
Appellant's Statement of Case

100 Avenue Road, London, NW3 3HF

November 2021

Appellant's Statement of Case

100 Avenue Road, NW3 3HF



Contents

1.	Introduction	1
2.	Site and Surroundings	4
3.	Submitted Details	6
4.	Submitted Application Documents	7
5.	Agreed Matters	11
6.	Planning Considerations	12
7.	Conclusions	18

Appendices

- **Appendix 1** – GRID Architectural Statement, November 2021
- **Appendix 2** – Sample Photographs of the Visual Mock-Up (VMU) of Materials, available to view on-site
- **Appendix 3** – Secretary of State's Decision for Development of the Site, dated 18 February

1. Introduction

- 1.1. This Statement of Case has been prepared on behalf of Essential Living (Swiss Cottage) Ltd (the Appellant) in support of an Appeal following a decision by the London Borough of Camden as the Local Planning Authority (LPA) to refuse an application for approval of details secured by a planning condition.
- 1.2. The details related to a planning condition placed upon an approved development at 100 Avenue Road, London, NW3 3HF. Planning permission was granted on 18 February 2016 (Ref: 2014/1617/P) by the Secretary of State following an Appeal (Ref: APP/X5210/W/14/3001616) for the following development at 100 Avenue Road:

Demolition of the existing building and redevelopment with a 24 storey building and a part 7 part 5 storey building comprising a total of 184 residential units (class C3) and up to 1,041sqm of flexible retail/financial or professional or café/restaurant floorspace (classes A1/A2/A3) inclusive of part sui generis floorspace or potential new London Underground station access fronting Avenue Road and up to 1,350sqm for community use (Class D1) with associated works including enlargement of the existing basement level to contain disabled car parking spaces and cycle parking, landscaping and access improvements.

- 1.3. A suite of planning conditions were applied to this permission when it was granted. This Appeal specifically relates to **Condition 18** as follows:

Development works above ground (other than demolition) shall not take place until details of the following have been submitted to, and approved in writing by, the local planning authority:

- a) Material samples and detailed drawings (scale 1:10) for typical external materials;*
- b) 1:1 mock-up of typical elevation bay, including windows and cladding surrounds for either the north or south elevations of the tower building;*
- c) Detailed drawings (scale 1:10) of the structural grid, in terms of its proportions and thickness of elements and the technical detail of these elements;*
- d) Detailed technical drawings of all types of walls and external features (scale 1:10), showing in detail the interface and joints of all different materials and features;*
- e) Detailed drawings (scale 1:10) including typical sections at 1:10 of external windows and door frames; and*
- f) Material samples of typical balconies and roof terraces.*

The relevant part of the works shall not be carried out otherwise than in accordance with the details approved.

Appellant's Statement of Case

100 Avenue Road, NW3 3HF



- 1.4. The wording of Condition 18 as set out above reflects a Non-Material Amendment (NMA) (Ref: 2019/1405/P) that was granted in May 2019. This is discussed further in Section 2 below.
- 1.5. An application to discharge Condition 18 was submitted to the London Borough of Camden on 4 January 2021 (Ref: 2021/0022/P). It was confirmed that the application was valid from 4 January 2021 (as noted on the LPA's website).
- 1.6. Following a site meeting with LPA officers on 21 April 2021 to view the required visual mock-up (VMU) of the sample materials and subsequent written comments from officers issued on 20 May 2021, additional and updated information was issued to the LPA on 26 August 2021.
- 1.7. This update revised the proposed details, notably to provide a recess in the mortar on the brick panelling to address officer concerns in regard to 'flatness' in this element of the façade and a return to a glazed material for the rainscreen panels at the highest parts of the building.
- 1.8. The full range of updates is set out within the *Condition 18 Technical Response (August 2021)* document prepared by GRID Architects.
- 1.9. The application was formally determined based upon the updated information issued on 26 August 2021.
- 1.10. The application was subsequently refused by decision notice dated 5 October 2021 for the following single reason:

The proposed facing materials, visual mock-up bay and associated details, by reason of material quality, design and finish, would be unacceptably detrimental to the character and appearance of the site and the immediate and wider area in accordance with the requirements of policies D1 (Design) and D2 (Heritage) of the Camden Local Plan 2017.

- 1.11. This Statement of Case responds to the single reason for refusal and is set out under the following headings:
 - **Section 2** outlines the site and its context within the surrounding area;
 - **Section 3** provides an outline of the details that were submitted for approval;
 - **Section 4** sets out all submitted Application documents that are relevant to this Appeal;
 - **Section 5** sets out agreed matters;
 - **Section 6** examines the main planning considerations; and
 - **Section 7** draws our conclusions in respect of the proposals.

Appellant's Statement of Case

100 Avenue Road, NW3 3HF



- 1.12. A full assessment of the development proposal and the context in which it sits was set out within the suite of documents that formed parts of the Application, as listed in Section 4 below. These documents should be reviewed in full with this Statement providing a supplementary assessment.
- 1.13. A further architectural review and summary of previously prepared documentation has also been undertaken by GRID Architects and is included at **Appendix 1**.

2. Site and Surroundings

- 2.1. The Appeal site faces directly onto Avenue Road. Designated as the A41, at this location Avenue Road is a dual carriageway road. It is key arterial route into central London from the north western suburbs and beyond and offers direct route from the North Circular Road and the M1 in the north through to the West End to the south. It sits to the east of the large junction/gyratory formed by the meeting of Finchley Road, College Crescent, Eton Avenue and Avenue Road itself. Eton Avenue runs along the northern boundary of the site.
- 2.2. The site is within the identified Finchley Road and Swiss Cottage Town Centre. Its location on a main vehicular route into central London from the north means that has prominence in the immediate local area.
- 2.3. To the rear of the site is the Swiss Cottage Open Space, a publicly accessible area of landscaped open space and the Hampstead Theatre. Swiss Cottage Library and Leisure Centre are immediately to the south.
- 2.4. The site is also immediately adjacent to an access to Swiss Cottage London Underground station on Avenue Road. Given this and the range of local bus services on the adjacent road network, the site enjoys the highest Public Transport Accessibility Level (PTAL) rating of 6b.
- 2.5. The site is not itself located within a conservation area but there are several in close proximity. These include Belsize Park, Fitzjohn Netherhall, South Hampstead and Elsworthy Conservation Areas. Swiss Cottage Library is also a Grade II listed building.
- 2.6. The immediate location is dominated by the road network. However, beyond the gyratory itself the area is predominantly residential in character.
- 2.7. Prior to its demolition, the site had accommodated a six storey office building dating from the 1980s. That building was demolished as part of the implementation of the planning permission to which this Appeal relates. Planning history is further discussed below.
- 2.8. The site has a total area of just over 6,000 sq m.
- 2.9. The site is formally allocated for development by the LPA as part of the Site Allocations DPD that was adopted in 2013. This required development to optimise the site's potential to provide new housing, include food, drink and/or other town centre uses, respect the Swiss Cottage Open Space, contribute to public realm improvements and contribute to pedestrian safety / junction / town centre improvements.

Relevant Previous Planning History

- 2.10. Planning permission was granted on 18 February 2016 (Ref: 2014/1617/P) by the Secretary of State following an Appeal (Ref: APP/X5210/W/14/3001616) for the following development at 100 Avenue Road:

Demolition of the existing building and redevelopment with a 24 storey building and a part 7 part 5 storey building comprising a total of 184 residential units (class C3) and up to 1,041sqm of flexible retail/financial or professional or café/restaurant floorspace (classes A1/A2/A3) inclusive of part sui generis floorspace or potential new London Underground station access fronting Avenue Road and up to 1,350sqm for community use (Class D1) with associated works including enlargement of the existing basement level to contain disabled car parking spaces and cycle parking, landscaping and access improvements.

- 2.11. The planning permission was implemented in December 2017 through initial demolition on-site. This was confirmed by the LPA through the grant of a Certificate of Lawful Existing Use or Development (CLEUD) in February 2018 (Ref: 2017/6884/P).
- 2.12. Since then, following complete demolition of the previous buildings, on-site construction works have continued relating to the construction of the approved basement. At the time of writing, this is the point that construction has reached with substantive work on-site paused in the summer of 2020 due to a combination of rising costs, construction delays and the impact of the Covid-19 pandemic. The current situation is therefore a cleared site with a completed basement form now in situ including a ground floor slab above.

Non-Material Amendments

- 2.13. This implemented 2016 permission has subsequently been subject to two Non-Material Amendment (NMA) approvals, submitted and approved under S96a of the Town and Country Planning Act (as amended). Firstly, the wording of Condition 18 was amended (Ref: 2019/1405/P, granted 7th May 2019) and secondly some minor changes to internal layouts and external details were approved (Ref: 2018/4239/P, granted 4th August 2020).
- 2.14. The NMA granted in 2019 is specifically relevant to this case since this amended the wording of Condition 18 which is the subject of this Appeal.

3. Submitted Details

- 3.1. Condition 18 requires submission and approval of a range of technical drawings, sample materials and the full-scale visual mock-up (VMU) of a typical elevation bay. The suite of documents submitted have provided the necessary range of information and details, as set out in Section 4 below.
- 3.2. With regard to the overall requirements of this information, the elevational details can be split into three broad areas, namely:
- *The light coloured framing elements across all parts of the approved building, which has been proposed to be formed of Glass Reinforced Concrete (GRC);*
 - *The brick panels that sit between the framing elements on the elevations of the approved building; and*
 - *The balconies and rainscreens that are found across each elevation and also provide some detail at the uppermost part of the approved building.*
- 3.3. The submitted documents have reflected these overall parts of the proposals with documents being prepared by GRID Architects to address each of these items. This information is then read alongside the VMU that offers an overall context for the proposals and how each material forms a part of the overall appearance of the building.
- 3.4. Together, this information provides confirmation of the high quality materials intended to be used to finish all external elevations of this building to deliver the approved design intent for this building.

4. Submitted Application Documents

4.1. The following documents were cited on the LPA's decision notice:

- *1:10 detailed drawings with drawing schedule, prepared by GRID Architects (full drawing references are noted at paragraph 4.5 below);*
- *Condition 18 Technical Response (August 2021), prepared by GRID Architects; and*
- *Submission of Details: Façade Materials Heritage Assessment (June 2021), prepared by Turley.*

4.2. In addition, the following documents were submitted to the LPA but were not listed on the formal decision notice:

- *Appeal Decision Notice ref: 2014/1617/P, dated 18 February 2016;*
- *NMA Decision Notice, ref: 2019/1405/P, granted 7 May 2019 and ref: 2018/4239/P, granted 4 August 2020; and*
- *Covering Planning Note, prepared by Savills.*

4.3. The documents noted below were submitted as part of the original application pack in January 2021:

- *Design Overview Document (December 2020), prepared by GRID Architects;*
- *GRC Proposals Document (December 2020), prepared by GRID Architects;*
- *Brickwork Proposals Document (December 2020), prepared by GRID Architects; and*
- *Compliance with Amended Building Regulations Document (December 2020), prepared by GRID Architects.*

4.4. Parts of these documents were superseded by updated information in the *Condition 18 Technical Response (August 2021)* document that formed part of the formal amendment of the submission and as such these were not included in the list of documents on the LPA's decision notice. However these do continue to provide useful background information and context outside of those parts that have been superseded.

4.5. For completeness, following the formal revision made to the submission in response to comments from officers the full pack of drawings upon which the decision was determined are noted below:

Appellant's Statement of Case

100 Avenue Road, NW3 3HF



Drawing Reference	Drawing Title
01-ZZ-DR-A-21800 Rev P2	Discharge of Condition 18 - Detailed Drawings of Typical External Materials - Bay Study T01
01-ZZ-DR-A-21801 Rev P2	Discharge of Condition 18 - Detailed Drawings of Typical External Materials - T01 Details Page 1
01-ZZ-DR-A-21802 Rev P2	Discharge of Condition 18 - Detailed Drawings of Typical External Materials - T01 Details Page 2
01-ZZ-DR-A-21803 Rev P2	Discharge of Condition 18 - Detailed Drawings of Typical External Materials - Bay Study T02
01-ZZ-DR-A-21805 Rev P2	Discharge of Condition 18 - Detailed Drawings of Typical External Materials - T02 Details Page 1
01-ZZ-DR-A-21806 Rev P2	Discharge of Condition 18 - Detailed Drawings of Typical External Materials - T02 Details Page 2
01-ZZ-DR-A-21807 Rev P2	Discharge of Condition 18 - Detailed Drawings of Typical External Materials - Bay Study T03
01-ZZ-DR-A-21808 Rev P2	Discharge of Condition 18 - Detailed Drawings of Typical External Materials - T03 Details Page 1
01-ZZ-DR-A-21809 Rev P2	Discharge of Condition 18 - Detailed Drawings of Typical External Materials - T03 Details Page 2
01-ZZ-DR-A-21810 Rev P2	Discharge of Condition 18 - Detailed Drawings of Typical External Materials - Bay Study T04
01-ZZ-DR-A-21811 Rev P2	Discharge of Condition 18 - Detailed Drawings of Typical External Materials - T04 Details Page 1
01-ZZ-DR-A-21812 Rev P2	Discharge of Condition 18 - Detailed Drawings of Typical External Materials - Bay Study T05
01-ZZ-DR-A-21813 Rev P2	Discharge of Condition 18 - Detailed Drawings of Typical External Materials - T05 Details Page 1
01-ZZ-DR-A-21814 Rev P2	Discharge of Condition 18 - Detailed Drawings of Typical External Materials - T05 Details Page 2
01-ZZ-DR-A-21815 Rev P2	Discharge of Condition 18 - Detailed Drawings of Typical External Materials - T05 Details Page 3
01-ZZ-DR-A-21816 Rev P2	Discharge of Condition 18 - Detailed Drawings of Typical External Materials - Bay Study T06
01-ZZ-DR-A-21817 Rev P2	Discharge of Condition 18 - Detailed Drawings of Typical External Materials - T06 Details Page 1

Appellant's Statement of Case

100 Avenue Road, NW3 3HF



01-ZZ-DR-A-21818 Rev P2	Discharge of Condition 18 - Detailed Drawings of Typical External Materials - T06 Details Page 2
01-ZZ-DR-A-21819 Rev P2	Discharge of Condition 18 - Detailed Drawings of Typical External Materials - Bay Study T07
01-ZZ-DR-A-21820 Rev P3	Discharge of Condition 18 - Detailed Drawings of Typical External Materials - Bay Study T08
01-ZZ-DR-A-21821 Rev P2	Discharge of Condition 18 - Detailed Drawings of Typical External Materials - T08 Details Page 1
01-ZZ-DR-A-21822 Rev P2	Discharge of Condition 18 - Detailed Drawings of Typical External Materials - T08 Details Page 2
01-ZZ-DR-A-21823 Rev P2	Discharge of Condition 18 - Detailed Drawings of Typical External Materials - T08 Details Page 3
01-ZZ-DR-A-21824 Rev P2	Discharge of Condition 18 - Detailed Drawings of Typical External Materials - Bay Study T09
01-ZZ-DR-A-21825 Rev P2	Discharge of Condition 18 - Detailed Drawings of Typical External Materials - T09 Details Page 1
01-ZZ-DR-A-21850 Rev P2	Discharge of Condition 18 - Detailed Drawings of Typical External Materials - Bay Study LB01
01-ZZ-DR-A-21851 Rev P2	Discharge of Condition 18 - Detailed Drawings of Typical External Materials - LB01 Details Page 1
01-ZZ-DR-A-21852 Rev P2	Discharge of Condition 18 - Detailed Drawings of Typical External Materials - LB01 Details Page 2
01-ZZ-DR-A-21853 Rev P2	Discharge of Condition 18 - Detailed Drawings of Typical External Materials - Bay Study LB02
01-ZZ-DR-A-21854 Rev P2	Discharge of Condition 18 - Detailed Drawings of Typical External Materials - LB02 Details Page 1
01-ZZ-DR-A-21855 Rev P2	Discharge of Condition 18 - Detailed Drawings of Typical External Materials - LB02 Details Page 2
01-ZZ-DR-A-21856 Rev P2	Discharge of Condition 18 - Detailed Drawings of Typical External Materials - LB02 Details Page 3
01-ZZ-DR-A-21857 Rev P2	Discharge of Condition 18 - Detailed Drawings of Typical External Materials - Bay Study LB03
01-ZZ-DR-A-21858 Rev P2	Discharge of Condition 18 - Detailed Drawings of Typical External Materials - LB03 Details Page 1
01-ZZ-DR-A-21859 Rev P2	Discharge of Condition 18 - Detailed Drawings of Typical External Materials - LB03 Details Page 2

Appellant's Statement of Case

100 Avenue Road, NW3 3HF



01-ZZ-DR-A-21860 Rev P2	Discharge of Condition 18 - Detailed Drawings of Typical External Materials - LB03 Details Page 3
01-ZZ-DR-A-21861 Rev P2	Discharge of Condition 18 - Detailed Drawings of Typical External Materials - Bay Study LB04
01-ZZ-DR-A-21862 Rev P2	Discharge of Condition 18 - Detailed Drawings of Typical External Materials - LB04 Details Page 1
01-ZZ-DR-A-21863 Rev P2	Discharge of Condition 18 - Detailed Drawings of Typical External Materials - LB04 Details Page 2
01-ZZ-DR-A-21864 Rev P2	Discharge of Condition 18 - Detailed Drawings of Typical External Materials - Bay Study LB05
01-ZZ-DR-A-21865 Rev P2	Discharge of Condition 18 - Detailed Drawings of Typical External Materials - LB05 Details Page 1
01-ZZ-DR-A-21866 Rev P2	Discharge of Condition 18 - Detailed Drawings of Typical External Materials - LB05 Details Page 2
01-ZZ-DR-A-21867 Rev P2	Discharge of Condition 18 - Detailed Drawings of Typical External Materials - Bay Study LB06
01-ZZ-DR-A-21868 Rev P2	Discharge of Condition 18 - Detailed Drawings of Typical External Materials - LB06 Details Page 1
01-ZZ-DR-A-21869 Rev P2	Discharge of Condition 18 - Detailed Drawings of Typical External Materials - LB06 Details Page 2
01-ZZ-DR-A-21870 Rev P2	Discharge of Condition 18 - Detailed Drawings of Typical External Materials - Bay Study LB07
01-ZZ-DR-A-21871 Rev P2	Discharge of Condition 18 - Detailed Drawings of Typical External Materials - LB07 Details Page 1
01-ZZ-DR-A-21872 Rev P2	Discharge of Condition 18 - Detailed Drawings of Typical External Materials - LB07 Details Page 2

- 4.6. In addition to the submitted documents, a full scale Visual Mock-Up (VMU) of a typical elevation bay has been erected on the site and was viewed by LPA officers on 21 April 2021. This specifically addressed the requirements of part b) of Condition 18 and allows for the actual proposed materials to be viewed and assessed in context.
- 4.7. These reports, drawings and the VMU constitute the full pack upon which the application was determined. Some images of the VMU are provided at **Appendix 2** although it is strongly suggested that the Inspector should also view the VMU.

5. Agreed Matters

- 5.1. The content of the LPA officer's report is clear that the refusal was based solely upon concerns in regard to the proposed use of glass reinforced concrete (GRC) for the light coloured framing elements across all parts of the approved building, the detailing of some of the jointing between the panels that form this element of the building and the use of metal cills (even when painted to match) as part of the GRC facing.
- 5.2. It is clearly stated that all other elements of the proposed facing materials, as amended during the determination of the application, were considered to be acceptable and would not have been refused approval if the GRC for the framing element was considered to be acceptable.
- 5.3. Given that all of these items have been found to be acceptable it is not necessary to consider them in significant further detail within this document. Relevant background information is set out across the full package of documents submitted to discharge this condition.
- 5.4. The remainder of this Statement therefore predominantly addresses the proposed use of GRC and its detailing. This commentary is provided as an addendum to the wider application pack include the detailed assessments provided by both GRID Architects and Turley (with regard to heritage matters).

6. Planning Considerations

- 6.1. Section 38(6) of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 requires that any planning application must be determined in accordance with the Development Plan for the area, unless any material considerations (which includes the NPPF) indicate otherwise.
- 6.2. In this case the Development Plan comprises:
- *The London Plan (March 2021); and*
 - *The London Borough of Camden Local Plan (June 2017).*
- 6.3. The adoption of a new London Plan since this application for approval of details was submitted is not considered to have materially impacted upon the context in which these details should be assessed.
- 6.4. As referenced in the reason for refusal Local Plan Policy D1 on Design and D2 on Heritage are considered to be of greatest relevance to this case.
- 6.5. More specifically, part d) of Policy D1 requires that development '*comprises details and materials that are of high quality and complement the local character*'. Any assessment of proposed materials and detailing is made in this context; if high quality materials are proposed then this will address the requirements of the policy.
- 6.6. With regard to Policy D2, this aims to preserve and enhance the diverse range of heritage assets within the borough. Although the site is not within a Conservation Area, the approved development will be within the setting of those Conservation Areas, albeit it should be noted that in approving the main development for this site (a copy of the Secretary of State's decision dated 18 February 2016 is provided at **Appendix 3**) the appointed Inspector clearly stated (paragraph 262) that:
- "I do not consider that any part of the setting of the conservation area is important to its significance, character or appearance, apart from being a 'surrounding' urban environment. This is important, as the conservation area is an enclave within the urban environment, with its own particular character and appearance. I therefore do not consider that the appeal site makes any contribution to the significance of the conservation area apart from being part of the urban surroundings."*
- 6.7. In this context, the setting of the nearby Conservation Areas is of limited relevance to how the proposed development (and its materials) is assessed.
- 6.8. It is noted that the closer proximity of the Grade II listed Swiss Cottage Library means that its setting should be considered.
- 6.9. This is discussed in more detail below, in addition to the case that has already been set out in the original application documents. The assessment reflects the three main design elements, namely the framing to the buildings, the brick panels and then the balconies and rainscreens.

- 6.10. An architectural overview is also provided in the further note prepared by GRID Architects that is at **Appendix 1**.

