprise private outdoor space:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">i. The balconies are not private but, instead, directly face onto the objectors' own residential properties located in very close proximity on the other side of the narrow mews;ii. The balconies are very small (with total depths no greater than 500mm), substantially below the 5sqm/1500mm minimums required by Standards 26 and 27 above; andiii. The very small size and position of these areas mean they are not of practical shape or utility and will not offer good amenity. <p>The evidently substandard provision of outdoor amenity space is further demonstrated by the below drawing extracts</p> <p>It is firmly refuted that the SPG at all indicates that support should be given to any housing scheme where "site constraints" render impossible the provision of private open space to over 91% of the total dwellings to be provided, as is the case here.</p> <p>Furthermore, it does not appear that any of the units which lack outdoor amenity space have, in fact, been provided with additional internal living space equivalent to the area of the private open space requirement. This finding is supported by the below drawing extracts:</p>	<p>Balconies, especially projecting balconies within mews streets is not a common sight. There are no visible large balconies in the existing buildings within Tottenham mews, and avoiding projecting balconies within this site follows those principles.</p> <p>The subject of balconies has been discussed extensively and tested in both architectural, and daylighting terms. The introduction of recessed balconies flush with the facade greatly compromises all affected apartments due to the large reduction on the internal daylighting. It is therefore proposed that the projecting Juliette balconies, which provide a sense of amenity, is a compromise between amenity and daylighting factors. All apartments affected have been accommodated with larger Living/Kitchen/Dining areas and are overall much larger than current housing standards require.</p> <p>The above was also highlighted to the members of the Design Review Panel, and as a result, their recommendation was to extend the Juliette balconies over the building line to allow for this additional amenity.</p> <p>Apartment layouts above ground level have been amended to accommodate larger Living/kitchen & Dining areas, and all apartments are larger than current housing standards require. The ground floor apartments have been reviewed with the access and disability consultants and with the proposed housing providers to their satisfaction.</p> <p>The above was also highlighted to the members of the Design Review Panel, and as a result, their recommendation was to extend</p>
-----------	---	---

Date:
22.03.2021



PROJECT: 14- 19 TOTTENHAM MEWS

SCHEDULE OF RESPONSES TO COMMENTS RECEIVED

		<p>the juliette balconies over the building line to allow for this additional amenity.</p> <p>Consultation on the proposed layouts have taken place during pre-application discussions with Origin and Newlon Registered providers. Both of them are supportive of the application and have confirmed that the proposed layouts are acceptable.</p> <p>Please refer to Appendix 2 for updated plans and accommodation schedule</p>
9.	<p>Page 37 – Open Space</p> <p>The application is not accompanied by any statement or document which would indicate that direct provision of open space has, as a minimum, been considered and appropriately investigated.</p> <p>Having regard to local policy A2, if the applicants do not consider that direct provision is achievable here then this should be appropriately explained and justified.</p> <p>In the event that direct provision cannot be achieved (and this is appropriately supported by the evidence), then the developers must be required to provide the relevant financial contribution.</p>	<p>All the information relevant to this is set out within the planning statement, the nature of the site does not lend itself to accommodate its own open space. It is surrounded by buildings and streets on all sides. Any rooftop open amenity space would require a core re-design, accommodating a firefighting core, which would in turn compromise all floor layouts and result in the reduction of residential accommodation, thereby reducing still further the number of affordable residential dwellings.</p>
10.	<p>Transport (Page 35)</p> <p>However, the exact location of the three parking bays on Tottenham Street has not been identified. Nor is it clear whether these parking bays are subject to use restrictions or would realistically be available for disabled residents of the site. Further information is evidently required.</p> <p>Furthermore, the scheme includes two units designed for disabled residents which have a cumulative capacity for 7 total occupants. In the event that the three disabled</p>	<p>The existing disabled spaces are located on the north side of Tottenham Street, immediately to the west of the junction with Tottenham Mews. These bays are for disabled use only with no restrictions on hours of usage. In addition, the guidance in <i>Camden Planning Guidance – Transport</i> (Jan 2021) identifies that Blue Badge / Green Badge holders are able to use parking spaces in Controlled Parking Zones without a parking permit. The disabled parking bays</p>