Framing to the Buildings

- 6.11. It is acknowledged again that LPA officers and the Appellant's architects, GRID, have been in extensive correspondence and discussion with regard to the proposed materials since 2017 (this is summarised in a number of application documents prepared by GRID including at p.6 of the Design Overview Document, p.5 of the GRC Proposals Document and p.6 of Brickwork Proposals Document). It is also acknowledged that officers have been consistent in their advice that, in their view, the proposed use of GRC in this location and in the way proposed is inappropriate.
- 6.12. Whilst the Appellant acknowledges the views offered by LPA officers, it is not a view that is shared. This is based upon the detailed and ongoing advice provided by GRID as the development's architect. Having been appointed to lead on design matters through this project their understanding of the overall design intent of the architecture is second to none.
- 6.13. GRID's expert position is that the use of GRC for the frame of the building is the most appropriate material in the specific circumstances; this has driven the Appellant's approach throughout.

Principle of using GRC

- 6.14. In Section 2 of the LPA officer's report to support the formal reason for refusal, it is noted that in determining the original application to which Condition 18 relates the Secretary of State and appointed Inspector assessed the proposed development in the context of the frame of the building being completed in material variously referred to as stone, artificial stone or reconstituted stone.
- 6.15. Whilst a suggested palette of materials was offered as part of that application, the simple existence of Condition 18 which is now the subject of this appeal (and which it should be reiterated was reworded through a later non-material amendment) makes clear that the exact detail of the materials to be used was not finalised at the application stage and was instead made subject to further assessment through the discharge of a condition.
- 6.16. This was noted by the Inspector at paragraph 319 of his report as follows (emphasis added):

"The proposal has suggested materials and colours which would provide an attractive building. However, I accept that there should be an opportunity for materials to be considered prior to construction, which is appropriate to be controlled through condition and in my experience occurs on the majority of planning applications."

- 6.17. In the simplest terms, the Inspector is noting that the materials proposed had not been finalised at that stage. Suggestions had been made and an overall context in which the appearance of the building was found to be acceptable is an inherent part of the original planning permission being granted. But by including a condition to secure further details at a later point in time, in a process that is common to almost all planning permissions where final materials have not been confirmed at application, it is clear that the 'suggested' materials are not the final selection from which no deviation is possible.
- 6.18. In this context, the test therefore is not simply the specific material to be used but the quality of that material. This must form part of the consideration of the determination of Condition 18 together with the wider benefits of the material put forward; this cannot simply be dismissed as 'the wrong material' when the reasoning for the existence of Condition 18 is to consider the finer detail of how the building will appear.

Extensive Benefits of using GRC

- 6.19. A full justification for the use of GRC, in place of either a stone or reconstituted stone alternative, is set out within the application pack and should be read in full. But to briefly summarise the range of reasons:
- *GRC allows for the use of larger panels than is possible with stone or reconstituted stone. This reduces the number of joints found across the façade, a characteristic that the LPA have consistently pushed for;*
 - *GRC also does not require mastic joints between individual panels, unlike other stone alternatives. This further emphasises the quality and purity of the elevation with less opportunity for inconsistent weathering;*
 - *GRC can ensure sharp edges and distinct corners, amplifying the overall appearance of the building;*
 - *Colour and surface finish can be delivered to the same effect as a reconstituted stone would. As such, there is no difference in these characteristics but the benefits noted above can also be delivered in a way that alternative materials cannot achieve;*
 - *GRC also delivers considerable sustainability benefits, demonstrated to deliver a 31% reduction in embodied carbon output over the building's life cycle relative to equivalent use of reconstituted stone;*
 - *With regard to obtaining materials of appropriate quality, GRC results in significant savings in transport mileage compared to equivalent alternatives;*
 - *There is significantly less wastage of materials when using GRC compared to equivalent materials; and*
 - *The pre-fabricated nature of GRC allows panels to be craned into place and thus delivers health and safety benefits by reducing requirements for high level working.*

- 6.20. Whilst the overall appearance and quality of the selected material is clearly the primary driver for both the original imposition of Condition 18 and the subsequent assessment of the proposed material, the planning benefits of GRC clearly go even further than that specific matter.
- 6.21. An enhanced emphasis upon sustainability, reducing transport mileage and minimising wastage are all factors that are of increasing importance and should be taken into consideration when approving a material to face an approved building. Indeed, the greater emphasis that can and should be placed on these matters compared to when a material was first suggested is a reflect of the time that has passed since the original application was first made.
- 6.22. It is entirely appropriate that these matters are also taken into consideration in determining the suitability of a material alongside only a consideration of its physical appearance.
- 6.23. Whilst the information presented by GRID makes a clear case for the quality of the material, these additional benefits that can be delivered (and cannot be delivered to the same extent by other stone materials) should also be taken into consideration as part of the appropriateness of the material suggested.

Setting of Swiss Cottage Library

- 6.24. A full assessment of the status of the listed Swiss Cottage Library and the relationship between it and the proposed materials at the Appeal site is set out within the *Submission of Details: Façade Materials Heritage Assessment (June 2021)* document prepared by Turley and provided as a part of this submission. As such it is not proposed to rehearse the case set out there in full, but the following key points should be highlighted.
- 6.25. In determining the application, officers held a position that only the use of stone would be complementary to the Swiss Cottage Library. But as noted at paragraphs 4.11 and 4.12 of Turley's report:

"Put simply, the Library is not a Portland stone building but rather a result of the imaginative and striking use of concrete in different forms, over a Portland stone base. Visually, the pattern and vertical emphasis of the concrete fins and concrete spandrel panels are the prominent and characteristic feature of the listed building, cladding its double height foyer and library space. Where Portland stone has been used it signifies, and is appropriate to, the civic stature and use of the Library building.

In these terms, the choice of GRC is entirely appropriate to the special architectural interest of the listed building, drawing upon strong elements of its character, to further strengthen the relationship between it and the new building."

- 6.26. In short, the heritage value of a predominantly concrete building will be maintained where a similar material is used as part of a modern building that sits within its wider setting. There is no requirement for the use of stone when the heritage quality of the listed building is drawn from concrete materials instead.

Summary of GRC

- 6.27. To refer this assessment back to Local Plan Policies D1 and D2, the overall quality of the material for the framing elements has been amply demonstrated through the detailed assessment undertaken by GRID and is then reflected in the actual material samples forming part of the VMU.
- 6.28. It is a material that is appropriately coloured and textured, that is hard wearing and can be constructed in such a way that a more continuous appearance (due to significantly reduced number of joints between panels that are required compared to other similar materials) can be delivered. It is a durable and fit-for-purpose material that will ensure a high quality appearance to the building for many years.
- 6.29. Given the overall quality and appearance of the material, this will ensure that the building does not detract from views into or out of the nearby Conservation Areas. As previously noted above, this should also be considered in the determination of the previous Inspector's decision for the overall development of this site where he was clear that this site and its development (and by extension, details related to that development) makes no contribution to the setting of the nearby Conservation Areas. Details should therefore be considered on their own merits with regard to the overall appearance of the building.
- 6.30. With specific reference to the adjacent listed building, Swiss Cottage Library, that the material is indistinguishable from other stone or reconstituted stone materials that could otherwise be used means that the effect on setting is no different with the use of GRC. The Library is also predominantly a concrete building with natural stone limited to some ground floor detail; in this context, any suggestion that GRC is out-of-keeping is not appropriate.

Brick Panels (Agreed as Acceptable)

- 6.31. The range of colours, pattern, pointing and finish of the proposed brick panels reflect the continued design development undertaken by GRID Architects throughout the extended period of consideration given to this building. This includes ongoing and detailed discussions with LPA officers.
- 6.32. The overall appearance of the brick panels draws from the colour and pattern of other existing brick buildings in the immediate local area. In practice for delivering the panels, this approach includes a specific control on the mix of colours within the bricks and the pattern in which they are laid out. The fixed nature of this pattern means that significant groupings of a single colour will be avoided to ensure a controlled 'randomness' in all areas of the panels.
- 6.33. With reference again to Policies D1 and D2, it is clear that the proposed brick panels will deliver high quality in a manner that respects and responds to local context. These materials are therefore clearly appropriate in this context.

Appellant's Statement of Case

100 Avenue Road, NW3 3HF



Balustrades and Rainscreens (Agreed as Acceptable)

- 6.34. As noted within the LPA officer's report, it is acknowledged that preference was given to the light-coloured glass rainscreen as the final option. This is acceptable to the Appellant and the details submitted reflect this in the event of an approval being given.
- 6.35. Given the overall high quality of the proposed materials that is demonstrated through both the submitted documentation and the full-scale VMU available to view it is clear that the proposed materials are entirely appropriate and deliver the high quality design intent that is underpinned by Local Plan Policies D1 and D2.

7. Conclusions

- 7.1. The intent of Condition 18 is to secure the final range of specific materials that will together deliver the external appearance of the approved building at 100 Avenue Road. This is not a consideration of the principles of the appearance of the building overall but instead is focused upon the quality that is delivered by those materials and as such from the facades overall.
- 7.2. The materials proposed are the result of an extended assessment of options and opportunities undertaken by GRID Architects. Their extensive involvement in this building from inception to the present means that they are the clear leading experts in assessing not only the architectural quality of the selected materials but also how these feed into the overall buildability, sustainability and durability and appearance of the building over its lifetime.
- 7.3. The package of materials selected will deliver on all of these matters. The final proposed selections are the outcomes of an extended programme of testing options and opportunities; it is a reflection of a design-led process that also delivers the same high quality appearance to the building for the foreseeable future.
- 7.4. The package selected has taken account of local context and reflected these styles in the more contemporary building that is being constructed. These materials will ensure that the new building is rooted in its context but also meets all necessary modern standards and expectations.
- 7.5. The package of materials is therefore appropriate and the discharge of Condition 18 of planning permission ref: 2014/1617/P (as amended) should be approved.

Appellant's Statement of Case

100 Avenue Road, NW3 3HF



Appendices

Appellant's Statement of Case

100 Avenue Road, NW3 3HF



- **Appendix 1** – GRID Architectural Statement, November 2021

	<i>Condition 18 – Architectural Appeal Statement</i>
Project Name	100 Avenue Road, NW3 3HF
Project No / Reference	15050/admin/2-0/2-0 Misc
Date / Time / Venue	05 November 2021
Issued / By / Checked	05 November 2021 / LO / CV

1.0 Introduction

- 1.1 This statement has been prepared for the appeal against the refusal of the application to discharge Condition 18 of Planning Permission Ref: 2014/1617/P at 100 Avenue Road, London, NW3 3HF
- 1.2 This statement has been written by Laurence Osborn BA (Hons), DIP ARCH, ARB, RIBA. Laurence has 25 years architectural experience and is a founding Director of GRID Architects, an award-winning practice in London. GRID architects work predominantly in the London area on residential led projects of various scales and are known for their contextual design response to sites and briefs. Laurence has led the design on notable completed projects in natural stone and reconstituted stone in distinguished and sensitive locations that consist of Conservation Areas and settings of Listed Buildings.

These include the following:

- Belvedere Gardens on the Southbank opposite the Palace of Westminster and adjacent to County Hall
- 190 Strand, opposite the Grade I listed St Clement Danes Church by Sir Christopher Wren.
- Montrose Place, Belgravia (whilst at Hamilton Associates)

In addition, Laurence Osborn was responsible for the design of Vantage Point in Islington which was an RIBA award winner in 2017. He is a respected member of the architectural profession particularly in housing and is an expert advisor on the RIBA Housing Group and is a guest lecturer at Sheffield University Architecture School.

- 1.3 In preparing this statement, I have referenced the following documents.

- GRID Architects 'Design and Access Statement Document' dated February 2014.
- The Design Council's response to the application dated 1 May 2014.
- GLA's response to the application dated 24 April 2014.
- LBC Committee Report dated 3 October 2014.
- DCLG's Appeal Decision Dated 18 February 2016
- Savills 'Application to Discharge Conditions 18 (External Materials) of Planning Permission Ref: 2014/1617/P dated 4 January 2021.
- GRID architects 'C. 18 Submission GRC Proposals' dated 18 December 2020.
- GRID architects 'C. 18 Submission Brick Proposals' dated 18 December 2020.
- GRID architects Sketchbook 37 – Façade Material – Recon or Natural Stone, dated 16 June 2019.
- GRID architects 'Condition 18 Technical Response, dated August 2021'
- LBC Delegated Report and Decision Notice (Refusal) dated 5 October 2021.

- 1.4 The evidence which I have prepared and provide for this appeal is true and has been prepared and given in accordance with my professional institution and I confirm that the opinions expressed are my true and professional opinion.

2.0 GRC Frame

- 2.1 As highlighted on page 62 of the Design and Access Statement Document we outlined our intentions for the frame *'The frame has been developed as a stone or artificial stone assembly of vertical and horizontal members'*.

On page 65 of the Design and Access Statement we highlighted the need at the later design stages for design development to the 'white frame' where GRC has been proposed; *'The white frame is designed as 'stone' though the suitability of natural stone has not been tested. The repetitive and modular nature of the facade lends itself to unitisation or prefabrication and if natural stone is used it would be a veneered or composite panel.'*

We have diligently and comprehensively carried out this design development process to ascertain the best material and form of construction for the frame that balanced the following considerations:

- Aesthetics
- Material quality
- Sustainability
- Site logistics and constraints
- Construction methods

Costs were not a principal driver in the decision process. Page 8 of 'C. 18 Submission GRC Proposals' dated 18 December 2020 summarises our design intent for this element of the façade as part of the planning approval.

The submission of information to discharge Condition 18 of the planning approval is the conclusion of 3 years of research and design development involving two different main contractors and a variety of sub-contractors and suppliers. Throughout the process we have invited and shared our research and recommendations with the London Borough of Camden's Planning and Design Officers (LBC) via documents, mock-ups and site visits. The timeline for this process of consultation can be found on page 5 of the 'C. 18 Submission GRC Proposals' dated 18 December 2020.

The submittal is a conclusion of a journey we have been on that proposes a material and construction method that we believe is best suited for the location and which meets the aspirations for the building set out in the planning approval. Page 12 of 'C. 18 Submission GRC Proposals' dated 18 December 2020 outlines the criteria we continually assessed our design development and options against.

2.2 Construction Method

We reviewed two possible methods for constructing the façade of the buildings:

- Pre-cast concrete panels
- Unitised curtain walling with rainscreen panels

These are the only two methods of construction that could be considered for a building of this height and with such site restrictions (limited site area for storing materials).

Pre-cast panels could be either self-finished concrete (e.g., re-con) or be faced with natural stone.

A pre-cast concrete facade (due to its weight) would require a thicker and more substantial structural concrete frame to support it. At a time when lowering embodied carbon is becoming so critical in attempting to reduced climate change, we believed such extensive use of concrete which has high embodied carbon would be the wrong choice of construction method (refer to pages 18-21 of 'C. 18 Submission GRC Proposals' dated 18 December 2020 for further information).

Nevertheless, when exploring the feasibility of this option with the Design Team, due to the cantilever of the tower over the LUL assets, the weight of the panels on the structure would be too great. Therefore,

a pre-cast concrete façade is not feasible for this site and project (refer to pages 18-20 of 'C. 18 Submission GRC Proposals' dated 18 December 2020 for further information)

As a result, we concluded that a unitised curtain walled façade with rainscreen panels was the only way we would be able to construct this building. Therefore, our next body of research focused on materials that we could feasibly use for the 'frame'.

2.3 Initial Frame Material Considered

The collective experience of the design and construction teams on the project (which included contractors) concluded that the best way to deliver the aesthetic intention of the frame outlined in the planning approval was to construct it in Glass Reinforced Concrete (GRC).

GRC is often used successfully on buildings in part or completely where the appearance of stone is needed to be replicated but where other factors make stone impractical to use. GRC is also commonly used in combination with natural stone. From a distance the visual differences are imperceptible and up close its visual appearance can be made the same as reconstituted stone. Qualitatively GRC is not of lower quality than reconstituted stone and has the same texture. Its benefits are as follows:

- Significant reduction in embodied carbon in its production that natural stone.
- It does not utilise a non-renewable natural resource.
- It is lighter than stone and therefore can be 'lifted' onto the building with the unitised curtain walling panel rather than being hand laid from a mast climber or scaffold.
- As a result, it is a safer method of construction.
- As a result, it reduces construction time and disruption to the local community.
- It can be constructed in storey high sections as one piece and omits need for joints at the corners required to form the frame shapes (e.g., the chamfered piers).
- It is less absorbent than natural stone and therefore less prone to staining over time.
- It can be produced in a range of finishes to replicate Portland Stone and is often used as such.

This proposal was submitted to LBC as a prelude to submittal of Condition 18 to obtain some feedback. However, despite its benefits, the LBC responded as follows:

"Our fundamental objection to GRC, as explained before, is its apparent inertness/lifelessness."

We appreciate that there can be misconceptions regarding the quality of GRC based on projects where it was used in its infancy of invention. These issues have been eradicated and there are many architectural award-winning projects constructed with GRC. Some of these are in the London Borough of Camden such as the Tapestry in Kings Cross.

GRC is also being used in sensitive heritage areas such as 10 Broadway in the City of Westminster, which is near Parliament Square, a World Heritage site.

Therefore, we believed it to be a legitimate proposed material for 100 Avenue Road and expected LBC to understand its qualities rather than deem it 'inferior' or of 'lower quality'

2.4 Frame Materials Considered

Following LBC's lack of support for GRC two different materials were researched and considered for the frame, both of which are feasible as a rainscreen on a unitised curtain walled façade:

- Natural stone
- Reconstituted stone

We undertook extensive research and design development for each material with contractors and specialist suppliers to understand the following:

- Feasible panel/element size of the material
- How the material would be jointed within a panel and between panels

- How the chamfered angle in the pier detail could be achieved.
- How the material would affect the construction of the building
- The embodied carbon impact of the material
- Durability of the material and ongoing maintenance issues
- Whether the material matched the design intent of the planning approval

2.4 Natural Stone vs Recon Stone

Following our research on the two materials considered; natural stone and reconstituted stone (re-con hereafter) we produced Sketchbook 37 – Façade Material – Recon or Natural Stone, dated 16 June 2019.

The report included photographs of a 1m high mock-up of a chamfered pier that represented the most common but complex geometry of the implementation of the material to test the following:

- Material quality
- Quality of the corner joints
- Quality of the chamfered joint
- Quality of stone joints

The report includes a mark-up of a two-storey bay to the tower to highlight the following:

- The stone or recon sizes achievable in a two-storey pier and bay wide spandrel
- The size and type of joints (e.g., open or sealed) and their locations

The LBC inspected some initial mock-ups of the pier in both materials. They identified several concerns regarding the jointing of the materials at the corner and chamfered junctions. Upon discussing these further with the fabricators, the mock-ups were reproduced, and a further inspection was undertaken by the LBC.

2.5 Evaluation of Natural Stone

To achieve the chamfered pier shape that characterised large portions of the tower the pier needs to be constructed in smaller pieces of stone to avoid high levels of wastage that would result from carving it from a series of large stone blocks and fractures. To avoid expressing the slim stone thickness at these corner junctions as 'a veneer of stone' we initially proposed a 'birds-mouth' joint. However, upon inspection the LBC did not like the appearance of the joint and this was subsequently changed to a mitred glued joint. The joint required at the chamfered angle between stones was glued.

Upon evaluation of the mock-up and details we had the following concerns:

- The glued joints would be prone to 'opening up' or cracking either through transportation or over time due to thermal movement in the stone. These would be become visually apparent.
- The ashlar stone effect is disrupted by the vertical joint at the chamfered corner.

Upon inspection of the mock-up panel and review of Sketchbook 37 the LBC did not believe the ashlar stone effect was their preferred appearance for the building. Our understanding is that they found the stone jointing detracted from the 'monolithic' appearance. The LBC encouraged the design team to explore options which minimised joints so the frame could be 'read' as more of a solid element. This proved to be unfeasible in stone due to limitations on the sizes of stone that could be quarried and its thickness in terms of loadings on the unitised cladding. More information on the evaluation of the natural stone proposal can be found on pages 14-15 of 'C. 18 Submission GRC Proposals' dated 18 December 2020.

One of the reasons for the refusal is that stone has not been submitted as the facing material. As explained, stone has been proposed to the LBC in the design development process. This was rejected by the LBC which is not acknowledged in the refusal.

2.6 Evaluation of Recon Stone

The method of constructing the chamfered pier detail in recon stone is identical to that of natural stone. Therefore, the concern regarding the joints remains the same.

The benefit of recon stone is that larger pieces are available compared to natural stone, nevertheless the maximum sheet size is still limited due to the fabrication process and would still require one horizontal joint mid-height to each pier.

Upon inspection of the mock-up panel and review of Sketchbook 37 the LBC informally suggested that re-con stone would be acceptable. As a result, the design team undertook further design development with the contractor and potential fabricator. However, at this point the fabricators confirmed that they would be unable to provide a warranty for the integrity of the joints in transportation or for the design life of the building. The contractor-initiated discussions with a multitude of fabricators across Europe and not one would relent on this issue.

Furthermore, time has given us the benefit of reviewing the mock-up over a period of exposure to the elements and how it fairs during careful transportation between sites. The mock-up viewed one year on from completion displays decolourisation at the glued joints, cracking and a proneness to chipping/damage. This mock-up was again shown to the LBC during the inspection of the Visual Mock-up to display these characteristics to them. It was explained that due to these factors and the lack of availability of a warranty, recon stone could no longer be considered as an option.

Please refer to page 16 and 17 of 'C. 18 Submission GRC Proposals' dated 18 December 2020 for further information.

One of the reasons for the refusal is that re-constituted stone has not been submitted as the facing material. Reconstituted stone would result in a greater number of joints than GRC and would weather poorly as demonstrated in the mock-up, another reason for LBC refusing GRC. Furthermore, we are technically unable to offer reconstituted stone due to being unable to obtain a warranty for its design and installation.

2.7 Glass Reinforced Concrete (GRC)

A detailed description of GRC can be found on pages 22-26 of 'C. 18 Submission GRC Proposals' dated 18 December 2020.

In response to the LBC's rejection of Natural Stone and considering the technical difficulties we had discovered in using recon stone, GRC was reconsidered. We deem it as the only material that would overcome the technical issues identified, reduce joints and provide the monolithic expression that the LBC were encouraging us to achieve in the design development and consultation process with them.