Date:
22.03.2021



PROJECT: 14- 19 TOTTENHAM MEWS

SCHEDULE OF RESPONSES TO COMMENTS RECEIVED

	<p>bays on Tottenham Street were fully occupied, it is not clear where the remaining disabled residents would be expected to park.</p> <p>This is a significant shortcoming of the scheme which warrants careful consideration</p>	<p>on Tottenham Street have been suspended for some time due to the construction of the adjacent Arthur Stanley House site, therefore it has not been possible to survey their existing usage. In the event that these bays are fully utilised, and LB Camden deem that further disabled parking is required, the Applicant is content to discuss whether further on-street disabled parking could be provided in close proximity to the development.</p> <p>Refer to Appendix 3 N01, SM for location of disabled bays.</p> <p>London Plan 2021 Policy T6.1 Part G requires the provision of disabled parking equating to a minimum of 3% of total unit numbers. For the proposed development of 23 residential units this generates a minimum requirement for up to 1 disabled parking space. There is a further requirement within the London Plan 2021 to demonstrate how disabled parking for a further 7% of total dwellings (or total WAH units) could be provided, thus a total of 2 spaces represents the policy maximum requirement for the 2 units designed for disabled resident use.</p>
11.	<p>Under croft Passage (Page 38)</p> <p>The objectors are also concerned that the undercroft passage proposed to link the Mews with Bedford Passage is likely to result in a material increase in the occurrence of crime and anti-social behaviour.</p> <p>Whilst the objectors are broadly supportive of the proposal to provide a pedestrian link here, it is considered that further consideration must be given to the design of this link.</p> <p>Indeed, it is the objectors' understanding that, although the council has promoted the provision of such a link for some time, it has previously adopted the stance that any</p>	<p>The 2012 proposals did include a covered passage with no direct open sky above it.</p> <p>The proposed under croft passage design ensures this link can be lit up during the evenings and overnight, to minimise anti-social behaviour.</p> <p>The plans in the submission removed the window cill facing the passage, and this has now also been amended in the sketch visual (refer to appendix 4 for the updated image).</p>

Date:
22.03.2021



PROJECT: 14- 19 TOTTENHAM MEWS

SCHEDULE OF RESPONSES TO COMMENTS RECEIVED

	such link should be open to the sky and that it would be essential that a clear line of sight were created between Tottenham Mews and Bedford Passage	
12.	<p>Daylight & Sunlight (Page 39 – 44)</p> <p>The applicants' submitted Daylight and Sunlight Report provides clear and incontrovertible evidence that levels of daylight to existing homes on the eastern side of the mews are substantially reduced by the proposed development. As such, the Panel's caveat is evidently not heeded.</p> <p>On the Panel's second point, the applicants' own Daylight and Sunlight Report makes it quite clear that the scheme would reduce levels of daylight to the objectors' properties far below what could reasonably be considered a "good" level.</p> <p>It is the objectors' firmly held stance, therefore, that - far from indicating the bulk and massing of the scheme to be acceptable - the Design Review Panel's response coupled with the subsequent daylight/sunlight investigations, provide a compelling reason for the application's refusal.</p> <p>Provided the new building rose no materially higher than nos. 10, and 11/12 Tottenham Mews (which stand at a not overly restrictive 12 metres), the objectors confirm that they would take no issue with BRE's Guidelines being applied flexibly, as is appropriate</p> <p>The submitted Daylight and Sunlight Report relies heavily upon the now expired 2012 permission secured on the site (2012/4786/P).</p>	

Date:
22.03.2021



PROJECT: 14- 19 TOTTENHAM MEWS

SCHEDULE OF RESPONSES TO COMMENTS RECEIVED

<p>This letter of objection has already explained the limited relevance of the 2012 application in some detail. Notwithstanding this, the following matters are of particular importance to the issue of daylight/sunlight impact:</p> <p>As correctly identified in the separate assessment provided by Right of Light Consulting Chartered Surveyors, one of the buildings now occupied by the objectors (11/12 Tottenham Mews) was not in residential use at the time of the 2012 application.</p> <p>It is worth noting, however, that nos. 11/12 did benefit at the time of the 2012 application from extant permission for their residential conversion.</p> <p>What is of greatest relevant, therefore, is the changed uses of those rooms most seriously affected (in terms of access to natural light) by the proposed development of the application site. At nos. 11/12, these are the rooms situated on the ground floor directly overlooking the mews.</p> <p>As confirmed by the officer's report on the 2012 application, "the windows on the Mews elevation at ground floor level do not serve habitable rooms, therefore there is no daylight requirement for these rooms."</p> <p>This is no longer the case. As confirmed by the applicants' own Daylight and Sunlight report, these worst affected windows now serve LKDs. The LKDs comprise those habitable rooms in the affected properties with the greatest requirement for natural light, meaning the substantial loss of light to these windows (as identified in the same report) would cause a very serious degree of harm to the living conditions of these dwellings.</p> <p>This is a level of harm which did not, as a matter of fact, arise from the 2012 scheme. Consequently, no weight at all should be given to the applicants' strained and disingenuous attempts to argue that "it would be difficult to distinguish between the Proposed Development and the 2012 consent in terms of sunlight</p>	<p>Please see response prepared by Point 2 issued to the Council on 26 January (and enclosed in Appendix 5)</p> <p>We do not believe this to be correct. The ground floor contained bedrooms on a quasi-mezzanine floor that are setback from the main glazing. The D/S report for the 2012 application did not assess these rooms on the basis they have little expectation for light given their heavily recessed position. See para 2.4 of the GVA D/S report (July 2012). We have assessed the ground floor bedrooms.</p> <p>We aren't aware of a change of use at the GF.</p> <p>There appears to be a misunderstanding of the configuration of the building and what was assessed in 2012. The LKD's are located at lower ground floor. These rooms were assessed in the 2012 D/S report (see para 2.4). The results in the same report confirm 56% reductions in VSC to the LKD windows.</p> <p>Therefore it is incorrect to say 'This is a level of harm which did not, as a matter of fact, arise from the 2012 scheme.</p>
--	--