We believe, following 3 years of research and development, it is the correct choice of material for the building for the following reasons (refer to pages 22-33 of C.18 Submission GRC Proposals dated 18 December 2020 for a more detailed explanation).

- The material ensures that the highest design quality is achieved and is in line with the design intent and aspirations for the building we outlined in the 'Design and Access Statement Document' dated February 2014.
- In terms of colour and surface finish, the GRC material can deliver the same effect as a reconstituted stone would. Its material make-up allows for the delivery of the other benefits noted below that is not possible with other materials.
- The mock-ups demonstrate it has extremely similar visual characteristics to the Recon Stone sample that was presented to LBC and approved in principle (prior to learning the issues with warranty and joints) and therefore LBC's concerns regarding its *"its apparent inertness/lifelessness"* can no longer be justified.
- The material reduces joints as far as possible. Where joints are necessary, they respect the main material in terms of colour and surface appearance, ensuring sharp edges and delivering

precise and accurate corners that give the appearance of the building elegance. There are fewer joints than there would be with recon / natural stone as the GRC can be formed in 3D single pieces rather than cut and mitre jointed.

- The material will deliver both aesthetically and technically unlike any other alternative material we researched and developed.
- GRC allows for the largest size of panels to be provided without intermediate joints between storeys. This therefore best achieves the design intent required for the scale of the development.
- A rebated overlap detail has been developed with the fabricators as part of this process preventing the need for mastic joints between storeys, the first time this will have been achieved in this way. This could not be achieved in any other of the alternative materials researched.
- The only 'open' joints are where they are unavoidable in order to construct the façade in a unitised, prefabricated manner. The size of the joints is dictated by the movement and tolerances. There are ways to form slip joints with the GRC, but this can only be achieved in one direction, not in both horizontal and vertical joints due to limitations with the panel installation and replacement strategies. As designers we believed the best solution aesthetically was to avoid the open joint in the horizontal between panels.
- It is worth noting open joints would be required regardless of the facing material selected. This is due to the construction method outlined in the item above and the fact that it is a ventilated rainscreen façade. Therefore, open joints are needed to allow this ventilation to take place and for any moisture/water in the cavity that may arise to drain out and the same number presented to the LBC in the GRC mock-up would exist in a natural stone or re-constituted stone solution.
- There is a significant sustainability gain from using GRC. Assessment has shown that the embodied carbon output from a GRC approach versus use of reconstituted stone is 31% less when assessed across the building's life cycle. This is a considerable improvement in sustainability performance, and it is BREEAM A+ product.
- There are significant savings in trans-European freightage mileage, which further reduces the carbon footprint of the materials.
- GRC allows for a pre-fabrication approach to be adopted. As well as quality control improvements, this approach supports enhanced health and safety by allowing panels to be craned into place and reducing requirements for high level working.

We have made best use of the extensive time period since approval and during our discussions with the LBC to refine the detailing of the proposals to alleviate their initial concerns. As stated, joints have been minimised, corners are precise, and details have been carefully considered to ensure the long-term appearance of the building remains high quality.

2.8 Joints

One of the reasons for refusal is 'detailed design concerns including the number and visibility of the joints'. As stated, a pre-cast façade solution in either stone faced pre-cast or reconstituted stone is not feasible for this project and the only feasible construction method is a unitised façade with a rainscreen fascia.

Any unitised rainscreen façade solution including stone or re-con stone, would require the number and visibility of joint proposed in the mock-up. These joints are governed by the construction method, not the material. This is unavoidable and extensive work has been undertaken to minimise these and reduce their visual impact. The CGI's submitted in the appeal also show dark horizontal joints at the interface of the spandrels and piers so should have been expected by the LBC.

These are the only joints that occur in the GRC proposal whereas the stone and recon proposal has many more joints between the stone pieces forming the panels.

Therefore, the proposal that has been refused represents the least number of joints of all the options assessed.

2.9 Weathering

One of the reasons for refusal is that the LBC do not believe that GRC weathers as well as natural material but conversely are concerned how it will look 'throughout the century and beyond'.

GRC is far less absorbent than a natural material and as a result will weather better than a natural material as it will not be as prone to staining or accumulation of dirt from the environment. We therefore believe it is inaccurate for LBC to have concerns over GRC regarding weathering as GRC would 'weather well and stand the test of time' better than stone or re-constituted stone.

The ledges/recesses of the spandrel elements are c.250mm deep to provide visual depth to the façade. However, at this depth the resulting horizontal surface is prone to significant exposure to water. Traditionally on stone buildings this horizontal surface would have been protected by leadwork or copper and on more modern buildings, an aluminium cill. GRID was asked to omit this cill on a stone building we completed in 2016 at 190 Strand. Subsequently the stone ledge has suffered from significant staining ever since and constantly requires extensive cleaning to remove it. Regular cleaning like this would obviously be impractical on a building of 24 storeys.

Despite its lower absorption than stone or re-constituted stone, GRC would suffer similar staining over time resulting from the horizontal exposed surfaces. Therefore, GRID have provided a metal cill to prevent this occurring and would have proposed this on the stone or re-con options if we had proceeded with these materials. The benefit of a metal cill can be seen on our Belvedere Gardens project on the Southbank which is weathering far better than 190 Strand as a result.

The LBC find 'the use of a metal cill to be objectionable and officers consider that this would not be required if the building were to be constructed out of natural or re-constituted stone'. We believe this to be factually incorrect from our experience. For this reason, metal cills have been included in the Condition 18 submittal for practical reasons and to ensure that the building weathers well over time which LBC identify as a key priority for them. Removing the metal cill as suggested by the LBC in their refusal would result in a building that would stain and become impossible to maintain.

In addition, the CGI's submitted at the appeal indicate a dark grey line at the interface of the piers and spandrels and these images bear little difference to the VMU. Therefore, we do not believe that the proposals depart greatly from the appearance of the building indicated in the CGI's.

2.9 Appearance

When considering the impact of the proposed material in its context, we believe it is wrong to assume that the building should be constructed in actual stone. As identified on page 23 of the Design and Access Statement Document or assessment of materials in the area states *'the perception of prevalent materials tends to be brick and stucco or brick and stone'*. We consider GRC to be the 21st century version of Stucco, a material historically used to simulate stone. We do not believe that the material is 'lifeless' or 'inert' as its texture and material content provide an extremely similar appearance to the recon stone sample and to the natural stone.

The LBC deem stone or re-constituted stone to have more 'integral character' than the surface finish of GRC. From experience GRC buildings viewed from a distance are imperceptible from those constructed in Portland Stone. Up close the textural quality is the same as re-constituted stone with a grit finish.

It is also wrong to consider it should be stone due to its proximity to the Grade II listed Swiss Cottage Library designed by Sir Basil Spence in 1964. Natural stone is limited to the ground floor of this building and the dominant material used is concrete in a combination of textures. Therefore, we believe GRC would relate more strongly to the library than stone.

2.10 Summary

- A natural stone facing material was presented to LBC via a mock-up of a pier in the design development process to submit this condition and was rejected by the LBC.

- A corner joint to the stone proposal could not be achieved that was visually acceptable to the LBC or that could be warranted by the specialist contractors.
- Similar jointing issues and warranty provision also exists with re-con stone and the mock-up which has been retained displays concerning weathering characteristics which were shown to the LBC
- A pre-cast façade is not feasible for this particularly building due to its location over the LUL tunnels. The only feasible construction method for the façade is to use unitised cladding with a rainscreen material. Therefore, the size, location and number of open joints presented on the GRC mock-up would be identical in a stone or re-con proposal due to unitised rainscreen cladding.
- Metal cills would need to be provided regardless of the facing material chosen to avoid staining due to the depth of the horizontal surfaces.
- GRC is not an inferior material and is used on award winning buildings within the borough and buildings under construction in more highly sensitive locations in close proximity to stone buildings of heritage asset.

3.0 Brick Panels

3.1 Planning Approval

The approved planning drawings (e.g., PL_200) indicate the 'infill' panels between the 'white frame' of the tower to be of 'faience'. Page 62 of the Design and Access Statement suggest these will be 'a red panel'. On the lower block, the infill panels are similarly described as 'Faience Terracotta or similar' (e.g. PL_206) and it was intended these would be of the same colour as the tower. The approved tower elevations indicate two horizontal joint lines over a two-storey vertical bay of faience, and these are also shown on the bay study on page 62 of the Design and Access Statement.

Page 64 of the Design and Access Statement goes further to suggest the 'red' could be faience, red rubber bricks or red mixed stock bricks. Images are shown on this page to indicate the appearance of each of these potential choices. The CGI's submitted for the appeal show these panels on the tower to be brick and to the lower block red faience.

3.2 Design Development

Reflecting advice from officers since the approval the infill 'red' panels to both the tower and lower block have been developed as brick. As the designers we support this design development as it enriches the façade with a different scale of material via the size of the individual bricks. This is expressed via the mortar joints and variation in colour of the blend and mix of bricks selected, rather than the homogenous faience. We believe that this texture should compensate for the concerns that the LBC have regarding the proposed GRC 'white frame'. The contrast in texture between the two materials reflects the combination of red brick and stucco found on buildings in the area.

3.3 Selection of Bricks

We believe that the selection of different bricks proposed reflects the varied colour and material quality of bricks used in the area. As identified in the Design and Access Statement and on pages 6 and 7 of 'C18 Submission - Brick Proposals' some bricks in the area are textured and some matt of different colours ranging from oranges to reds with even some tinges of purple brick. We concluded that it would be wrong to consider the context as being dominated by a single shade of brick or texture and our proposals reflect this variation. Page 8 of 'C18 Submission - Brick Proposals' justifies this selection.

3.4 Mortar

A mortar has been selected which we believe works with the variety of brick colour and texture proposed. It is proposed to flush point the mortar to reflect mortar jointing of brickwork buildings in the area which were rarely recessed, or bucket handle jointed.

3.5 Joint Between Panels

The approved tower elevations indicate two horizontal joint lines over a two-storey vertical bay of faience, and these are also shown on the bay study on page 62 of the Design and Access Statement. The design development of the cladding system has allowed us to reduce this to one horizontal joint which we consider as a positive improvement to the design.

As in the GRC piers this has been developed as a rebated joint to avoid a pure 'open' joint to give it a greater sense of solidity. However due to the panels being constructed from brick slip (the only way of constructing brick on a unitised curtain walling system) it has been impossible for the material in the recess to be brick too. Nevertheless, it should be considered that the first of these joints will occur at 2nd floor level. The depth and size of this joint will mean that from the viewing angle of a pedestrian only brick will be seen in this location and the joint will be almost imperceptible.

3.6 Summary

We believe the development of the 'red' panels since approval has enhanced the appearance and quality of the building. We believe the mix of bricks selected in terms of colour and texture and how these have been blended is an intelligent method of responding to the context. The bricks in combination with the GRC white frame will provide a high-quality building in accordance with the approval.

Appellant's Statement of Case

100 Avenue Road, NW3 3HF



- **Appendix 2** – Sample Photographs of the Visual Mock-Up (VMU) of Materials, available to view on-site





Appellant's Statement of Case

100 Avenue Road, NW3 3HF



- **Appendix 3** – Secretary of State's Decision for Development of the Site, dated 18 February 2016



Department for Communities and Local Government

Ms Lorna Henderson
Turley
17 Gresse Street
London
W1T 1QL

Our Ref: APP/X5210/W/14/3001616

18 February 2016

Dear Madam,

**TOWN AND COUNTRY PLANNING ACT 1990 – SECTION 78
APPEAL ESSENTIAL LIVING (SWISS COTTAGE) LTD
100 AVENUE ROAD, LONDON, NW3 3HF**

1. I am directed by the Secretary of State to say that consideration has been given to the report of the Inspector, Graham Dudley BA (Hons) Arch Dip Cons AA RIBA FRICS, who carried out an Inquiry which was held on 14 – 17 July, 20 – 24 July and 10 August 2015 into your client's appeal against a decision of the London Borough of Camden ('the Council') to refuse planning permission for the demolition of the existing building and redevelopment with a 24 storey building and a part 7 part 5 storey building comprising a total of 184 residential units (class C3) and up to 1,041sqm of flexible retail/financial or professional or café/restaurant floorspace (classes A1/A2/A3) inclusive of part sui generis floorspace or potential new London Underground station access fronting Avenue Road and up to 1,350sqm for community use (Class D1) with associated works including enlargement of the existing basement level to contain disabled car parking spaces and cycle parking, landscaping and access improvements in accordance with application reference 2014/1617/P, dated 28 February 2014.
2. The appeal was recovered for the Secretary of State's determination on 11 March 2015, in pursuance of section 79 of, and paragraph 3 of Schedule 6 to, the Town and Country Planning Act 1990, because the appeal involves a proposals for residential development of over 150 units or on sites of over 5 hectares, which would significantly impact on the Government's objective to secure a better balance between housing demand and supply and create high quality, sustainable, mixed and inclusive communities.

Inspector's recommendation and summary of the decision

3. The Inspector recommended that the appeal be allowed subject to conditions. For the reasons given below, the Secretary of State agrees with the Inspector's conclusions, except where stated, and agrees with his recommendation. A copy of the Inspector's report (IR) is enclosed. All references to paragraph numbers, unless otherwise stated, are to that report.

Procedural matters

4. On 3 November 2015 the Secretary of State wrote to the Council to clarify that the proposed planning obligations conform with the Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) Regulations 2010, Regulation 123(3) as amended, concerning limitations on the use of planning obligations in the determination of planning applications and appeals. The Council responded on 16 November 2015.
5. The Secretary of State has had regard to correspondence submitted too late to be considered by the Inspector, as set out in Annex A to this letter. He has carefully considered and taken into account these representations but he does not consider that they raise new issues that would affect his decision or require him to refer back to parties. Copies of the representations received can be made available on written request to the address at the foot of the first page of this letter.

Policy and Statutory considerations

6. In deciding the appeal, the Secretary of State has had regard to section 38(6) of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 which requires that proposals be determined in accordance with the development plan unless material considerations indicate otherwise. In this case, the adopted development plan for the area comprises The London Plan (adopted July 2011), the Revised Early Minor Alterations to the London Plan (2013), Further Alterations to the London Plan (2015), Camden Core Strategy (CS) and Development Policies (DP) (both adopted November 2010) and the Camden Site Allocations Development Plan Document. Relevant Supplementary Planning Guidance includes the Mayor's Housing Standards SPG and Camden's Planning Guidance document.
7. In accordance with section 66(1) of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 (the LBCA Act), the Secretary of State has paid special regard to the desirability of preserving listed structures or their settings or any features of special architectural or historic interest which they may possess. In accordance with Section 72 of the LBCA Act the Secretary of State has paid special attention to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character or appearance of a conservation area.
8. The Secretary of State considers that the development plan policies most relevant to the appeal are those set out by the Inspector at IR11-43.
9. Other material considerations which the Secretary of State has taken into account include: the National Planning Policy Framework ('the Framework'), and the planning guidance published in March 2014. The Secretary of State has also had careful regard to the Tall Buildings: Historic England Advice Note 4 published 10 December 2015 which replaces and cancels the 2007 joint English Heritage/CABE guidance and considers, in the light of the facts of this case, that changes to the guidance do not alter his conclusions or decision.

Main issues

10. The Secretary of State agrees that the main disputed issues in this case are those outlined by the Inspector at IR232-233.

Heritage Assets

11. The Secretary of State has carefully considered the Inspector's analysis at IR234-241 and agrees for the reasons given that while there is no specific duty under Section 72(1) of the LBCA Act to consider the setting of conservation areas, it is established practice that views into and out of a conservation area and any effect on character and/or appearance are

relevant (IR234) and the correct assessment of harm to Conservation Areas, as designated heritage assets in the Framework, is the effect on the character and/or appearance of the conservation area as a whole while acknowledging that this does not mean that any harm identified has to be over the whole area, and harm in one part of the conservation area (or outside) could have an effect on the conservation area as a whole. He further finds, in agreement with the Inspector that great weight should be given to the assets' conservation (IR235).

12. The Secretary of State agrees with the Inspector that no listed building is physically affected by the proposal apart from the Hampstead Figure Sculpture and generally it is the setting of various listed buildings that needs to be considered (IR236).
13. The Secretary of State agrees with the Inspector's interpretation of policies CS5, CS14 and DP25 for the reasons given (IR237-238). He agrees with the Inspector that the aim of policies CS5, CS14 and DP25 is to seek development which both preserves and enhances heritage assets, but that development that only preserves the assets or would not cause harm to them would also effectively satisfy the Framework policy tests (IR238). The Secretary of State considers that the heritage aims of policies CS5, CS14 and DP25 are closely aligned with paragraph 126 of the Framework, which, amongst other things, refers to the desirability of sustaining and enhancing the significance of heritage assets and the desirability of new development making a positive contribution to local character and distinctiveness. As such, and applying paragraph 215 of the Framework he gives full weight to policies CS5, CS14 and DP25.
14. The Secretary of State notes that the effects on heritage assets were considered by Historic England who indicated that they did not consider that there would be effects on the historic environment of such significance that they needed to continue to be involved. He agrees with the Inspector that if Historic England had considered that there was a notable unacceptable impact that he would have expected them to have commented (IR241). However, he also agrees with the Inspector that just because Historic England did not comment does not mean that there was no harm to be identified as they considered that was to be left to the Council (IR241).
15. The Secretary of State has carefully considered the Inspector's analysis of the effects on the significance, character and appearance of the various nearby conservation areas at IR242-275. Likewise, he has carefully considered the Inspector's analysis of the effects on the significance and special architectural and historic interest of listed buildings, as well as evidence put to the Inquiry by the parties in these respects, and national policy in Section 12 of the Framework.

Conservation Areas

16. The Secretary of State agrees with the Inspector that the development would cause 'less than substantial' harm, in Framework terms, to the Belsize Conservation Area associated with the view from Belsize Park (IR245-260). He also agrees with the Inspector, for the reasons given, that the character and appearance and significance of the Fitzjohn's and Netherhall Conservation Area would be preserved (IR261-265), as would the significance and special architectural and historic interest of the Alexandra Road Conservation Area (IR272-275). Further, the Secretary of State agrees with the Inspector for the reasons given that with regard to the Elsworthy Road, St John's Wood and South Hampstead Conservation Areas their character and appearance and significance would be preserved and the Conservation Areas unaffected (IR266-271).

17. Overall, the Secretary of State attaches considerable weight to the 'less than substantial' harm he finds to the Belsize Conservation Area. Applying paragraph 134 of the Framework, the Secretary of State weighs this harm against the public benefits of the proposal, including securing its optimum use.

Listed Buildings

18. In deciding this appeal, the Secretary of State has had special regard to the desirability of preserving any listed building or its setting or any features of special architectural or historic interest which it possesses, as required by section 66 of the LBCA Act.
19. The Secretary of State has carefully considered the assessment of the impact of the scheme on the listed buildings identified at IR276-295 and IR296-303 of the Inspector's Report.
20. As to the Hampstead Figure Sculpture, the Secretary of State notes it would be necessary to remove the listed sculpture and reposition it after the works are complete (IR283). He agrees with the Inspector that there is likely to be a significant enhancement to the setting of the sculpture and therefore the special architectural and historic interest would be likely to be enhanced (IR286). As to the Swiss Cottage Library, the Secretary of State agrees with the Inspector that the proposal would enhance the town centre setting and therefore also the significance of the listed building and its special architectural and historic interest would be enhanced (IR279).
21. Considering the Regency Lodge and the Fire Station at Lancaster Grove and Eton Grove (IR287-292), the Secretary of State agrees with the Inspector for the reasons given that the impact of their significance would be neutral and their significance, special architectural and historic interest would be preserved (IR288 & 292). Turning to the Alexandra Road Estate and Primrose Hill Tunnels (Entrance), the Secretary of State concludes for the reasons given that the proposal would not cause any impact on the setting or affect the significance or special architectural and historic interest of the listed buildings (IR295).
22. With regard to the effect on the significance and special architectural and historic interest of the other listed buildings in the surrounding area identified by other parties, the Secretary of State agrees with the Inspector's analysis for the reasons given at IR296-303 that the introduction of the appeal proposal would not have any impact on the special architectural and historic interest or significance of these listed buildings.

Undesignated heritage assets

23. The Secretary of State has carefully considered the Inspector's analysis of the effects on the setting and therefore significance of certain locally-listed buildings, namely the Swiss Cottage Open Space (IR304), the Hampstead Theatre (IR305), the Swiss Cottage Leisure Centre (IR306), the Royal Central School of Speech and Drama (IR307-308) and the Swiss Cottage Inn (IR309). He has also had regard to the evidence put to the inquiry by the parties in this respect, and national policy in paragraph 135 of the Framework. For the reasons given at IR304-309 the Secretary of State agrees with the Inspector that the significance of the non-designated heritage assets would not be harmed by the proposal.

Conclusion on Heritage Assets

24. Overall, the Secretary of State agrees with the Inspector for the reasons given that the proposal generally accords with the aims and objectives of CS Policies CS5 & CS14, DP Policy DP25 and LP Policy 7.8. However, he also agrees with the Inspector for the reasons given that there is some harm in terms of CS Policies CS5, CS14 and DP25 to be carried

through into the planning balance, due to the 'less than substantial' harm the development would cause to the Belsize Conservation Area in respect of the view from Belsize Park.

Character and Appearance

25. The Secretary of State has carefully considered the Inspector's analysis of the effect on the character and appearance of the surrounding area at IR311-320 and the evidence put to the inquiry by the parties in this respect. He agrees that the existing building is attractively designed and generally well thought out in relation to its surroundings, while acknowledging that the ground floor poorly relates to the surrounding area and the provision of active frontages around the building would considerably improve the urban environment (IR311). Comparing the existing building with the proposed building, the Secretary of State agrees with the Inspector that there is no doubt there would be a considerable change in the size of the buildings, which will have a greater presence and that the extent of the change for the area is not the main consideration, but whether what is proposed would be acceptable in the context of its surroundings (IR312).
26. The Secretary of State agrees with the Inspector for the reasons given that the proposed development would not have any direct impact on the setting, amenity value or significance of the park at Primrose Hill (IR314) and that the principle of development for residential and commercial uses is appropriate, the site being in the town centre and not far from many other residential developments (IR316).
27. As to whether the buildings are appropriately scaled, in terms of height and massing, in their surrounds and the other design consequences of the scheme, the Secretary of State notes that there are a number of tall buildings near to the appeal site and that the Camden Site Allocations Local Development Document identifies the appeal site as being appropriate for the type of development proposed, noting the potential for taller buildings (IR316).
28. Overall, and for the reasons given in IR311-320, the Secretary of State agrees with the Inspector that the proposal meets the criteria of the Camden Site Allocations Policy and concludes, in agreement with the GLA and the Design Council, that it would be a well designed, attractive building that sits well within its town centre context. However, he agrees with the Inspector that this must be an expectation of new development and therefore adds minimal weight to the planning balance (IR391). He further agrees with the Inspector that the proposal accords with policies CS3, CS5, CS7 & CS15, DP24 & DP31 and LP policies 2.15, 3.3, 3.4, 3.5, 3.6, 3.7, 3.8, 3.9, 3.10, 4.7, 4.8 and 7.7.

Sunlight and Daylight

29. The Secretary of State has carefully considered the Inspector's assessment of sunlight and daylight issues at IR321-332 and the BRE Site Layout Planning for Daylight and Sunlight Guide 2011 ('BRE guidance'). He has also had regard to the views of the Design Council who considered the impact on sunlight/daylight in considerable detail and concluded, following changes after their initial comments, that it was acceptable (IR332).
30. The Secretary of State agrees with the Inspector that the additional shading would not have an unacceptable impact on the amenity provided by the Swiss Cottage Open Space and generally would comply with the BRE guidance (IR327). As to the additional shading of the pedestrianised end of Eton Avenue, where markets are held, he agrees with the Inspector for the reasons given that the markets would not be unacceptably affected and their amenity, social and economic value would remain (IR328). Furthermore, he agrees with the Inspector for the reasons given that the impact on the residences at Cresta House in terms

of daylight and sunlight would be minimal and would accord with BRE recommendations (IR329-330).

31. Overall, the Secretary of State agrees with the Inspector for the reasons given that the increase in shading is a harm that weighs against the proposal, and he affords moderate weight to this.

Other Amenity Issues

32. The Secretary of State has carefully considered the Inspector's analysis of other amenity issues at IR333-342. Like the Inspector he does not consider the additional overlooking would have any significant impact on the use of the Swiss Cottage Open Space or harm its amenity for users (IR334). He agrees that the significant increase in residential use at the appeal site would result in a greater use of the Swiss Cottage Open Space and considers, in agreement with the Inspector, that this would be an enhancement in terms of increased vitality of the area (IR335). He also agrees with the Inspector for the reasons given that in view of the distance from the properties and control of opening hours, that there is unlikely to be unacceptable noise and disturbance generated by the properties (IR336-337).
33. The Secretary of State agrees with the Inspector for the reasons given that while the appearance of the setting would change, the civic/town centre character would not (IR339). Overall, he agrees with the Inspector and does not consider there would be an unacceptable impact on the Swiss Cottage Open Space (IR338-339). He agrees with the Inspector's assessment as to the impact of the proposed development as experienced from the swimming pool (IR340) and from the various residential properties around the proposed development for the reasons given at IR340-341.
34. Overall, the Secretary of State agrees with the Inspector for the reasons given that the proposal accords with CS Policy CS5, DP Policy DP26 and LP Policy 7.7 (IR342).

Other Matters

35. The Secretary of State has carefully considered the Inspector's analysis at IR343-350 in regard to air quality, along with evidence put to the inquiry by the parties in this respect and overall agrees that, with the recommended mitigation measures in place, air quality is not considered to be a significant consideration for the proposed development (IR350).
36. Turning to the impact from any increase in wind speed, the Secretary of State considers that suitable micro climate mitigation measures are incorporated within the design to mitigate potential adverse wind environments arising from the development which are secured by condition 15. He considers that condition 15 is appropriate and necessary and would meet the tests of paragraph 206 of the Framework. For the reasons given by the Inspector at IR351-357 the Secretary of State concludes that, with these suitable mitigation methods, no harm to the users of the area would be caused and the proposal would accord with CS Policies CS5 & CS15, DP Policies 26 and DP31 and LP Policies 5.1 and 5.2 (IR357).
37. The Secretary of State has considered the Inspector's comments at IR358 and like him does not consider that the new entrance to the Avenue would result in any significant impact on the safety of the users of the Swiss Cottage Open Space. He further agrees with the Inspector for the reasons given that while the gas reduction valve adjacent to the appeal site is reasonably close to the building, he does not consider that this is a safety issue (IR359).
38. As to road access issues, the Secretary of State has carefully considered the Inspector's analysis (IR360-364) and the evidence put to the inquiry by the parties in this respect. He

notes that the appeal site is in a town centre location directly adjacent to the Swiss Cottage underground station with the highest achievable PTAL Level on routes ideally located for a car free development as proposed (IR360). The Secretary of State agrees with the Inspector for the reasons given that there is no reason why with good management service access to the property cannot be controlled (IR362). Overall, the Secretary of State agrees with the Inspector that the traffic impacts of the development would not be substantial and certainly not severe as indicated at paragraph 32 of the Framework (IR363) and that the proposal would accord with CS Policies CS5 & CS15, DP Policy 26 and LP Policy 3.6.

39. As to tree issues, the Secretary of State has carefully considered the Inspector's analysis (IR365-368) and the evidence put to the inquiry by the parties in this respect. Overall, the Secretary of State agrees with the Inspector for the reasons given that the loss of trees to the south of the appeal site would cause some harm to amenity which weighs against the scheme, to which he attaches moderate weight.
40. As to the community facility, the Secretary of State agrees with the Inspector for the reasons given (IR369-370) that the allocation of the community space, whether taken up by the Winchester Project or others, is a significant benefit to go into the planning balance.

5 Year Housing Land Supply

41. The Secretary of State agrees with the Inspector for the reasons given that the Council has a 5 year housing land supply (IR371).

Housing Issues

42. The Secretary of State has carefully considered the Inspector's analysis of housing issues at IR371-373 and agrees (IR372) that great weight should be attached to the housing provision proposed.
43. The Secretary of State has carefully considered the concerns raised by interested parties about the number of affordable units proposed. He has also had regard to the viability appraisal and the Inspector's analysis of the issue (IR373). He notes the Council and the Appellant agree (IQ30): that the provision of 36 affordable units and 18 discounted market housing units for 15 years comprises a policy compliant affordable housing provision having regard to the viability of the proposed scheme with the provision secured by way of a section 106 obligation; that the s106 agreement includes a review mechanism requiring the viability of providing affordable housing to be re-assessed at the end of the project (within one year after the date of practical completion of the development) and if it is found that there should have been more affordable units a mechanism is set out for adjustment by a deferred payment; that a provision permitting the use of the community space for additional affordable units is necessary if the community space within the scheme is no longer required; and that as such the proposals would satisfy the provisions of Policies CS6 and CS19 and Policies DP3 and DP4. Overall, the Secretary of State agrees with the Inspector for the reasons given that the viability study and method of ensuring that adequate affordable housing is provided is fairly and reasonably related in scale and kind to the proposed development and necessary having regard to the policy framework and the housing needs of the Borough (IR373).

Environmental Impact Assessment

44. The Secretary of State notes the Save Swiss Cottage Group queried why the proposals were negatively screened for EIA purposes (IR374) although it is noted that they do not state that the proposal is EIA development or formally request that the screening decision be reviewed. Like the Inspector, in reaching his decision on the appeal, the Secretary of

State has taken into consideration the extensive environmental information submitted and evidence from consultation bodies and other organisations (IR374).

Planning Obligations and Conditions

45. The Secretary of State has carefully considered the s106 agreement, the Inspector's analysis at IR375-383, national policy set out at paragraphs 203-205 of the Framework, the relevant planning guidance, and the CIL Regulations 2010 as amended.
46. The Secretary of State agrees with the Inspector for the reasons given that the requirements for affordable housing (IR376); parking (IR377); public realm (IR378) the Construction Management Plan, Service Management Plan and the Travel Plan (IR379); local procurement/local employment, Energy Efficiency, Community Facility and potential New Station Access (IR380) and waste disposal and recycling (IR381) are all necessary, fair and reasonably related to the development. However, he also agrees with the Inspector, for the reasons given at IR382, that the clause in the obligation relating to the project architects is not compliant with the CIL Regulations or paragraph 204 of the Framework, as it is not necessary to make the development acceptable in planning terms. Overall, the Secretary of State agrees with the Inspector for the reasons given that the s106 requirements, save for the project architects clause, complies with Regulation 122 of the CIL Regulations and the tests at paragraph 204 of the Framework.
47. Having carefully considered the s106 agreement and the Council's response letter referred to in DL4, above, the Secretary of State concludes: That the contributions relating to affordable housing are excluded from Regulation 123; that the external public open space maintenance contribution is an obligation specific to this particular area of open space being provided and does not form part of any wider project or infrastructure provision; that the landscape and public realm contributions relate solely towards the proposal and do not form part of any wider project or infrastructure provision; that the travel plan monitoring contribution is a contribution towards the cost to the Council of monitoring the travel plan that will be agreed in respect of the development and is site specific and not part of any wider project; and that with respect to the carbon reduction contribution, the Council confirmed that 5 or more separate obligations have not already been entered into since April 2010 within the relevant area which provide for the funding of that infrastructure project or type. The Secretary of State agrees with the Council that aside from these financial contributions that the s106 agreement contains site specific obligations relating to the carrying out, management and operation of this particular development and that none of the obligations provide for the funding or provision of an infrastructure project which has been part funded or provided by any other obligation.
48. The Secretary of State has considered the Inspector's comments at IR384 on planning conditions and the schedule of agreed conditions he recommends at Annex A of his report together with the reasons for them and is satisfied that the proposed conditions are reasonable and necessary and would meet the tests of paragraph 206 of the Framework and the planning guidance.

Planning balance and conclusion

49. In deciding this appeal, the Secretary of State has had regard to section 38(6) of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 which requires that proposals be determined in accordance with the development plan unless material considerations indicate otherwise. In accordance with section 66(1) of the LBCA Act, the Secretary of State has paid special regard to the desirability of preserving listed structures or their settings or any features of special architectural or historic interest which they may possess. In accordance with

Section 72 of the LBCA Act the Secretary of State has paid special attention to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character or appearance of a conservation area.

50. For the reasons given above, the Secretary of State considers that the proposal is in accordance with the development plan as a whole. He has gone on to consider whether there are material considerations in this case that indicate the appeal should be determined other than in accordance with the development plan.
51. Weighing against the proposal, for the reasons given above is the 'less than substantial harm' in Framework terms to the Belsize Conservation Area, to which the Secretary of State attaches considerable weight. Other factors that the Secretary of State finds weigh against the scheme are: the impact on trees, to which he attaches moderate weight; disruption during construction, to which he attaches little weight for the reasons in IR392; the impacts on views from around the area and the increase in shading in respect of the Swiss Cottage Open Space, both of which he gives moderate weight.
52. Weighing in favour of the appeal the Secretary of State finds, for the reasons given above: considerable social benefit in the provision of the proposed housing and affordable housing, and by the provision of space for community use; the potential for the underground station to be improved would also be a significant benefit; there would be an enhancement to the frontages of the buildings at ground level compared with the existing arrangement that could improve the vitality of the area (IR390); and that the proposed development is an attractive design and will fit in with the area, although he agrees with the Inspector for the reasons given that this adds minimal weight to the planning balance (IR391).
53. Applying paragraph 134 of the Framework, the Secretary of State considers that the public benefits of the proposal outweigh the less than substantial harm, in Framework terms, to the Belsize Conservation Area.
54. The Secretary of State considers, for the reasons above, and in agreement with the Inspector (IR395) that the social, economic and environmental benefits of the proposal make it sustainable development in terms of the Framework and that the substantial benefits considerably outweigh the harms that have been identified. He therefore concludes that there are no material considerations that indicate that the proposal should be determined other than in accordance with the development plan.

Formal Decision

55. Accordingly, for the reasons given above, the Secretary of State agrees with the Inspector's recommendation. He hereby allows your client's appeal and grants planning permission for the demolition of the existing building and redevelopment with a 24 storey building and a part 7 part 5 storey building comprising a total of 184 residential units (class C3) and up to 1,041sqm of flexible retail/financial or professional or café/restaurant floorspace (classes A1/A2/A3) inclusive of part sui generis floorspace or potential new London Underground station access fronting Avenue Road and up to 1,350sqm for community use (Class D1) with associated works including enlargement of the existing basement level to contain disabled car parking spaces and cycle parking, landscaping and access improvements in accordance with application reference 2014/1617/P, dated 28 February 2014 subject to the conditions listed in Annex B to this letter.
56. An applicant for any consent, agreement or approval required by a condition of this permission for agreement of reserved matters has a statutory right of appeal to the Secretary of State if consent, agreement or approval is refused or granted conditionally or if the Local Planning Authority fail to give notice of their decision within the prescribed period.

57. This letter does not convey any approval or consent which may be required under any enactment, bye-law, order or regulation other than section 57 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990.

Right to challenge the decision

58. A separate note is attached setting out the circumstances in which the validity of the Secretary of State's decision may be challenged. This must be done by making an application to the High Court within six weeks from the date of this letter for leave to bring a statutory review under section 288 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990.

59. A copy of this letter has been sent to the London Borough of Camden as well as representatives of the Rule 6 parties: Mr Reed, Belsize Residents' Association, Winchester Road Residents' Association, Cresta House Residents' Association, Eton Avenue Housing Association and Save Swiss Cottage Action Group. A notification letter has been sent to all other parties who asked to be informed of the decision.

Yours faithfully

Philip Barber

Authorised by Secretary of State to sign in that behalf

Annex A: correspondence submitted too late to be considered by the Inspector

From	Date
B Alter	17/03/2015
N Piercy	30/06/2015
A H Kay	06/07/2015, 10/07/2015
C Athanasius	08/07/2015
C Athanassious	08/07/2015
D Mackersey	08/07/2015
N Coleman	08/07/2015
P Rankin	09/07/2015
V & C Renton	09/07/2015
K Lawlor	10/07/2015
D Heinen	11/07/2015
J Marinkovic	11/07/2015, 10/07/2015
Rumenka	11/07/2015
I Smithers & D Angelova	13/07/2015
J Higgins	16/07/2015
M Barron	16/07/2015, 17/07/2015, 16/12/2015
R Grimm	15,16&17/07/2015 11/08/2015, 12/08/2015, 03/09/2015
G Chen	20/07/2015
No Name	20/07/2015
G Turner	23/07/2015
M Kirk	24/07/2015
T Ewing	24/07/2015
M Slade	04/08/2015
J Hovington	06/08/2015, 29/10/2015
D Reed	25/08/2015, 25/09/2015, 20/10/2015, 15/11/2015, 15/11/2015, 18/11/2015, 05/01/2016, 07/01/2015
T Siddiq MP	04/09/2015

From	Date
E Chambers	05/09/2015, 08/10/2015, 16/11/2015
J Sachs	29/09/2015, 09/11/2015, 10/11/2015, 16/11/2016, 15/01/2016, 08/02/2016
A Christiansen	04/10/2015
A Foden	04/10/2015
A Kramer	04/10/2015
A Laden	04/10/2015
C Green	04/10/2015
C Tobelem	04/10/2015
D Bethlehem	04/10/2015
D Greene	04/10/2015
DT Hsiung	04/10/2015
E Strange	04/10/2015
G Lee	04/10/2015, 19/10/2015
H Nowell-Smith	04/10/2015
HP Bogard	04/10/2015
J Manthorpe	04/10/2015
J Nasatyr	04/10/2015
J Snyder	04/10/2015
J Tims	04/10/2015
J Walker	04/10/2015
K Barron	04/10/2015
K Fernald	04/10/2015
K Levina	04/10/2015
K Morris	04/10/2015
M Jameson	04/10/2015
O Pavlova	04/10/2015
P Royston	04/10/2015
Q Lloyd-Harris	04/10/2015
R Brandon	04/10/2015
R Rosen	04/10/2015
RL Bunker	04/10/2015
S & D Montague	04/10/2015
S Gaudenzi	04/10/2015
S Perth	04/10/2015

From	Date
Y Klemperer	04/10/2015
A Charvet	05/10/2015
A&G Raingold	06/10/2015
B Alter	06/10/2015
B Bullock & K Dahlstrom	06/10/2015
B Tankel	06/10/2015
C Askar	06/10/2015
C Jackman	06/10/2015
D Schumacher	06/10/2015
Dr K von Abrams	06/10/2015
Dr S Collins	06/10/2015
E Broomberg	06/10/2015
E Raff	06/10/2015 16/11/2015
E Solnick	06/10/2015
FT Unkan	06/10/2015
G Denniss	06/10/2015
G Maclean	06/10/2015
G Young	06/10/2015
GP Adams	06/10/2015
H Djurkovik	06/10/2015
J Ezekiel	06/10/2015
J Israelsohn	06/10/2015
J Johnson	06/10/2015
J Mishon	06/10/2015
J Stephenson	06/10/2015
J Veale	06/10/2015, 04/12/2015
K & G Balint-Kurti	06/10/2015
L Veale	06/10/2015
M Dreyfus-Terrett	06/10/2015
M Monjardino	06/10/2015
R & R Vanderkar	06/10/2015
S Abraham	06/10/2015
S Khanna	06/10/2015
S Malin	06/10/2015
T Haiman	06/10/2015
T Salmon	06/10/2015
T Tugnut	06/10/2015

From	Date
O Kooij	07/10/2015
S Cheifetz	07/10/2015
V Solti	07/10/2015
A Eastman	08/10/2015
C Cowdray	08/10/2015
C Eschenbach	08/10/2015
J Ooi	09/10/2015
A Richards	12/10/2015
J & H Heitz Jackson	12/10/2015
M Crossick	12/10/2015
R Sutton	12/10/2015
T Tugnut	12/10/2015
B Barnett	13/10/2015
G Deane	13/10/2015
J Huntington	13/10/2015
L van der Pump	13/10/2015
E Brooks	14/10/2015
H Hallam	14/10/2015
R Fletcher	14/10/2015
R Mallard	14/10/2015
A Plattner	15/10/2015
D Cheifetz	15/10/2015
P Symonds	15/10/2015
C & C Rozes	16/10/2015
E Beinart	16/10/2015
V Stern	16/10/2015
A Brownjohn	17/10/2015
J Clarke	17/10/2015
A Stevens	18/10/2015, 01/12/2015
A Stocker	18/10/2015
A Thompson	18/10/2015
B Alden	18/10/2015
M Gretton	18/10/2015
M Herbst	18/10/2015
R Fletcher	18/10/2015
TL Wingrove	18/10/2015
A Nottage	19/10/2015
G Fitzgerald	19/10/2015
G Riley	19/10/2015
H Gregory	19/10/2015
J Lasik	19/10/2015
N Pearce	19/10/2015
P Cocks	19/10/2015
R Hopkirk	19/10/2015
G Avshalom	19/10/2015

From	Date
S Parry-Wingfield	19/10/2015
V Renton	19/10/2015
C Castelino	20/10/2015
L Stern	20/10/2015
M Bottcher	20/10/2015
R Morris	20/10/2015
S Bagherzade	20/10/2015
S Courtin & C Despins	20/10/2015
Yee	20/10/2015
D Court	21/10/2015
M Hall	21/10/2015
M McKinnon	21/10/2015
P Magnus	21/10/2015
C Michaelides	22/10/2015
L Darlington	22/10/2015
O Buhus	22/10/2015
H Stevens	23/10/2015
J eEarl	23/10/2015
M Shakeshaft	23/10/2015
P Peacock	23/10/2015
M Mackie	25/10/2015
R & E Kernick	25/10/2015
D Bernasconi	26/10/2015
D Gluckman	27/10/2015
B Smith	28/10/2015
J Webster	28/10/2015
L Klein	28/10/2015
S Stahl	28/10/2015
S Tylerman	28/10/2015
C Conaré	29/10/2015
E Evans	29/10/2015
M Lange	29/10/2015
E Evans	30/10/2015
L Corbin	30/10/2015
E Peel	02/11/2015, 03/11/2015, 04/11/2015, 04/11/2015
F de Freitas	02/11/2015
S Hadida	02/11/2015
L Tyndall	03/11/2015
C Heinsen	04/11/2015
K Parish	04/11/2015
M Vaswani	04/11/2015
J Richardson	05/11/2015
R Mistry	05/11/2015
D Strelitz	06/11/2015

From	Date
F Radford	06/11/2015, 02/12/2015
M Pharey	06/11/2015
D Preston	07/11/2015
K Bligh	08/11/2015, 15/12/2015
A Brightrell	09/11/2015
B Feder	09/11/2015
H Patel	09/11/2015
M Tornero	09/11/2015
R Oliner	10/11/2015
A Ziv	11/11/2015
M Högel	11/11/2015
R Olins	11/11/2015
V Phillips	11/11/2015
L McNeir	12/11/2015
L Michael	12/11/2015
H Braunsberg	14/11/2015
E Bonzanigo	16/11/2015
F Papageorgiou	17/11/2015
E Battaglia Trovato	19/11/2015
L Duggan	20/11/2015, 05/12/2015
S Miles	21/11/2015
D Ury	24/11/2015
S Hunter	24/11/2015
D Farrell	25/11/2015
C Esmond	30/11/2015
S Schlemmer	01/12/2015
M Woper	04/12/2015
M Hillman	19/12/2015
M Chordia	20/12/2015
C Woodcock	22/12/2015
E Moylan	17/01/2016
S Step	18/01/2016
Cllr CL Leyland	21/01/2016
W Bartlett, LB Camden	16/11/2015
S Morand	undated

Annex B: Conditions

1. The works hereby permitted shall be begun not later than the end of three years from the date of this consent.
2. The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the approved plans listed below.