Date:
22.03.2021



PROJECT: 14- 19 TOTTENHAM MEWS

SCHEDULE OF RESPONSES TO COMMENTS RECEIVED

<p>The submitted Daylight and Sunlight Report relies heavily upon the now expired 2012 permission secured on the site (2012/4786/P).</p> <p>This letter of objection has already explained the limited relevance of the 2012 application in some detail. Notwithstanding this, the following matters are of particular importance to the issue of daylight/sunlight impact:</p> <p>As correctly identified in the separate assessment provided by Right of Light Consulting Chartered Surveyors, one of the buildings now occupied by the objectors (11/12 Tottenham Mews) was not in residential use at the time of the 2012 application.</p> <p>It is worth noting, however, that nos. 11/12 did benefit at the time of the 2012 application from extant permission for their residential conversion.</p> <p>What is of greatest relevant, therefore, is the changed uses of those rooms most seriously affected (in terms of access to natural light) by the proposed development of the application site. At nos. 11/12, these are the rooms situated on the ground floor directly overlooking the mews.</p> <p>As confirmed by the officer's report on the 2012 application, "the windows on the Mews elevation at ground floor level do not serve habitable rooms, therefore there is no daylight requirement for these rooms."</p> <p>This is no longer the case. As confirmed by the applicants' own Daylight and Sunlight report, these worst affected windows now serve LKDs. The LKDs comprise those habitable rooms in the affected properties with the greatest requirement for natural light, meaning the substantial loss of light to these windows (as identified in the same report) would cause a very serious degree of harm to the living conditions of these dwellings.</p>	<p>The effects of the application scheme are compared to application scheme in p2 D/S report</p> <p>Please see response prepared by Point 2 issued to the Council on 26 January (and enclosed in Appendix 5)</p>
--	--

Date:
22.03.2021



PROJECT: 14- 19 TOTTENHAM MEWS

SCHEDULE OF RESPONSES TO COMMENTS RECEIVED

	<p>This is a level of harm which did not, as a matter of fact, arise from the 2012 scheme. Consequently, no weight at all should be given to the applicants' strained and disingenuous attempts to argue that "it would be difficult to distinguish between the Proposed Development and the 2012 consent in terms of sunlight"⁸</p> <p>Commercial units</p> <p>At paragraph 2.3, the Daylight and Sunlight Report submitted with the application states, "commercial properties and non-habitable rooms such as bathrooms and hallways have not been considered within this report."</p> <p>The applicants' failure to assess the loss of light to neighbouring commercial premises is considered to be at odds with the relevant BRE Guidance. In particular, paragraph 2.2.2 of the BRE Guidance states, "the guidelines may also be applied to any existing non-domestic building where the occupants have a reasonable expectation of daylight; this would normally include schools, hospitals, hotels and hostels, small workshops and some offices."</p> <p>No. 10 Tottenham Mews contains offices on the ground floor whose access to natural light is likely to be materially impacted by the development proposed. The lack of any investigation or assessment of the light impact on commercial occupants of the mews renders it impossible to establish whether or not this would be acceptable.</p> <p>No. 10 Tottenham Mews</p> <p>The residential occupants of no. 10 Tottenham Mews are also particularly concerned that their building's front elevation onto Tottenham Mews is the only aspect of their building which receives any natural light. The few small windows at its rear open onto a building "well" which is enclosed by the rear elevations of buildings on Charlotte Street. Accordingly, the substantial loss of light to no. 10's windows arising from the</p>	
--	--	--

Date:
22.03.2021



PROJECT: 14- 19 TOTTENHAM MEWS

SCHEDULE OF RESPONSES TO COMMENTS RECEIVED

	proposed development is immitigable and would cause material and unsupportable harm to its residential amenity	
--	--	--

Date:
22.03.2021



PROJECT: 14- 19 TOTTENHAM MEWS

SCHEDULE OF RESPONSES TO COMMENTS RECEIVED

Appendix 1 Sectional diagram illustrating the massing differences between our proposal, and the 2012 scheme outlined in red.