PL_099 P3, PL_100 P2, PL_101 P1, PL_102 P1, PL_105 P3, PL_106 P1, PL_107 P2, PL_108 P1, PL_113 P2, PL_119 P1, PL_121 P1, PL_123 P1, PL_124 P1, PL_161 P1, PL_162 P1, PL_163 P1, PL_164 P1, PL_170 P1, PL_171 P1, PL_172 P1, PL_173 P1, PL_200 P1, PL_201 P2, PL_202 P1, PL_203 P1, PL_204 P1, PL_205 P1, PL_206 P1, PL_207 P1, PL_210 P1, PL_211 P1, PL_401 P1, PL_402 P1, PL_403 P1, PL_404 P1, PL_405 P1, PL_406 P1, LL443-100-001 P1, LL443-100-002 P2, LL443-100-003 P1, LL443-100-004 P1, LL443-100-005 P2, LL443-100-006 P1, LL443-100-007 P1, LL443-100-100, LL443-200-101.
3. No part of the development hereby permitted shall be occupied until the following have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority
 - a) full details of hard and soft landscaping and means of enclosure of all un-built, open areas [such details/shall include details of any proposed earthworks including grading, mounding and other changes in ground levels as well as the delivery of a feature of public art.]
 - b) a scheme for replacement trees, including details of tree pit locations, viability and a planting programme.
 - c) a planting programme and landscape aftercare plan.The development shall be undertaken in accordance with the approved details including the planting program.
4. Development works (other than demolition) shall not take place until plans showing the levels at the interface of the relevant phase of development with the boundary of the property and the public highway have been submitted to and approved in writing by the council. Thereafter the development shall be carried out in accordance with the details approved.
5. No plant or machinery shall be installed on the external parts of the building other than in the areas indicated as plant areas on the plans hereby approved.
6. Prior to the installation of any mechanical plant, an acoustic report demonstrating how any mechanical plant to be installed will accord with the noise and vibration standards as set out in the Local Development Framework and Camden Planning Guidance shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The report shall include such manufacturer's specifications and details of noise and vibration mitigation measures as necessary. The plant shall not be operated other than in complete accordance with such measures approved.
7. At 1 metre outside the windows of any neighbouring habitable room the level of noise from all plant and machinery shall be at all times at least 5 decibels below the existing background noise levels, expressed in dB(A) at such locations. Where the noise from the plant and machinery is tonal in character the differences in these levels shall be at least 10 dB(A).
8. No more than 1100sqm gross external area of floorspace shall be provided within use classes A1-A3.

9. Before any ducting and ventilation is installed associated with the proposed Class A uses details of extract ventilating systems shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. Such details to include routing of ducts and discharge points and associated acoustic isolation and sound and vibration attenuation measures and an Acoustic Impact report prepared by a suitably qualified and experienced acoustic engineer which sets out how the equipment would meet the council's published noise and vibration standards.
10. The acoustic isolation shall thereafter be maintained in effective order. In the event of no satisfactory ventilation being provided, no primary cooking shall take place on the premises.
11. Any Class A use hereby permitted shall not be carried out outside the following times:
08:00hrs to 23:00hrs Sunday to Thursday and Bank Holidays and 08:00hrs to 00:00hrs on Friday and Saturday.
12. Outdoor seating areas associated with the Class A uses shall be cleared of customers between 22:00 and 08:00 hours, 7 days a week.
13. The shop front windows to the retail and food drink units shall be used for display purposes and the window glass must not be painted or obscured.
14. Development shall not commence below ground level until a scheme for the following has been submitted to and approved in writing by the council:
 - a) an intrusive land contamination survey and the written results. Laboratory results must be provided as numeric values in a formatted electronic spread sheet.
 - b) a remediation scheme, if necessary, shall be agreed in writing with the Local Planning Authority.The scheme as approved shall be implemented before any part of the development hereby permitted is occupied.
15. Development works (other than Demolition) shall not take place until details of the following micro climate mitigation measures have been submitted to and approved in writing by the council.
 - the raising of the proposed balustrade on the west-facing penthouse to 1.8m in height and mitigation in the area of the eastern site boundary adjacent to the Hampstead TheatreDevelopment shall not be carried out other than in accordance with the approved measures.
16. Prior to the occupation of the first residential unit three of the proposed basement car parking spaces shall include access to an electrical charging point.
17. (i) Works below ground level shall not start until detailed design and construction method statements for all of the ground floor structures, foundations and basements and for any structures below ground level, including piling (temporary and permanent) have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. These shall:
 - Accommodate the proposed location of the HS2 structures and tunnels.
 - Accommodate ground movement and associated effects arising from the construction thereof, and;
 - Mitigate the effects of noise and vibration arising from the operation of the HS2 railway within the tunnels, ventilation shaft and associated below and above ground structures.

(ii) The design and construction method statements to be submitted under part (i) shall include arrangements to secure that, during any period when concurrent construction is taking place of both the development hereby permitted and of the HS2 structures and tunnels in or adjacent to the site of that development, the construction of the HS2 structures and tunnels is not impeded. The development shall be carried out in all respects in accordance with the approved design and method statement and all structures and works comprised within the development hereby permitted which are required by the approved design statements in order to procure the matters mentioned in part (i) shall be completed, in their entirety, before any part of the building(s) hereby permitted is/are occupied.

(iii) No works below ground level comprised within the development hereby permitted shall be carried out at any time when a tunnel boring machine used for the purposes of boring tunnels for the HS2 Ltd railway is within 100 metres of the land on which the development hereby permitted is situated.

18. Development works (other than demolition) shall not take place until details of the following have been submitted to, and approved in writing by, the Local Planning Authority:

- a) Facing materials of all buildings
- b) Details including typical sections at 1:10 of external windows and door frames.
- c) Details including materials typical of balconies and roof terraces.

The relevant part of the works shall not be carried out otherwise than in accordance with the details approved.

19. Prior to first occupation details of the following shall be submitted to, and approved in writing by, the Local Planning Authority:

- Shopfronts; including sections, elevations and materials

The relevant part of the works shall not be carried out otherwise than in accordance with the details thus approved.

20. Replacement trees that do not survive for five years after they are planted shall be replaced within the first available planting season.

21. Before any development commences details demonstrating how trees to be retained shall be protected during demolition and construction work shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the council. Such details shall be implemented as approved before any development commences and retained during the demolition and construction works, unless otherwise agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The approved works shall follow guidelines and standards set out in BS5837:2012 "Trees in Relation to Construction". All trees on the site, or parts of trees growing from adjoining sites, unless shown on the permitted drawings as being removed, shall be retained and protected from damage in accordance with the approved protection details.

22. None of the residential units shall be occupied until details of external lighting have been submitted to and approved by the Local Planning Authority. The external lighting details shall be implemented and retained in accordance with the approved details before any residential unit is occupied.

23. Before the occupation of any part of the development full details of cycle parking shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority and thereafter provided in accordance with the approved details. The approved cycle parking facilities shall be permanently retained thereafter.

24. Before any works or construction commences details of at least two real time particulate air quality monitors shall be submitted to and agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority. Such details shall include the location, number and specification of the monitors, including evidence of the fact that they have been installed in line with guidance outlined in the GLA's Control of Dust and Emissions during Construction and Demolition Supplementary Planning Guidance. The monitors shall be installed 1 month prior to the development taking place and must be retained and maintained on site for the duration of the development in accordance with the details thus approved. Real time data from the monitors should be available online, and council officers provided access to this data. In addition, quarterly reports should be sent to the Air Quality officer for the duration of the works. These should detail any exceedences of the trigger action level (which is 250 ug/m³), and the action that was taken to remedy this.
25. Before any plant is installed details of the proposed CHP (combined heat and power) engine and any required mitigation measures to demonstrate that the Mayor's 'Band B' NO_x emissions standards will be adhered to must be submitted to the Local Authority and approved in writing. The measures shall be installed in accordance with the approved details.
26. Prior to occupation, details (installation contracts, photographs) of the approved CHP engine and required mitigation measures to demonstrate that the Mayors 'Band B' NO_x emissions standards will be adhered to must be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. Thereafter, these measures shall be retained in accordance with the approved details.
27. Before any development commences details of proposed u-values and the approach to thermal bridging shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details.
28. The development shall achieve 60% BREEAM score for the retail (A Class), retail/LUL and community floorspace within the buildings.
29. Before first occupation details of the brown roof in the area indicated on the approved roof plan of the tower element shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. No part of the buildings shall be occupied until the approved details have been implemented and these works shall be permanently retained and maintained thereafter.
30. Before the first residential unit is occupied details of mechanical ventilation shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the council. Prior to occupation of any residential unit the mechanical ventilation shall be installed and be in full working in the residential units, as the approved details. All such measures shall thereafter be retained and maintained.
31. Before development commences detailed design and assessment reports and outline method statements (in consultation with London Underground) for all of the foundations, basement and ground floor structures, or for any other structures below ground level, including piling (temporary and permanent), shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning authority, such reports shall:
 - provide details on all structures over and adjacent to LU assets
 - accommodate the location of the existing London Underground structures and tunnels
 - accommodate ground movement arising from the construction thereof
 - mitigate the effects of noise and vibration arising from the adjoining

operations within the structures and tunnels and mitigate against any EMC (Electromagnetic Compatibility) issues arising from the construction of the new plant.

The development shall thereafter be carried out in all respects in accordance with the approved design and assessment report, method statements and subject to an agreed monitoring strategy, and all structures and works comprised within the development which are required by the approved design statements in order to procure the matters mentioned in paragraphs of this condition shall be completed, in their entirety, before any part of the building hereby permitted is occupied.

32. The proposed Class A uses will operate within use classes A1, A2, and A3 only.
33. Before any residential unit is occupied a scheme to demonstrate that each dwelling hereby approved achieves a maximum internal water use of 105 litres/person/day, allowing 5 litres/person/day for external water use, shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The development shall be constructed in accordance with the approved scheme and retained thereafter.

Report to the Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government

by Graham Dudley BA (Hons) Arch Dip Cons AA RIBA FRICS

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government

Date 23 September 2015

Town and Country Planning Act 1990

Essential Living (Swiss Cottage) Ltd

The London Borough of Camden

Inquiry commenced on 14 July 2015

100 Avenue Road, London NW3 3HF

File Ref: APP/X5210/W/14/3001616

File Ref: APP/X5210/W/14/3001616

100 Avenue Road, London NW3 3HF

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 against a refusal to grant planning permission.
- The appeal is made by Essential Living (Swiss Cottage) Ltd against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Camden.
- The application Ref 2014/1617/P, dated 28 February 2014, was refused by notice dated 3 October 2014.
- The development proposed is the demolition of the existing building and redevelopment with a 24 storey building and a part 7 part 5 storey building comprising a total of 184 residential units (class C3) and up to 1,041sqm of flexible retail/financial or professional or café/restaurant floorspace (classes A1/A2/A3) inclusive of part sui generis floorspace or potential new London Underground station access fronting Avenue Road and up to 1,350sqm for community use (Class D1) with associated works including enlargement of the existing basement level to contain disabled car parking spaces and cycle parking, landscaping and access improvements.

Summary of Recommendation: The appeal be allowed subject to conditions

Procedural Matters

1. The inquiry was held on 14 – 17 July, 20 – 24 July and 10 August 2015. The site visit was made on Wednesday 22 July 2015.
2. This report includes a description of the application site and surrounding area, the gist of the cases made at the inquiry and my conclusions and recommendation. I have attached all documents, including proofs of evidence/statements and plans submitted to the inquiry. These are as originally submitted and do not take account of how the evidence may have been affected during the inquiry.

The Site and Surroundings¹

3. The statement of common ground² agreed between the London Borough of Camden and Essential Living (Swiss Cottage) Ltd and the design and access statement provide detailed information on the site and context. Also useful in terms of looking at the wider area is the plan submitted by Save Swiss Cottage Action Group³ although locally listed buildings should be identified in the Camden Local List⁴.
4. The appeal site is in the designated Town Centre that was extended to include the appeal site in the recent past⁵. It is a linear centre following the Finchley Road, with the appeal site at the southern end and with the library/leisure centre beyond⁶. There was some question as to whether the appeal site was in Central

¹ It is useful to look at CD 1.6 the Design and Access Statement. Aerial photographs of the area are shown on pages 4, 5 and 6. A location plan showing the context and location of nearby buildings is at page 9. Nearby conservation areas/listed buildings are shown on page 10 and these are further identified in the Heritage statement at CD1.9. Existing building heights can be seen on pages 16 and 17 in CD 1.6

² Document CD 1.66, CD1.9, CD2.0 and CD2.1

³ Document IQ41

⁴ Document CD 5.4

⁵ Document 1.66 page 8 paragraph 3.24

⁶ Document CD 1.6 page 9 – blue outline

London. The London Plan⁷ shows Camden as being within the Central London Sub Region.

5. There are some representations suggesting loss of open space⁸. However, the open space is shown in document C2 page 14 fig 2. It can be seen that the open space does not extend up to the existing building and does not include the nearby north south walkway. Although the proposed development would be wider than the existing building, it would not encroach on to the public open space.
6. The appeal site is not in a conservation area, but there are several conservation areas nearby, the closest being the Belsize Park Conservation Area and the Fitzjohn and Netherhall Conservation Area. South Hampstead Conservation Area is to the west, Elsworthy Road Conservation Area to the south east, St John's Wood Conservation Areas to the south and Alexandra Road Conservation Area to the south west⁹.
7. The site fronts Avenue Road near to College Crescent and the Swiss Cottage/Finchley Road Gyratory and is adjacent to the Swiss Cottage London Underground Station. To the north of the site is Eton Avenue, which is pedestrianised near to the appeal site and is used on a regular basis for street markets. To the east is the designated Swiss Cottage Open Space. Also to the east side fronting Eton Avenue is the Hampstead Theatre and beyond the open space are properties fronting Winchester Road, some of which are within the Belsize Conservation Area. These are mainly residential, but with some commercial uses at street level and the Winchester Project towards the southern end and the Mora Burnet House elderly persons home on the corner with Eton Avenue. Across Eton Avenue from the appeal site is the Central School of Speech and Drama.
8. To the south of the appeal site is the grade II listed Swiss Cottage Library and between it and the existing building at the appeal site, and directly adjacent to it, is the grade II listed Hampstead Figure Sculpture. To the east of this is the Swiss Cottage Leisure Centre and beyond to the east the Visage building.
9. On the opposite side of Avenue Road is the grade II listed Regency Lodge, a large block of mid 20th century flats. Also across the main road from the appeal site are Ye Olde Swiss Cottage public house, Overland House and Cresta House flats¹⁰.
10. Currently the office building at the appeal site is unused. The height of this building reduces from 6 to 3 storeys as it approaches the Swiss Cottage library and it had some restaurant uses at ground level. The building dates from the 1980s and the project architect for that scheme, who opposes the current proposal, provides information about its design¹¹.

⁷ Document CD 4.0 page 61 Map 2.1 Sub-regions

⁸ See paragraph [144]

⁹ Document IQ41

¹⁰ Document IQ8

¹¹ Document R7

Planning Policy

11. The planning policies relevant to the development as a whole are set out in the Statement of Common Ground¹². The policies that are relevant to the main two reasons for refusal as set out in the Reasons for Refusal are Camden Local Development Framework Core Strategy [CS] Policies CS5, CS14 and CS15 and Camden Local Development Framework Development Policies [DP] DP24, DP25, DP26 and DP31. The relevant London Plan (2015) Policies [LP] are 2.15, 3.3, 3.4, 3.5, 3.6, 3.7, 3.8, 3.9, 3.10, 3.11, 3.12, 4.1, 4.7, 4.8, 5.1 and 5.2.
12. CS Policy CS3¹³ indicates that the council will promote appropriate development in highly accessible areas and the town centre of Finchley Road/Swiss Cottage is identified. They are considered to be suitable for homes, shops, food and drink, offices, community facilities and uses that are likely to increase demand for travel. Development is to take account of amenity and community safety.
13. CS Policy CS5¹⁴ reiterates that the overall approach of the CS is to manage Camden's growth to make sure that its opportunities and benefits are delivered and sustainable development achieved, while continuing to preserve and enhance the features that make Camden an attractive place to live, work and visit. Particular consideration is to be given to providing sustainable buildings and spaces of the highest quality, protecting and enhancing the environment and heritage and the amenity and quality of life of local communities. It seeks to protect the amenities of Camden residents and those working and visiting the area, making sure that the impact of development on occupiers and neighbours is fully considered. It also seeks to ensure development contributes towards strong and successful communities by balancing the needs of development with the needs and characteristics of local areas and communities.
14. CS Policy CS6 relates to providing new homes seeking to maximise the supply of additional housing to meet or exceed Camden's targets. This includes affordable housing where the target is for 50% of homes to be affordable.
15. CS Policy CS7¹⁵ promotes Camden's centres and shops.
16. CS Policy CS14¹⁶ promotes high quality places and the conservation of the heritage assets. It requires development of the highest standard of design that respects local context and character, preservation and enhancement of Camden's rich and diverse heritage assets and their settings, including conservation areas, listed buildings and historic parks and gardens, promoting high quality landscaping and works to streets and public spaces. While the need to preserve and enhance is written into the policy, supporting text indicates the responsibility to preserve and, where possible, to enhance heritage of important buildings. Reference is made to DP Policy DP25.
17. CS Policy CS15¹⁷ seeks to protect and improve parks and open spaces, encouraging biodiversity. It indicates that the council will protect and improve

¹² Document CD 1.66 page 10 Section 5

¹³ Document CE 4.5 page 26

¹⁴ Document CD 4.5 page 31

¹⁵ Document CD4.5 page 46

¹⁶ Document CD 4.5 page 89

¹⁷ Document CD 4.5 page 96

Camden's parks and open spaces. Open spaces will be protected. The policy recognises the shortage of open space in Camden. Text to the policy notes development on sites adjacent to open space will only be allowed if it respects the size, form and use of that open space and does not cause harm to its wholeness, appearance or setting, or harm public enjoyment of the space¹⁸.

18. DP Policy DP24¹⁹ aims to secure buildings of the highest standard of design and will expect developments to consider character, setting, context and the form and scale of neighbouring buildings.
19. DP Policy DP25²⁰ seeks to conserve Camden's heritage. The council will take account of conservation area statements, appraisals and management plans when assessing applications within conservation areas. Only development within conservation areas that preserves and enhances the character and appearance of the conservation area should be permitted. Development outside of a conservation area that causes harm to the character and appearance of that conservation area will not be permitted. In relation to listed buildings development will not be permitted if it would cause harm to the setting of a listed building. Accompanying text to the policy indicates the character and appearance of conservation areas can also be affected by development which is outside of conservation areas, but visible from within them. This includes high, bulky buildings, which can have an impact on areas some distance away, as well as adjacent premises. The council will therefore not permit development in locations outside conservation areas that it considers would cause harm to the character, appearance or setting of the area.
20. DP Policy DP26²¹ seeks to protect the quality of life of occupiers and neighbours by only granting permission for development that does not cause harm to amenity and factors to be considered are visual privacy and overlooking, overshadowing and outlook, sunlight, daylight and artificial light levels, microclimate, fumes and dust and the inclusion of appropriate attenuation measures. Explanatory text to the policy notes that it is expected that the potential negative impacts of the development on neighbours will be considered at the design stage to prevent negative impacts. It notes that to assess whether acceptable levels of daylight and sunlight are available the British Research Establishment's Site Layout Planning for Daylight and Sunlight – A Guide to Good Practice²² will be used.
21. DP Policy DP31²³ relates to the provision of, and improvements to, open space and outdoor sports and recreation facilities. The policy strongly promotes provision of open space on the development site, but recognises that this is not always going to be the case. Where this is the case developments should provide an appropriate financial contribution towards improving existing open space.

¹⁸ Document CD4.5 page 98 paragraph 15.6

¹⁹ Document CD4.6 page 93

²⁰ Document CD4.6 page 97

²¹ Document CD4.6 page 101

²² Document CD4.6 page 102

²³ Document CD4.6 page 113

22. LP Policy 2.15²⁴ relates to town centres. It notes that the Mayor, boroughs and other stake holders should co-ordinate the development of London's network of town centres in the context of Map 2.6 and Annex 2 so they provide the main focus beyond the Central Activities Zone for commercial development and intensification, including residential development.
23. LP Policy 3.3 relates to increasing Housing Supply. The Mayor recognises the pressing need for more homes in London in order to promote opportunity and provide a real choice for all Londoners in ways that meet their needs at a price they can afford. It notes that boroughs should identify and seek to enable additional development capacity to be brought forward to supplement these targets having regard to other policies in the plan.
24. LP Policy 3.4 indicates that planning decisions should take account of local context and character, the design principles in chapter 7 and public transport capacity. Density guidance is given in Table 3.2, but it is noted that this should not be applied mechanistically.
25. LP Policy 3.5 relates to the quality of housing, requiring the highest quality internally and externally in relation to their wider context and environment. Development should enhance the quality of local spaces, taking account of physical context, local character, density, tenure and land use mix, and relationships with and provision of public, communal and open spaces, taking particular account of the needs of children and older people.
26. LP Policy 3.6 relates to the provision of children's and young people's play and informal recreation facilities.
27. LP Policy 3.7 encourages large residential developments including complementary non-residential uses in areas of high public transport accessibility. It is common ground that in terms of accessibility and the Public Transport Accessibility Level (PTAL) the site is at the highest level, being located near to bus routes and the underground.
28. LP Policy 3.8 aims to provide housing choice, including affordable housing, accessible housing and units of varying sizes and types.
29. LP Policy 3.9 aims to achieve mixed and balanced communities by tenure and household income through small and large scale developments, which foster social diversity, redress social exclusion and strengthen communities' sense of responsibility for and identity with their neighbourhoods.
30. LP Policy 3.10 defines affordable housing and LP Policy 3.11 defines affordable housing targets. LP Policy 3.12 notes the maximum amount of affordable housing should be sought and that this can be the subject of negotiation, taking account of individual circumstances, and allows for reappraising of viability studies.
31. LP Policy 4.1 is a strategic policy promoting developing London's economy.
32. LP Policy 4.7 relates to retail and town centre development. In principle retail, commercial, cultural and leisure development should be focused on sites within

²⁴ Document CD4.0 page 82

- town centres and those at the edge of town should be the subject of an assessment of impact.
33. LP Policy 4.8 supports a successful and diverse retail sector and related facilities and services.
 34. LP Policy 5.1 seeks to mitigate the effects of development on climate change and LP Policy 5.2 to minimising carbon dioxide emissions.
 35. LP Policy 7.7 relates to the location and design of tall and large buildings. Text to the policy²⁵ indicates that tall and large buildings are those that are substantially taller than their surroundings, cause a significant change to the skyline or are larger than the threshold sizes set for the referral of planning applications to the Mayor. There is no dispute between the parties that this proposal includes a tall building.
 36. Strategically these are to be part of a plan led approach to changing or developing an area by identification of appropriate, sensitive and inappropriate locations. Tall and large buildings should not have an unacceptable impact on their surroundings.
 37. Tall buildings should meet various criteria, including only being considered in areas whose character would not be affected adversely by the scale, mass or bulk of a tall or large building. They should relate well to the form, proportion, composition, scale and character of surrounding buildings, urban grain and public realm (including landscape features), particularly at street level. Individually or as a group, they should improve the legibility of an area, by emphasising a point of civic or visual significance where appropriate, and enhance the skyline and image of London. The highest standards of architecture and materials, including sustainable design and construction practices should be incorporated. Ground floor activities should provide a positive relationship to the surrounding streets and permeability of the site and wider area should be improved.
 38. Tall buildings should not affect their surroundings adversely in terms of microclimate, wind turbulence and overshadowing and should not impact on local or strategic views adversely.
 39. The impact of tall buildings in sensitive locations should be given particular consideration. Such areas might include conservation areas, listed buildings and their settings or other areas designated as being sensitive locations.
 40. LP Policy 7.8 relates to heritage assets and in relation to settings notes that development affecting heritage assets and their settings should conserve their significance, by being sympathetic to their form, scale, materials and architectural detail.
 41. Camden's Site Allocations Local Development Document identifies 100 Avenue Road, Swiss Cottage²⁶. Allocation guidance indicates a mixed use redevelopment including permanent residential, and other appropriate town centre uses, such as retail and employment. Development is expected to optimise the site to provide housing, including affordable housing, include retail use or food and drink

²⁵ Document CD4.0 page 285 paragraph 7.25

²⁶ Document CD 4.7 page 130 – Site 30

particularly to create active frontages at ground level. It is to respect the Swiss Cottage Open Space and contribute to the public realm with respect to public safety and improvements and contribute to local town centre improvements.

42. Accompanying text to the guidance indicates that in terms of acceptable scale and massing, there may be potential for an increase in height, especially at the northern end of the site, which does not abut directly on to the open space. While there is some potential for taller buildings, the acceptability will ultimately depend on the quality of the design and the relationship with the existing buildings in the area and the open space. It is noted that the development should not detrimentally impact on Swiss Cottage open space. It is also noted that the context to the nearby Belsize Conservation Area, and townscape issues with assessment of impact on sunlight, daylight and microclimate would need to be addressed.
43. Draft Interim Housing SPG²⁷ indicates that Town Centres are noted as being some of the most accessible locations in London and consequently higher density housing provision in these locations will play a key role in addressing London's requirement for additional housing. While the weight to this should be limited it does support the aims and objectives of LP Policy 3.7. The Mayor of London's Housing supplementary Planning Guidance of 2012 has similar aims identifying 1200 town centres of different sizes in London, and in line with the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) the London Plan anticipates that they will be the primary geographical focus for most new Londoners.
44. Conservation Area Statements are provided for all the conservation areas²⁸.

Planning History

45. There have been no recent relevant planning applications at the appeal site²⁹.

The Proposals

46. The proposal is for a total of 184 new homes, which will include private rented units as well as affordable housing units. It would include a mix of uses comprising flexible retail space at ground level and a smaller flexible commercial unit in the southern building with potential to provide a new access to Swiss Cottage underground station and floorspace for community use. It would be in two buildings. The taller would be 24 storeys and about 81m high, located at the northern end of the site. This would hold the majority of the residential units, but with a 'A' class unit at ground level. The second block is part 5 and part 7 storeys, with the 5 storey part on the Swiss Cottage open space side. This varies between about 19m and 27m. There would be a pedestrian link formed between the buildings from Avenue Road to the theatre/open space. There would be a basement area providing 12 parking spaces for use by those with disabilities, secure parking for 240 cycles and space for other ancillary service use.
47. The current anticipation is that the community space will be taken by the Winchester Project, currently located across the open space in Winchester Road.

²⁷ Document CD 4.4 Section 7.4

²⁸ Document G5

²⁹ Document R11 appendix 5 at page 44 provides some historic evidence to past history around the site

Evidence related to this use is provided by the Winchester Project³⁰. Space will also be set aside for Transport for London to improve the access to the Swiss Cottage Underground Station, if taken up by them.

Other Agreed Facts

48. For other agreed facts see the statement of common ground and addendum³¹. Generally the other parties opposing the appeal do not agree with the statement of common ground, particularly that all the reasons for refusal can be overcome through conditions/obligation.

The Case for Essential Living (Swiss Cottage) Ltd

49. The case for the appellant is set out in Docs A1 to A10, with closing submissions at IQ38. The material points are as follows.

Daylight and Sunlight³²

50. Reference is made to DP Policy 26 and that the council will take into account standards recommended in BRE Site Layout Planning for Daylight and Sunlight – A Guide to Good Practice (1991) [now updated to 2011]. In section 3.3 it deals with gardens and open spaces, noting that good site layout planning for daylight and sunlight should not limit itself to providing good natural lighting inside buildings. Sunlight in the spaces between buildings has an important impact on the overall appearance and ambience of a development³³. The guide gives advice on site layout planning to achieve good sunlight and daylight both within buildings and in the open spaces between them.
51. The BRE guidance indicates that at least half of the amenity areas listed (including parks) should receive at least two hours of sunlight on 21 March³⁴. The BRE research established that if the area of a space receives greater than 2 hours of sun on March 21st to greater than 50% of that area of that space, then the space would overall be a well sunlit one. This is on the basis that during the months when the sun is higher in the sky a greater percentage of the space would see sun at some point of the day.
52. The detailed analysis undertaken indicates that the BRE 'test' was met at March 21st. Planning Officers agreed that the proposal was in compliance with the BRE and recommended the scheme for approval. It is acknowledged that during the design process a different proposal was put to CABE (Design Council) that also complied with the guidance, but was not found acceptable by CABE. The scheme was subsequently redesigned and found acceptable by CABE.
53. Sunlight on the ground plots indicates that there is negligible alteration to the area that would experience less than 2 hours of sunlight. There would be no area that would receive less than 2 hours of sunlight to the main amenity space. The drawing of 2 hour sunlight shows very small patches that receive less than 2 hours sunlight. These are in the circulation spaces and are only less than 5% of

³⁰ Document IQ16

³¹ Documents CD1.66 and IQ30

³² Document A1 and appendices, CD1.10 and CD1.57

³³ Document CD1.57 page 18 paragraph 3.3.1

³⁴ Document CD1.57 page 18 paragraph 3.3.7

the area of circulation, with no impact on the main amenity space. This would comply with the BRE guidance. There is a suggestion that shadows on the Swiss Cottage Open Space have been underestimated because changes in levels are not accounted for, but that is not correct; the software used is in a standard form and takes account of levels.

54. The BRE guidance suggests that where a large building is proposed that may affect a number of gardens or open spaces it is often illustrative to plot a shadow plan showing the location of shadows at different times of the day and year³⁵, advising that where there are existing buildings looking at the before and after is useful. It also notes that it must be borne in mind that nearly all structures will create areas of new shadow, and some degree of transient overshadowing of a space is to be expected. It recommends the 21st March for the assessment, but that other dates such as 21st June may also be looked at, representing the best case of minimum shadow.
55. Shadow diagrams for 21st March, 21st June, 25th August and 21st December have been produced³⁶. These demonstrate that for the great majority of daylight hours throughout the year, the appeal scheme has no impact whatsoever in terms of sunlight and overshadowing. It is only in the summer months at later times of the day from mid afternoon onwards, the exact time varying slightly with each month, that there would be any additional impact on sunlit areas of the space.
56. There is no policy in relation to having views of the sun. In assessing the impact from local streets there would be an effect of the amount of time that the sun would be directly visible at different times of the year. The duration would be very limited and the hours of sunlight remaining visible would be significant in terms of amenity and comparable with other streets in London where there are tall buildings.
57. The technical study was extended to consider overshadowing of nearby gardens/amenity spaces located to the north east and east of the site³⁷. These show that the gardens receive at least 2 hours of sunlight on the ground on 21st March and no greater than 20% loss of sunlight between the existing and proposed situation. Tree canopies were excluded from the study. In terms of transient overshadowing, the diagrams show that many of the gardens do not get any overshadowing and where it does the additional overshadowing is fleeting, with no additional area of shadow lasting for greater than one hour in any one particular area. The drawings also indicate that either existing neighbouring properties or associated garden boundaries would have a far greater overshadowing effect, such that by the time the resultant overshadowing from the development falls upon the garden, any additional overshadowing from the development would be negligible. The additional overshadowing as a result of the proposal would also be negligible.
58. In respect of the Hampstead Theatre terrace, it is reasonable to assume that the main use would be in the summer months. The transient overshadowing plots demonstrate that the proposal will have no effect on the theatre terrace from sunrise to 4pm so would receive at least 10 hours of sunlight, well within the BRE

³⁵ Document CD1.57 page 19 paragraph 3.3.13

³⁶ Document A1 Appendices and CD 1.10.

³⁷ Document A1 appendices drawing 204, 205, 208 and 219

guidelines³⁸. The transient overshadowing would occur about 16:00 and be limited to no longer than 1hr as the Hampstead Theatre overshadows its own terrace from about 17:00. The additional overshadowing is minor.

59. Daylight to Cresta House has been considered, although it is acknowledged there was a mistake in identification of the building, referring to Overground House. Applying the BRE methodology it has been shown that the balconies restrict daylight availability to these properties and therefore burden neighbouring development. In the absence of balconies, all windows will satisfy the BRE guidance and in terms of daylight distribution will retain excellent daylight levels and it was noted at the inquiry that the difference in the length of the room compared with that identified would not alter the overall conclusion. Similarly daylight and sunlight have been assessed for Mora Burnet House and found to be acceptable.
60. There would also be some transient overshadowing of the street market during the course of the day, but this is for a relatively short period and there is already some shading by the large trees and the canopies provided for the stalls.
61. The reports have been assessed and verified by an independent daylight and sunlight expert on behalf of the council³⁹.

*Architecture*⁴⁰

62. The brief was for a high quality mixed-use, mixed tenure building. While the council probed whether there was a specific requirement, particularly in terms of space and height, the architect explained that the process was iterative and that there was significant consultation, not least with the council officers, with the design evolving with comments received.
63. The key principles were for a sustainable and efficient building meeting operational needs. It should be accessible, permeable with good connectivity, adaptable and resilient. There should be successful public spaces and active frontages with high quality architecture that integrates into the surroundings, specifically by reference to its form, proportions, composition, scale, mass and height, to reinforce a sense of place. The tall building was to reinforce the town centre, without detrimentally affecting the character of the surrounding area and to protect the residential amenity of surrounding occupiers.
64. The site's immediate setting is the busy town centre, which is unfortunately dominated by the multi-lane main roads and busy traffic, with Swiss Cottage an important focus for the local area, but the site and its context lack a sense of place. There are significant civic facilities at the site, including the library, leisure centre and the adjacent Swiss Cottage underground station, which is one of the least legible in London. The scale of the large post-war buildings on the other side of Finchley Road is more appropriate to the area than the existing building on the appeal site.
65. There are substantial buildings on the north and south sides of Finchley Road in the town centre. To the south east of the appeal site is the post war Chalcots

³⁸ Document A1 appendices drawings 216 and 217

³⁹ Document CD1.42 and 1.43

⁴⁰ Document A9 also see Design and Access Statement CD1.6

- Estate high rise and low rise housing, which has four towers. To the north, south and west of the town centre are areas of nineteenth century housing of good quality, much of it in conservation areas. There are views from these areas of nearby residential towers. There is an opportunity to provide a building to act as a marker for the town centre, offer enhanced legibility, improve the sense of place and provide active edges to the street.
66. The existing building at the site, which steps down from 6 to 3 storeys was a product of its time of construction in the 1980s, and has poor access and frontages, being designed before the creation of the Swiss Cottage Open Space. Its effect on the public realm and open space is negative.
67. The buildings to the west of Finchley Road are substantial: some between 10 and 12 storeys. The Swiss Cottage Open Space, Library and Leisure Centre have a different character and appearance. The grade II listed library is three storeys and was designed by Sir Basil Spence.
68. A stepped scheme was considered for the appeal site, but in consultation with the council officers it was agreed to proceed with the two block solution, with the taller element to the north, providing access from Avenue Road to the Swiss Cottage Open Space.
69. The height of the tower was not seen by the designers or council officers and consultees as a target or a limit, but there had been previous iteration to that height and other tall buildings nearby. The tower was seen by the council, Design Council and GLA to offer opportunities for enhancement and to act as a marker building and focal point. The impact of the designs produced was tested against the context and in particular agreed views, sunlight and daylight and microclimate.
70. The conclusion was reached that it would have little additional impact in terms of daylight and sunlight over and above the existing building or in terms of a building half its height. The design was endorsed by key stakeholders, including the Design Council, CABE, the GLA and council officers⁴¹.
71. The two blocks are treated architecturally in a similar way, albeit in different forms and are effectively tenure blind. The tower has a massing and form with the silhouette slender and well proportioned and acknowledgement of the surroundings. The tower has a clear appearance of bottom, middle and top, with implied vertical break to the centre bays so that the façade has two main elements joined together.
72. The framed façade has a clear rhythm and proportion. The frames are removed from the lower and top levels and horizontal strings collect one, two and three floors together. There are retail uses on the low levels and amenity space on the top level. Between the frames are either glass openings or faience/terracotta panels of a contrasting colour.
73. On the top floors there is a change of expressions. These contain large family units with quick access to the amenity space above. Colours are yet to be decided, but the context suggests red panels in a white frame. At the ground floor the pilaster or frame above turns unmistakeably to columns. The bottom of

⁴¹ Documents CD 1.37, CD1.39 – CD1.41 and CD1.45-1.48

the northern block, covering two storeys, is glazed to the double height area of the concierge.

74. The southern block's south façade, facing the library, mediates in scale between the new building and the library, and acknowledges some of the library's simple fin expression. The east façade to the Swiss Cottage Open Space has a rhythm which reflects the greater number of balcony openings. The park side is based on a repetitive column and beam arrangement with recessed infill windows and panels.
75. The architecture of the proposed scheme is of high quality. The height, scale and massing of the appeal scheme have been carefully considered and respond to the site context. The tower would provide a well designed marker for the local area, including in views along main routes and from the wider residential neighbourhoods, as well as providing a strong frontage to Avenue Road and the Swiss Cottage Open Space.
76. The height of the tower is appropriate, with its greatest visual presence within the town centre and when seen along main roads. It is not generally visible from the residential hinterland. Residential towers are already an aspect of the residential hinterland, and of the setting of conservation areas, as is typical of the mixed character of London's townscape.
77. There will be townscape enhancements around the building and the connectivity between the building and its surroundings by the proposed ground floor uses will be a considerable benefit to the streets and Swiss Cottage Open Space. It will humanise and enliven the streetscape.
78. Concern was expressed about the view of the development from Primrose Hill⁴². But as can be seen in the photographs there are already views of tall buildings, and with the distance this development would have no unacceptable impact on the users of this park.

Heritage Assets

79. The decision maker is required to pay special attention to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character or appearance of a conservation area. Considerable importance and weight is to be accorded to this duty and is to be focused on the conservation area as a whole. The appeal is outside of any conservation area and the statutory duty does not extend to the setting⁴³.
80. Setting is defined as the surroundings in which a heritage asset is experienced and may be positive, negative or neutral in their contribution to significance of the asset. In this case it is assessed that the existing building and site do not make a positive contribution to the character and appearance of the adjacent and nearby conservation areas.
81. Development outside can have an effect on character and/or appearance, but such impact needs to have a nature and magnitude to be adverse to the character and appearance of the conservation area as a whole. In relation to this appeal the character and appearance of the conservation areas and the qualities

⁴² Document CD1.4 pages 50 – 52 also see Document R11 appendix 2 View 26

⁴³ Document A6 at Section 4 analyses the various conservation areas.

which give them their significance are a product of the buildings and spaces in the areas themselves, which largely sets them apart from their surroundings.

82. Because of the tall and large scale buildings close to the Belsize Conservation Area it is inevitable that where there are views out, such buildings are a common and well established part of the setting and its character and appearance⁴⁴. The appeal proposal, where visible, is predominantly seen in the existing context of 20th century residential and town centre development and it is concluded that there would be no adverse impact on the character and appearance of the conservation areas.
83. Where there are views in the conservation area where modern buildings play a lesser role in the existing character and appearance, the visual impact has the potential to be adverse, but nevertheless would be so limited in nature that it would not detrimentally affect the conservation area as a whole.
84. Account is also taken of the opportunity to provide improvement to the street scene on the western edge of the Belsize Conservation Area. Overall, the proposal would not have an adverse impact on the conservation area as a whole and would not result in harm to its significance. With regard to other conservation areas, given those dominated by larger-scaled buildings (Elsworthy Conservation Area), the distance from the appeal site and the nature of interposed development (Fitzjohn's & Netherhall and West Hampstead Conservation Areas) the appeal proposals will have no adverse impact on their character or appearance.
85. Even if it were found that there was some harm to character and appearance, while this would need to be accorded considerable importance and weight (or great weight) it would be less than substantial in terms of the Framework.

Listed Buildings

86. With respect to the Swiss Cottage Library, the appeal proposal would enhance its setting and thereby significance, through complementary architectural design and improved, shared public realm and related activity.
87. The Hampstead Figure Sculpture has been repositioned in the past nearer to the existing building on the appeal site and is not easily viewed from all around because it is close to the building. The proposal would enable the statue to be relocated more in keeping with the original location and allow all around viewing and so the proposed enhancements would be an improvement to the listed building, enhancing its special architectural and historic interest.
88. Regency Lodge is a large scale modern building in the town centre. While the setting would be affected it would not impact on the significance of the listed building.
89. The Belsize Fire Station is a notable building at the Junction of Eton Avenue and Lancaster Grove⁴⁵ and is grade II* listed. This was built around 1912/15 and designed by Charles Windmill to fit in with the other houses in the area.

⁴⁴ Document A6 page 7 Fig RM2 and page 11 RM4 show taller buildings near the appeal site

⁴⁵ Documents A6 page 28 photo RM10

Conservation Areas

Belsize Conservation Area

90. The Belsize Conservation Area is large and occupies land rising to the north, towards Hampstead village and is characterised by streets of mostly large detached and semi-detached villas dating from the late 19th century to the early 20th century of varied architectural styles, but with consistencies in detailing and materials⁴⁶. The conservation area statement notes that the character of the areas is largely derived from the mid 19th century Italianate villas, whilst noting 6 distinct character areas, reflecting different densities, scales and styles of building, within the overall whole. These are Belsize Park, Belsize Village, Eton Avenue, Glenloch, Primrose Gardens/Antrim Road and England's Lane. Belsize Park and Eton Avenue are the closest parts to the appeal site. The buildings in the Belsize Park have strong consistency in height, with mostly 3 storey buildings with lower ground and sometimes an attic level, with front gardens to the street. The consistency between buildings and their rhythm to the streets provides a strong sense of identity and unity.
91. Later buildings, including Manor Mansions, have contrasting brickwork with stucco banding. The grade II listed St Peter's church is a landmark feature and is visible more widely within the area.
92. To the south west of the area is College Crescent which is near to the town centre of Swiss Cottage. The buildings here are stucco with slate roofs, but with some variation of detailing. These are seen in the context of the modern Royal Central School of Speech and Drama and town centre buildings on the west side of the road.
93. Belsize Avenue's character is derived mainly from the large scale houses set back from the road with an avenue of trees along its length. It is wide, with grass verges, and the buildings comprise two main types: 3 storey paired villas and 2/3 storey terraced properties. There is some variation to the detailing and arrangement of the villas. There are some later buildings, including a terrace of late 1960s houses and Hillfield Court and Tudor Close from the 1930s.
94. Crossfield and Adamson Roads form part of the Eton College Estate and were developed speculatively by different developers in the 1870/1880s. The houses tend to be a bit plainer and of greater variety in both type and architectural style, but with general consistency to the building line and short front gardens defined by boundary walls. Adamson Road has cherry trees in the pavement and paired London Stock villas at the western end and red brick houses with brick detailing at the northern end with full height bays giving strong vertical emphasis.
95. Adamson Road meets Eton Avenue on the west edge of the conservation area, with a small triangular open space and mature trees providing the entrance into the area from Swiss Cottage Town Centre. The boundary includes part of the Royal School of Speech and Drama and goes up to the town centre⁴⁷. Eton Avenue is a consistent area of predominantly late Victorian housing with some

⁴⁶ Document CD2.6 The conservation area statement describes character and significance

⁴⁷ Document A6 page 24 photograph

pockets of Edwardian housing mainly, in the ownership of Eton College. The area includes Eton Avenue, Strathway Gardens, Fellow Road, and Winchester Road.

96. Eton Avenue and Strathway Gardens have mainly large detached red-brick houses built from about 1885-1900 with a considerable number listed grade II. There are extensive mature trees in the pavement. The buildings' style has domestic revival architectural influences and, although detailing and treatment of elevations varies, they provide a consistent character and appearance. From this area there are many views of the towers of the Chalcots Estate from within the conservation area⁴⁸. The west end of Eton Avenue, where it joins Adamson Road, is strongly influenced by the buildings in the adjacent town centre.
97. A section of Winchester Road and part of Fellows Road are within the conservation area and were laid out earlier than Eton Avenue and have a variety of building types, mainly of 3 storeys. Fellows Road is adjacent to the Chalcots Estate and has mainly 3 storey villas with brick walls and detailing, and further along there is a modern building, Godolphin House, and a mix of Victorian house with Arts and Crafts and Italianate detailing and many brick boundary walls to front gardens.
98. This part of the conservation area is readily seen in the context of modern development including to the Chalcots Estate, Visage building, Leisure Centre and Theatre⁴⁹.
99. Other parts of the conservation area are further away but again with character and appearance dominated by the styles of residential architecture. England's Lane sub area was an old lane that became a shopping street in the later 19th century. This is mainly formed of 3/4 storey terraces with shops at ground level.
100. The conservation area is large with some variety to identified sub-areas but with its overall character and appearance defined by 19th century residential development laid out in street form with much mature planting. The larger and taller modern buildings surrounding the area, including in the town centre and at the Chalcots Estate are commonly seen from within the conservation area.

Fitzjohn's and Netherhall Conservation Area

101. This is also a large conservation area with the street layout dominated by Fitzjohn's Avenue that runs through the centre with other streets running parallel, with the overall character set by the large houses and gardens. Because of the slope of the land there are some long views. While the houses are very similar in overall character there is a variety of architectural styles including neo-Gothic, classical Italianate, Queen Anne, Domestic Revival and Arts and Crafts with some properties individually designed by architects. The verdant planting adds considerably to its character, which is mainly that of a relatively quiet suburb. In summary the character and appearance of the area is derived from later 19th century residential development in a variety of architectural styles, combined with verdant planting. The general sloping nature of the land allows some distant views over the conservation area, in some instances to the Swiss Cottage town centre beyond.

⁴⁸ Document A6 page 27 photographs RM8 and RM9

⁴⁹ Document A6 page 30 photograph RM12

Elsworthy Conservation Area

102. This conservation area is located to the south east of the appeal site, beyond the library and leisure centre, road, large UCL Academy buildings and London Marriot Hotel. It extends from Primrose Hill Road to Avenue Road. The northern edge runs along King Henry's Road south of the Chalcots Estate and the southern edge abuts Primrose Hill. The Willett Development in sub area 3 is the most distinct part of the conservation area at Harley Road, Wadham Gardens and Elsworthy Road. It was developed in the late 1890s by William Willett. The houses are detached, but closely spaced, and are a mix of Arts and Crafts movement styling, with very mixed use of materials that include stucco and tile hanging and interesting detailing. The character of the area is derived from the style and layout of houses and views out that influence that character are towards Primrose Hill and to the north towards the Chalcots Estate.

South Hampstead Conservation Area

103. This area was originally named the Swiss Cottage Conservation Area, but was renamed to reflect the historical development of the area and its spatial and historic relationship with Hampstead as opposed to Swiss Cottage, which is on the east side of Finchley Road. It is a well preserved, leafy Victorian suburb, almost exclusively residential and largely homogenous in scale and character. There are mainly semi-detached and terraced late Victorian properties, usually constructed in red or gault brick with varied roofscapes and gables and interesting details and features in terracotta, brick and ironwork. Front gardens contribute to the character and appearance of the area, with ornate walls and vegetation.
104. There are some views out of the conservation area towards the Swiss Cottage Town Centre and its buildings. There are also views of the 20 storey tower blocks of Casterbridge and Snowman House.

Alexandra Road Conservation Area

105. This is to the south west of the appeal site and was built in the late 1960s. The development was a dramatically modern solution to housing and forms a long concrete terrace⁵⁰, with the principle buildings grade II* listed. The main buildings area constructed of shuttered concrete with flat roofs arranged in parallel blocks with a distinctive stepped form. The character and appearance of the conservation area is directly linked to the character and appearance of the buildings and their layout. These buildings are seen in views that include nearby towers⁵¹

St John's Wood Conservation Area

106. This has two separate conservation areas. The west area is just to the south of the Alexandra Road Conservation Area and the east part located to the west of Avenue Road comprising large detached villas dating from the mid 19th century. Because of the topography and intervening built form, inter-visibility with Swiss Cottage town centre is limited.

⁵⁰ Document A6 page 47 Figure RM10 and Photo RM27 and RM28

⁵¹ Document A6 page 48 Photo RM28

Other Matters

107. The appellant questions the council's five year supply arrangements⁵². It is argued that the council has masked the availability of general housing supply by including the provision of student accommodation in figures. It says there is a serious risk that the main needs of general housing will not be met. In any case, whether it is met or not, the 5 year supply figure is a minimum and there is agreement with the council that significant weight should be attached to the provision of the housing proposed.
108. The appellant acknowledges that the wind environment would be greater when compared with the baseline figure⁵³, which is to be expected if a tall building is constructed. The increase would be considered significant if conditions became unsuitable for the intended activities. Therefore, while some areas might become unsuitable for sitting during the windiest season it would not mean the area as a whole would not be usable; overall other areas would be suitable for use in the majority of locations.
109. The transport assessment shows that the development accords with relevant transport related policy guidance, is highly accessible being adjacent to Swiss Cottage underground station and on bus routes and while this is the anticipated use by residents etc. the numbers would not have a significant effect in relation to the overall numbers using the services. It would have a basement for servicing and disabled parking and provide an opportunity to improve the access to the underground. The impact would be mitigated by the travel plan, service plan, construction logistics plan and car park management plan. Paragraph 32 of the Framework indicates that development should only be prevented or refused on transport grounds where the residual cumulative impacts of development are severe.
110. The appellant identifies the public benefits of the proposal. Socially it would provide about 54 genuinely affordable homes and 130 private rented homes, meeting residential space standards. The mixed use and tenures provide a socially inclusive community.
111. In environmental terms, there would be innovative, attractive and distinctive architecture of high quality, replacing a poor and unattractive building. It would make a positive contribution to local distinctiveness, enhancing the townscape and legibility of the area, with the tower providing a focal point for the town centre and civic buildings. It would have a positive contribution to the library and nearby conservation areas. There would be improved permeability and connectivity and improved landscaping. It would be a very sustainable development in terms of transport and the building itself would have a high energy performance.
112. In economic terms the scheme would optimise the potential of the site with an appropriate mix of uses, putting the town centre at the heart of the community and providing vitality from the shops, restaurants, homes and social project and retaining the existing Eton Avenue Street Markets. It would generate jobs in

⁵² Document A3 page 21 paragraphs 2.95 onwards

⁵³ Document CD 1.11 page 9 (Also see Document IQ31)

construction and use, employing local people. It would directly and indirectly generate economic activity.

113. It meets the aspirations of the Framework and would be sustainable development.

The Case for the London Borough of Camden

114. The case for the London Borough of Camden is set out in Docs C1 to C5 with closing submissions at IQ37. The material points are:-
115. A key issue in the English Heritage-CABE Design Council : Guidance on Tall Buildings is the architectural quality of a tall building. Not only is the tower too tall, it is also too bulky and has an incongruous form which makes no reference to local distinctiveness derived from the character of the local environment. The brutalist and monolithic appearance is overbearing on all sides. There are no notable setbacks on the higher floors and no attempt has been made to soften the tower's impact on the skyline. The design does not mitigate the visual impact of the incongruous form by the articulation of modelling of the façades. The elevations are over complicated, with a profusion of horizontal and vertical elements creating a jagged effect of a threatening nature on the surrounding area. This is also the case for the lower block. The building is out of scale and fails to integrate with the surroundings. The increased size and bulk of the building will impact on the Swiss Cottage Open Space, adjacent listed buildings and conservation areas. The suggestion that there is a need to improve legibility is not a benefit as the site is not illegible at the moment.
116. The Swiss Cottage Library (grade II) is a small distance from the end of the development, with an open space between, where the Hampstead Figure Sculpture is located. The existing building steps down to the library, respecting its curved façade. The new building would be between 5 and 7 storeys and would be dominant and overbearing. The spacing of the vertical elements of the design does not reflect those of the library, which are much finer and closely spaced.
117. The change in height of the western elevation would also unacceptably jar with the simple form of the library. The tower would be an unwelcome feature and not harmonise with the library that has a strong horizontal emphasis. It would be an unwelcome intrusion because of its threatening, overbearing and heavy appearance. It would be an unacceptable backdrop on the skyline. The materials would also not complement the high quality materials used on the library. The stone or reconstituted stone of the new development would unacceptably contrast with the Portland stone of the library, as would the proposed red panels. The contrast in scale, textures and colour would be unwelcome.
118. The sculpture is a nationally important post war example, portraying a reclining abstract bronze figure. It is an integral part of the civic centre, that includes the library. The sculpture is only a few metres from the end elevation of the proposed building, which would compete with the sculpture. However, because the sculpture is a robust, abstract design it will hold its own in the changed setting and would still be appreciated for its three dimensional qualities and textural qualities from other angles. There would be less than substantial harm.

119. Regency Lodge is on the west side of Avenue Road and to the south of the appeal site. It is of 6 storeys and was designed between the wars by Robert Atkinson. It is a flat roofed building, again with horizontal emphasis, so will suffer limited harm as a result of the proposed development. The excessive height, bulk, mass, form and scale of the proposal, as portrayed in terms of impact on the setting of the library, will be similar on Regency Lodge. However, because of its solid character, the larger scale of its façades and its location on an island site the impact would be less, but would still be less than substantial harm.
120. The proposal would also cause some harm to non-designated heritage assets, including the Royal Central School of Speech and Drama, Hampstead Theatre, Swiss Cottage Leisure Centre and Swiss Cottage Open Space. It would also affect the setting of Ye Olde Swiss Cottage public house, a well known local landmark.
121. The 24 storey tower would loom over the adjacent Royal Central School of Speech and Drama and have an overbearing and oppressive effect. It would also unbalance the gateway that this building forms with the existing building at the appeal site. It would also impact on the external space in front of the building. The Hampstead Theatre will also be totally dominated by the tower and adjacent blocks, because of their height, scale, bulk and mass, as will be the adjacent Swiss Cottage Open Space that is used as an area of congregation. The Swiss Cottage Leisure Centre is a 'light weight' design and relatively low building with a low key appearance, complementing the setting of the adjacent listed library. The proposed development, because of its size and height, would dominate and encroach on the leisure centre.
122. The development, particularly the tower, would loom over Ye Olde Swiss Cottage public house.
123. Low rise 19th and 20th century domestic buildings prevail in the streets adjacent to the appeal site. The large majority of these buildings are in conservation areas because of their high architectural value and the contribution they make to the townscape, and this includes listed buildings. The setting of these properties will be affected by the construction of the proposed 24 storey tower and adjacent 5/7 storey block. It will cause harm to the visual aspect of many of the tree-lined streets, severely compromising numerous views out of the six surrounding conservation areas. The conservation areas affected would be Belsize Conservation Area, Elsworthy Conservation Area, Fitzjohn's and Netherhall Conservation Area, South Hampstead Conservation Area, Alexandra Road Estate Conservation Area and St John's Wood Conservation Area⁵⁴. It was confirmed at the inquiry and in the rebuttal evidence that when considering harm to conservation areas, it is in consideration of the whole of the conservation area. At the inquiry the council confirmed that the harm to Belsize Conservation Area, Fitzjohn's and Netherhall Conservation area and South Hampstead Conservation Area would, in terms of the Framework be 'substantial harm' and for the others, 'less than substantial' harm.
124. The Swiss Cottage Open Space is identified in the Local Development Document Proposals Map⁵⁵. The space includes the rectangular area between the

⁵⁴ Document C1 page 54 to 84 considers the views of the appeal site from the various conservation areas

⁵⁵ Document C2 page 13 Fig 1 shows extract

appeal site and Winchester Road and between the Hampstead Theatre and Leisure Centre. It includes the Multi Use Games Area and playground that abuts the leisure centre and the land between the Swiss Cottage Library and appeal site. It is an important open space with the next nearest being Primrose Hill.

125. The space is adjacent to many civic buildings, theatre, library and leisure centre and underground entrance, so attracting people from a wider area than just locals. The existing buildings around it exert a low level of influence on the space and their heights and juxtaposition complement it. Although the proposed building would not intrude into the Swiss Cottage Open Space⁵⁶ it is wider than the existing building, so is closer to the Open Space. The height of the building is considerably greater⁵⁷. The increased height by the library will make the building appear significantly larger than existing and would be far more dominant than the existing building. The impact of the building on the amenity of existing users of the space, because of the increased size, bulk and scale, would be much greater. It would loom over and dominate the open space.
126. The space has been visited on a number of occasions, particularly in the afternoon when the effect of shading would be at its most, and it was generally seen to be well used, including the playground and this is at a time when the appeal site is currently empty. However, it was also noted that the playground and games area use does not appear to be weather dependent. In clement weather the open space is generally used for recreational purposes, with generally greater use at the weekends. The general impression is that the shadow areas when present are little used.
127. It is estimated that about 18% more shadow would occur at 14.00 on 21 March. 6 out of the 27 people would be affected. People using the walkway by Eton Avenue would also be affected. It would place a greater proportion of the main part of the Swiss Cottage Open Space in shadow from 13.00 - 16.00. The combination of the increased shading and the visual impact of the buildings would adversely affect all users of the open space.
128. It is estimated that about 30% more shadow would occur at 17.00 on 21 June than existing. On the 3 June at 16.30 there were about 95 people using the space of which about 50 would be in area that would be shaded by the proposed development. The area around the theatre and its patio area would be shaded, making it less desirable to sit out.
129. It is estimated that about 40% more shadow would occur at 18.00 on 21 June than existing. About 55 of the 92 people seen using the space on 3 June at 17.30 would be affected by the increased shading.
130. It is estimated that about 29% more shadow would occur at 17.00 on 25 August than existing. About 60 of the 95 people using the space would be affected by the increased shading on the 3 June at 16.30. From about June to August about 3 hours of each day would have increased shading. Overall, between March and September it is concluded that the impact of the buildings proposed would be to cast materially greater areas of shadow over the Swiss Cottage Open Space at times when the space is used extensively by the public. It

⁵⁶ Document C2 page 15 fig 3

⁵⁷ Document C2 pages 16 – 18 figs 4 and 5

- will make it a less desirable place and have an impact on the amenity of users in terms of shading and visual impact. The landscaping proposed, while a benefit, would not be sufficient to mitigate that harm.
131. Much of the area used for the Eton Avenue market⁵⁸ would be in shadow cast by the new tower. This would add to the current shading by the theatre and result in a glum and unappealing environment around the street market, reducing its appeal. The shadow diagrams show considerably more shading of the market area in June and August between 12.00 and 14.00. The tower would also loom over the market place. It would detract considerably from the amenity of the area.
132. At 17.00 on 25 August the shadow diagrams show that 67, 69 and 71 Eton Avenue would have gardens in shade, which would not be the case currently. It would appear to shorten the day when not in shadow by about 1 hour changing from 18.00 to 17.00. There would also be an effect on dwellings in Fellows Road. While it is only a relatively short period, it is during the summer months and at times when users might be expected to try to make use of the gardens.
133. There will be some limited but adverse impact on these neighbouring occupiers which would conflict with the CS Policies CS5 and DP Policy DP26.
134. Properties fronting Winchester Road have rear amenity areas. While this does have a wall at the rear, there would still be increased shading of about 1hr around 16:00 onwards on 21 March. This will have an adverse effect on the amenity of the occupiers of those properties.
135. The council acknowledges that the BRE guidance⁵⁹ is important in the assessment of daylight and sunlight and is referred to in its own guidance. However, the council says that it is still necessary to consider the impact that any additional buildings have on the particular use of a space. In this case it says that the effect in the afternoon and evening is such that it would cause unacceptable harm to users at this important time of the day.
136. In relation to affordable housing there is a target in CS Policy CS6 for 50% self contained affordable housing, with similar aims in DP Policy DP3. However the appellant provided viability information that indicates that what has been offered is the maximum viable and therefore acceptable.
137. The site is allocated for development in the Site Allocations DPD⁶⁰ but this, amongst other things, indicates that it should respect the setting of Swiss Cottage Open Space. It is not considered that the proposal does.
138. It is accepted that there will be positive benefits from the proposal in terms of housing, affordable housing and space for the Winchester project. This is tempered a little by the fact the council does have an up to date 5 year housing supply, but this is still a matter of significant weight. The appellant questioned how the council dealt with student housing. This is done in accordance with the current government advice, but even if these were not considered out as suggested by the appellant, the council would still have a 5 year housing supply.

⁵⁸ Document C2 page 28/29

⁵⁹ Document CD 1.57

⁶⁰ Document CD 4.7 page 130

While the benefit of providing further housing is acknowledged, overall the harm is not outweighed by the benefits of the development.

The Case for Belsize Residents' Association⁶¹

139. The case for Belsize Residents' Association is set out in Docs R3 to R9 with closing submissions at IQ36. The material points are:-

Landscape

140. The residential population surrounding the Swiss Cottage Open Space is diverse and includes some vulnerable people, including elderly residents at Mora Burnet House and special needs residents at Winchester Mews. It is a well used and popular resource used actively and passively⁶². A local resident explains the importance of the open space⁶³. The developer talks of town centre location, but the Swiss Cottage Open Space is not in the town centre, it is a residential area. The functions of the Swiss Cottage Open Space should not be associated with the town centre. The developer says that its aim is to generate more activity and vitality, which is a considerable concern of residents.
141. The history of development of the area around the Swiss Cottage Open Space demonstrates sensitivity to the local heritage and scale of existing buildings. The existing building at 100 Avenue Road respected the Library, as did the redevelopment at the theatre. In the original design for the buildings on the site the presence of the busy road was important, with the design screening the open space from it, providing protection from noise, pollution and traffic and making the open space a tranquil, safe and intimate space for users of the park. Closure to traffic of the Eton Avenue junction with Finchley Road reinforces the protection⁶⁴.
142. The development with two buildings would mean that this 'barrier' and protection would be breached and compromise the qualities of the space, particularly in terms of tranquillity and amenity. The use by parents with children is considerable and this is possible because of the inherent safety of the area. There would be no baffling of noise or wind through the new gap, which would result in further deterioration in the qualities of the space. The noise breach would also cause disturbance to residents surrounding the outside space, including at the sheltered housing complex.
143. The wider building means that a lot of the planting on the east side of the building would be lost and further hard areas for seating would further reduce the soft landscaping⁶⁵. Losses would include a mown grass verge and shrub beds with a small number of mature trees. At the southern end of the proposed development soft landscape areas would also be lost and some grass areas would be converted to a self binding gravel surface. While there would be some planting, mainly in the form of planters, there would be a net loss of about 9% of the area's soft landscaping.

⁶¹ Documents R3 to R9 and IQ36

⁶² Document R3 pg 2 para 1.7

⁶³ Document R5

⁶⁴ Document R3 pg 4/5 para 2.6

⁶⁵ Document R3 page 5 para 2.10

144. The shrub beds are an important buffer and green edge between the park and existing buildings and contribute to the bio-diversity of the area⁶⁶. The trees and shrubs are also important in terms of improving air quality and help with cooling and reducing pollutants. Swiss Cottage is short of open space, with no opportunity to replace it locally. The proposal would contravene Camden's Open Space Policy N4 which requires open space deficiency not to be made worse by development. It should only be permitted where the application is supported by an appropriate contribution to the supply of public open space.
145. The study done of daylight and sunlight demonstrates that there would be an increase in shading and visual enclosure of the Swiss Cottage Open Space. This would reduce the amenity value of the area, heavily used by the public. Summer evenings would be particularly affected by the proposal, which is a time late sunshine would be enjoyed. The effect would extend into the surrounding private gardens. The consistency of the skyline would also be affected, with even the lower blocks being considerably higher than the other buildings surrounding the Swiss Cottage Open Space. The consistency of horizon is important. It would change the proportions and character of the open space.
146. The presence of the hard seating areas for the café / restaurants, even with planter structures, would introduce commercial activity into the open space. In the past such a use was allowed and resulted in repeated night time disturbance for residents with the potential for cooking odours, music, noise and disturbance⁶⁷.
147. The tranquillity of the park is a very important feature of the Swiss Cottage Open Space and should be preserved.
148. Local people take pride in their properties and care in maintenance and alterations, so it seems strange that a proposal that is out of character and scale with the area should be proposed⁶⁸. Eton Avenue is a lively, suburban residential road lined by trees and special properties and views up and down are part of the heritage. The area is geared up to residential living and providing a good quality of life. It would be dwarfed by a disproportionately high tower block out of keeping with the surrounding area and would cause harm.
149. Currently development around the Swiss Cottage Open Space defers to the height of the Swiss Cottage Library, with flats of Adelaide Road the only exception, built in a different era. The various developments are harmonious and a product of many years' successive developments balancing public and private spaces as well as civic buildings. With the proposal the balance that currently works in favour of the community would be lost.
150. The tower would overshadow Flat 4 at 73 Eton Avenue, the balcony of which provides a haven and its enjoyment would be affected. Many of the residents in the area do not have gardens, so the Swiss Cottage Open Space provides a way of getting outside and enjoying greenery.

⁶⁶ Document R5 page 3 para 14

⁶⁷ Document 5 page 3 para 12

⁶⁸ Document R4

151. The height of the tower would mean that construction will take proportionately longer, with associated increased noise and disturbance to local residents. Currently the house moves when lorries go past and this is likely to increase with the proposed development. There has been some anti-social behaviour in the past requiring a dispersal order⁶⁹. It is no longer a problem and residents do not want it to return.
152. The increase in residents at the appeal site would also put a strain on local services, particularly the Swiss Cottage Tube Station, which is already very busy.
153. A representative of the group was the project architect of the current building on the site. He is not 'broken hearted' at the thought of it being demolished. However, the current building respected various design principles. The listed building needed to be connected to, without being overpowered, so it stepped down towards it, with surrounding activities on a human scale.
154. A second principle was sharing space between the commercial occupiers and others, especially the residents around the open space, particularly not to overshadow the space. It was also necessary to separate the open space from the busy road. Other considerations related to fire access and underground access.
155. Thirdly, there was some funding for improvements, with nursery, squash court, and six a side football pitch. Allowance was also made for the popular market space, including allowing cars and vans to access it.
156. There is also concern over vehicular access, particularly during construction. There could be no access from the gyratory, so vehicles would be using the residential roads. When the building is in use, there would be no parking proposed, so again residential roads would be used for parking.
157. The flats are proposed to be let on 3/5 year tenancies, so residents would be transient, likely to be single people and couples, not likely to well integrate into the community or contribute to its activities. A main need is for affordable social housing, but little is proposed. There would be overshadowing of the open space, greatly increased by comparison with the existing building, reducing the times that the space can be enjoyed. There would be high winds generated around the base of the building and around-the-clock noise from traffic through the gap created to the main road. Flat owners would be likely to need to keep their windows closed.
158. There is also concern over air quality and the sense of siting 184 flats adjacent to the heavily polluted Finchley Road, a focus area for pollution monitoring. This could contribute to the likelihood of an increase in the incidence of asthma.
159. Aesthetically the proposal would break the skyline for a considerable distance around in a highly prominent way and especially be damaging to the adjacent conservation areas as its upper floors would create an unfortunate and visually upsetting backcloth to the mainly 19th century housing.

⁶⁹ Document R5 page 4 para 16

Historic Environment

160. The Belsize Residents Association relies on the evidence of Mr Davies⁷⁰ (formerly of English Heritage), who was unable to attend the inquiry. The Association disagrees with the council's approach to assessing the effect on heritage assets⁷¹.
161. The two closest listed buildings are the Swiss Cottage Library (Grade II) by Sir Basil Spence and the Hampstead Figure Sculpture (Grade II) by F E McWilliam. A little further away is Regency Lodge (Grade II) residential block by Robert Atkinson.
162. The library is only 50m from the appeal site and separated by soft landscaping. The 3 storey block now adjacent was designed to respond to the scale of the library and surrounding environment. The part 5 and part 7 storey height of the proposed building in this location would be dominant and overbearing and have a negative impact on the curved wall of the library. It is not accepted that the vertical structure of the proposal would pick up on the finely spaced concrete fins of the library, as the vertical elements of the proposed design are much more widely spaced and do not read with the library. The double height at ground level also contrasts with the single height entrance of the library.
163. The flank walls of the proposal would dominate views of the flat roofed long, low library and the different heights of the building would jar with the simple form of the library. It would 'hang' over the distinct form of the curved north elevation of the library, interrupting views of this important post-war listed building.
164. The Hampstead Figure is a nationally important post war sculpture, portraying a reclining abstract bronze figure and is an integral part of the 1960 civic centre scheme, which includes the library. The sculpture was placed centrally to the entrance of the library and remains a focal point in the recent re-landscaping of this area. It is only a few metres from the appeal site and would be overwhelmed by the end elevation of the new building.
165. Regency Lodge is 6 storeys high and is a robust and streamlined building of interwar period. It has a strong horizontal emphasis. This would suffer limited harm as the result of the proposed development, but views to it will be affected by the building.
166. There are a number of grade II listed buildings in Eton Avenue and one grade II* building whose setting would be affected. No 73 is within 200m of the tower.
167. The proposal would also have a significant adverse effect on the townscape character of Swiss Cottage town centre⁷² and cause harm to its visual amenity. The development because it is mainly residential development, would not bring anything to the centre, beyond the offer of some limited ground floor uses.

⁷⁰ Document CD1.34

⁷¹ Document R9

⁷² Document R9 page 35/36

Belsize Conservation Area

168. The Belsize Conservation Area is the closest and most significant in respect of the appeal proposal. It includes part of the Winchester Road terrace near the civic centre. It has 6 discrete sub-areas, described in the conservation area statement⁷³. The earlier parts are formed of semi-detached Victorian villas faced in stucco with elevated ground floors above basements. The later buildings, such as at Eton Avenue developed by W Willet for Eton College estate, have imposing detached houses faced in red brick and terracotta many in variation of the Queen Anne revival style. There are broad, straight tree-lined streets with open ended vistas that add to the spacious feel of the area and little development outside the area intrudes on this. There are occasional views of the Chalcots Estate tower between Fellows Road and Adelaide Road that do detract from its character and are indicative of the impact that outside development can have. It is well preserved but vulnerable to inappropriate development. A measure of its importance is the number of paintings within it by the Camden Town Group in collections in the Tate and Museum of London.
169. The conservation area statement notes that where development does not preserve or enhance the setting of the conservation area it is generally because of inappropriate scale, bulk, height, and massing. Policy BE20 also notes modern development has not always taken account of existing context, but notes that modern development will not be resisted if it respects the layout, height and scale of existing development. The tower would not accord with this aim and is contrary to Policy BE20⁷⁴.
170. Particular views of concern are Eton Avenue from outside the fire station, Adamson Road from Crossfield Road, Belsize Park looking south west on to Buckland Crescent, Daleham Gardens looking down to Belsize Lane, Swiss Cottage open space and Belsize Square from south of St Peter's Church, all with high value and high sensitivity⁷⁵.

Design

171. It is the Association's view that the Environmental Impact Assessment was not adequate⁷⁶. This does not address the design considerations in the English Heritage-CABE Guidance on Tall Buildings⁷⁷.
172. The main issue is the height and mass, particularly the increase of this development over that existing. The existing building was carefully designed to suit the site. It is acknowledged that the Camden Site Allocations Plan (2013) notes the potential for development of the appeal site and that it might be suitable for a taller building, especially at the northern end of the site. However, this is not justification for the increase in height now proposed or mean that it is suitable for high rise development.
173. The appeal site is not in a highly urbanised setting as noted in the heritage statement, but is an edge of town centre location. While there are a number of

⁷³ Document G5

⁷⁴ Document R9 considers townscape characteristics and views between pages 37-43

⁷⁵ Document R9 Views 4, 5, 6/24, 7/22 and 27 pages 42 - 29

⁷⁶ Document R9 page 23 para 6.40

⁷⁷ Document R9 Conclusion page 1 CABE ref paras B.1.1, 4.1.4, 4.1.5, 4.1.9 and 4.4

civic buildings, these are in a residential setting, where much of that is in conservation areas. The quality of the building is not sufficient for its prominence, as it would be the tallest residential building in Camden, visible from Westminster and Brent. The tower is too tall and, because of the floor area, too bulky. It does not attempt to relate to local distinctiveness or the character and context of the local area and historic environment. The tower takes the form of a flat roofed vertical slab, with its broader sides facing north and south.

174. It would have a domineering appearance, with an unchanging floor area on each floor. Seen from the corners, as would be the case from some conservation areas, its bulk would appear even greater. It does not reduce in size as it rises, nor does it have a pleasing skyline. There is no relief articulation or modelling of the elevations. Similar comments apply to the lower block, which would have a far greater impact on the surrounding area than the existing building, because of its increased width and height, and consequently mass and bulk. The current building is only 3 storeys near the library, whereas the proposal is 5/7 storeys. It would be imposing and out of scale with the adjacent buildings and spaces, including the grade II library and sculpture and buildings in the conservation area.

Residential Amenities

175. The development contravenes LP Policy 7.7C as its scale, mass and bulk would adversely affect the character of the surrounding area and would fail to relate well to the form, proportion, composition, scale and character of surrounding buildings, urban grain and public realm, particularly at street level. It is contrary to LP Policy 7.7D as it would adversely affect local views and be contrary to LP Policy 7.7E relating to tall buildings and impact on sensitive locations, including conservation areas, listed buildings and their settings. It would have an unacceptable impact.
176. It would fail to comply with CS5 and CS14 of the London Borough of Camden Local Development Framework Core Strategy and the London Borough of Camden Local Development Framework Development Policies DP24 and DP25.
177. There would be some benefit in the form of step free access to the underground, but Transport for London have not yet committed to this. The building would have an impact in terms of shading and the environment adjacent to the theatre. Over 900 people have objected to the proposal.

The Case for Cresta House Residents' Association⁷⁸

178. The case for Cresta House Residents' Association is set out in Doc R13 with closing submissions at IQ36. The material points are:-
179. Camden's Development Policy 26 notes the council will protect the quality of life of occupiers and neighbours by only granting permission for development that does not cause harm to amenity.
180. The officer's report indicated that there are no residential properties directly adjacent to the appeal site, but did go on to refer to some nearby properties. It noted that only properties at Overground House would experience a loss of

⁷⁸ Document R13

vertical sky component greater than the guideline 20%. Cresta House is 38 fully occupied residential properties above Overground House, 75m away from the site⁷⁹. Therefore, if Overground House would have a loss of greater than the 20% guideline, so would Cresta House residents. There has therefore been an error in considering daylight and sunlight issues with regard to the omission of Cresta House.

181. There is no mention by the council in its consideration of the proposal about the effect on daylight and sunlight at Cresta House, although it is noted by Mr Hughes of the Council that the vertical skylight component and average daylight factors for Cresta House will incur losses but such a degree of loss would not be noticeable⁸⁰. The suggestion by the appellant is that residents of Cresta House already suffer as a result of neighbouring buildings restricting daylight availability to their own windows and rooms, so that further harm does not matter. That is not reasonable and in any case there are 7 apartments where this does not occur. The depth of the rooms is also incorrect in the report.
182. The impact of the tower in terms of its impact on outlook would be at its greatest as seen from the terraces of Cresta House. There would also be a severe impact on privacy. The residents of Cresta House will suffer a substantial loss of amenity.

The Case for Eton Avenue Housing Association⁸¹

183. The case for Eton Avenue Housing Association is set out in Docs R12 and IQ29 with closing submissions at IQ36. The material points are:-
184. The case made by Belsize Residents' Association is supported.
185. The representative has lived in the area for a considerable time, with connections with it for some 45 years. The last development in the area was about 2006 and it is considered that what has been provided to date works very well. There is a tranquil open space where people can relax and children play. There is a thriving cultural centre and market place. It is an oasis in the heart of Swiss Cottage with a special community spirit that would be destroyed if the scheme goes ahead.
186. Nearby residents would be affected by noise and disturbance, initially from construction and then from the many shops and cafés that would span the perimeter. Noise and air pollution from the gyratory would permeate the open space through the new gap between buildings. There would be a significant increase in wind and overshadowing, particularly in the evening, a time when the open space is most frequented.
187. There would also be a considerable increased risk to pedestrians with increased traffic at the Eton Avenue end of the area, from commercial vehicles servicing the many flats.

⁷⁹ Document 13 page 3 para 5

⁸⁰ Document R13 page 4 para 10

⁸¹ Document R12 and IQ29

188. The tower would loom over some housing and gardens in the area, harming the outlook for residents⁸². The fact that there is Chalcots Estates Towers in Fellows Road does not justify another view of a tall building that is higher.
189. The appellant's report on micro climate makes significant errors and remains uncorrected, despite being identified to the appellants. It uses pre-development baseline figures and this is evident in figures 3 and 5 of RWDIs Assessment⁸³. A reduction of about 51 'sitting' is substantial. The area already suffers high winds. The entrance of the tube station is often windy. The report is correct in noting Eton Avenue and pathway adjacent to the theatre as being one of the windiest areas, to the extent of impeding walking on the windiest days of the year. We are concerned the errors will have affected the predictions of the impact of the development.
190. J Sachs submitted a note to the inquiry relating to the microclimate around the building. Concern is expressed about the wind environment, particularly that associated with the tall building⁸⁴. They note that the report indicates conditions around and within the site would be windier when the development is complete compared to baseline conditions, which is largely because of the height of the development compared with the surrounding buildings creating down-draughts and channelling. Using the Lawson Comfort Criteria, the wind blight would increase from pre-development baseline figures, particularly from 67 sitting to 16.
191. It is not acceptable that there is no social rented sector housing as they are most needed. Only 19.9% of the units are affordable houses⁸⁵. The development does not satisfy the affordable housing need in the area. It falls well below the Camden Strategy Policy CS6 (f) which seeks to secure 50% of the borough wide target for new homes as affordable housing.

The Case for Mr Reed⁸⁶

192. The case for Mr Reed is set out in Docs R1 and R2 with closing submissions at IQ35. The material points are:-
193. The objections in terms of character and appearance and impacts on living conditions as put by other interested parties are supported and this is because of the over-development of the site. However, the main focus relates to the lack of direct vehicular access to the building and the lack of attempt to identify the extent of the occupation that would occur, particularly as this is located on a busy Red Route with no stopping allowed.
194. This means that access will have to be through the pedestrianised street market area, with much of it coming along Winchester Road from the main A41, via the B509 Adelaide Road.
195. The use of taxis appears to be promoted, but these cannot stop on the Red Route, so will also contribute to additional traffic in the pedestrianised area, as

⁸² Document R12 page 3

⁸³ Document R12 page 3

⁸⁴ CD11.1 Microclimate Assessment

⁸⁵ Document R12 page 4

⁸⁶ Document R1 and IQ35

would home delivered shopping etc. Mr Reed questions whether the residents of a high quality block would walk or cycle, particularly as the main road adjacent is a Red Route. The transport report notes that deliveries would also be via the pedestrianised area.

196. He considers residents would not contribute to the local economy, would be a burden on leisure facilities and, with more active use of the adjacent open space, would spoil the tranquillity of the area.
197. The open space is the only traffic free open space in the area and backs onto a hundred flats who do not want people pouring out of restaurants and bars at all hours, or the noise, pollution and winds through gaps between buildings that would occurred. It is a widely used space by thousands of local people, with many passing through to the library, leisure centre, theatre and community centre as well as users of the Central School for Speech and Drama. If pedestrian flows are considered there is a peak flow area directly adjacent to the tower, which would be the same place that vehicles would have to pass through. In addition, because traffic access is limited to the north east corner, it means, because of the way the main roads are, that this traffic would have to use local roads, that are residential and already intensively used.
198. A survey⁸⁷ was undertaken that shows the area to be already very busy with vehicles and pedestrians and the proposed use could generate a further 200 deliveries a day. This could be a rate of about 30 movements an hour, crossing the busy pedestrian route (counted 1376 pedestrians and 34 bikes in 1 hour at lunch time).
199. It is suggested that bollards can control traffic flows. This was done before, but the bollards were not successful and have been removed.
200. Finally there is a gas pressure reduction station beneath the tower block, so is it sensible to locate a tower block in close proximity to it?

The Case for Save Swiss Cottage Action Group⁸⁸

201. The case for Save Swiss Cottage Action Group is set out in Docs R10 and R11 with closing submissions at IQ34. The material points are:-
202. A key concern is the scale, massing and lack of relationship with the other buildings round the site. To the east is the Victorian Winchester Terrace, simple and unpretentious, but with a sense of scale and rhythm. To the north is the small-scale Hampstead Theatre, again unpretentious but relating well to the open space that falls away to the south. The library building is a strong statement, but the elevation treatment is simple and precise and relates well to the adjacent leisure centre, which itself relates well to the Visage building at the corner.
203. While there are large buildings at Adelaide Road, it is quite wrong to use those as a precedent for here as times have moved on and to match the size and crudity of those would be totally inappropriate. It is hard to see how the slab like elevation adjacent to the listed library can be considered acceptable. The Belsize Park Conservation Area is important, which is well explained in the conservation

⁸⁷ See Document R10 and appendices at R11

⁸⁸ Document R7 and IQ34

- area statement⁸⁹. An unusual contribution to the area is the grade II listed fire station with an impressive design. The great thing about the area is the completeness and lack of incongruous or unsympathetic elements in such an extensive area.
204. Fitzjohn's and Netherhall Conservation Area is directly adjacent to Belsize Park Conservation Area. This has a parade of impressive detached and semi-detached houses, mostly in red brick and dating from the latter part of the nineteenth century in a style that combines Queen Anne with Arts and Crafts influences based on the work of Norman Shaw. Parallel roads are all in a similar style, with a mix of detached and semi-detached buildings with large gardens.
205. South Hampstead Conservation Area is to the west of Finchley Road and was developed from the 1870s in a consistent red brick style, mainly closely placed semi-detached housing but with a small number of villa style buildings along gently curving roads. To the east there are some taller buildings and flat blocks. All have large rear gardens, some of which are communal. There is a considerable consistency of style, which is important.
206. Alexandra Road Conservation Area is unusual as it consists mainly of two extensive grade II* listed residential buildings built along the railway tracks. These were built in the 1970s and epitomise the style of that period and are a better example of architecture of this period⁹⁰.
207. Elsworthy Road Conservation Area to the south of Swiss Cottage comprises a mix of individual and semi-detached private houses in what could be described as the Arts and Crafts style or in a small number of cases, Art Nouveau style, and are good examples of this. It is a more urban version of the Hampstead Garden Suburbs. To the north are Victorian buildings, mainly in gault bricks.
208. St John's Hampstead has substantial semi-detached stuccoed houses interspersed with more rustic cottages in a style that might have been associated with Nash.
209. The Swiss Cottage inn is a significant local feature, as well as giving its name to the area. Although it is not listed it merits some consideration in development proposals⁹¹.
210. A listed building that needs to be taken into consideration is the below ground pair of listed railway portals at the western end of the Primrose Hill tunnels below Hilgrove and Alexandra Road. These are seen in a view from the west which would incorporate the tower.
211. While the proposal was put before the Design Council⁹² [CABE] they did not consider the impact on heritage assets; it left that to Historic England who left the decision to the council⁹³. The historic environment is a crucial aspect of the overall environment and the fact this aspect was not considered by the Design Council undermines the credibility of its comments.

⁸⁹ Document G5

⁹⁰ Documents R11 appendix 2 view 22 shows Alexandra Road flat with tower behind

⁹¹ Document R10 and R11. Analysis of views in apx 2 and pages 9 -

⁹² Documents CD1.45 – 1.48

⁹³ Document CD1.37 paragraph 4.4

Amenity.

212. The park generally has an open aspect, with generally two to five storey buildings around it. The Visage building is higher to the south, but you are not aware of this in the park. The existing building steps down from 6 to 3 storeys and is not overbearing. The combination of planting, including some small and large trees, combined with the gentle slope and water feature makes a very attractive space. There is currently little overshadowing. It also provides space for local markets. The theatres are an added attraction.
213. The design resulting from the design process⁹⁴ is unacceptable. The tower is too high, thus causing public and technical objection, particularly in such a relatively sensitive neighbourhood and secondly the lower block is also too high because of the impact that it would have on the Swiss Cottage Open Space. The lower block is completely disrespectful of the listed library and the lower block would also appear to be out of all proportion in relation to the Winchester Terrace on the other side of the open space.
214. In relation to trees⁹⁵ it is considered that 7 of the Cherry Trees should be grade B and not C and that 3 other trees (Beech and Tulip) should be Grade A and not Grade C. 33 of the 54 trees would be directly affected by the development. 4 high grade plane trees along Eton Avenue have been omitted. 11 other mature Tulip trees should also have been assessed, because of their size. It is therefore considered that more trees will be lost than identified. There is no real assessment of how the construction phase would be undertaken and the way that protection would be undertaken. The conclusion is that there is insufficient detail to guarantee the safe and healthy retention of the trees which it is stated can be retained. Of particular concern are the large plane trees at the construction entrances.
215. In terms of overshadowing and light⁹⁶, the appellant's assessment appears to interpret the BRE guidance in an unusual way. There is particular concern that the extent of overshadowing would be far greater than it demonstrates, particularly in relation to Cresta House residents on the top of Overground House. It is criticised that some trees have not been taken into consideration when working out the daylight factors and that using adjacent building calculations is not reasonable. The impact of the obstruction of the proposed development on daylight as well as sunlight needs to be considered. The appellant has not taken account of changing ground levels which would affect the shadows produced⁹⁷. However, the expert that produced the report did not attend the inquiry and the evidence was not cross-examined. The report also does not conclude that the proposal would not comply with the BRE guidance but complains about the 'flexible' interpretation⁹⁸.
216. Similar concerns are raised in relation to access as Belsize Residents' Association and particularly that large lorries parked to supply materials within the site could mean Eton Avenue is unusable for much of the construction period.

⁹⁴ Document R10 page 22

⁹⁵ Document R11 appendix 6

⁹⁶ Document R11 appendix 7

⁹⁷ Document R11 appendix 7 page 9

⁹⁸ Document R11 appendix 7 page10

217. The articulation of the façades lacks delicacy and widening the blocks would not help the open space or public realm generally. Isolating the tower will also result in a windy gap and loses protection for the park in terms of privacy and noise from the main road. Provision of restaurants is to be applauded, but it is questioned whether it makes sense in this location.

The case for Winchester Road Residents' Association

218. The case for Winchester Road Residents' Association is set out in the case for Belsize Residents' Association with closing submissions at IQ36. The material points are:-

219. At one end of Winchester Road is Mora Burnet House containing 35 flats for frail older tenants who have 24 hour care and support⁹⁹. There is then a small row of shops and restaurants entered from Winchester Road with flats above. The restaurants do not use garden space at the rear and cause no disturbance. The Winchester Project is a charity for children and beyond the walkway is a community centre with residential accommodation for people with mental and physical disabilities.

220. On the second side of the open space is the Swiss Cottage Leisure Centre, providing a wide range of community facilities and a café carefully run at hours following consultation with residents. There are flats above the leisure centre again for people with mental and physical disabilities. The Swiss Cottage Library is adjacent.

221. The appeal site runs along the third side of the Swiss Cottage Open Space. The fourth side has the Hampstead Theatre, with an artistic and cultural function and ancillary restaurant and bars. This does not create unacceptable noise. The theatre withdrew proposals to extend outside terraces after consulting residents.

222. The new walkway between the two buildings would create a new access into the open space and people using the walkway may create noise and simply use the walkway and open space as a cut through increasing noise and disturbance.

223. The proposals will turn the open space into a noisy area by day and night. The commercial space, where occupiers will seek licences to serve alcohol, is too close to the residential areas. Those using it will be likely to linger on the open space after closing time, creating noise close to residences, especially in summer months, causing sleep problems for those using the many bedrooms facing the open space.

224. The current space is very harmonious through progressive developments and will be spoilt by the proposed development. There is a balance of public and private space, architecture and greenery. The space provides a location for those without gardens to go and see the wildlife which has now returned following previous developments. The balance would be broken.

225. There have been past problems with anti-social behaviour caused by people lingering in the open space. The police and council had to take action, issuing dispersal notices¹⁰⁰, and the sports pitch had to have night security and then

⁹⁹ Document R5 See attachments for description of Mora Burnett House

¹⁰⁰ Document R5 See attachments for copy of notice

fencing. It is no longer a significant problem and it is essential it should not return.

226. The space is not town centre but a residential area, with many properties with bedrooms overlooking the open space. It cannot be compared to a town centre or square which might have non residential buildings surrounding it and Winchester Road is not part of the town centre. There is real concern that the developer's aim to create activity on all sides to engage the public realm will occur, causing change and disturbance to residents. The town centre does not surround the development as the open space is not part of the town centre. There is also concern about the noise and disturbance from construction traffic.

227. **Mr Grimm** is concerned about the impact of the development on the swimming pool in terms of privacy and outlook¹⁰¹.

228. **Mr T Ewing** appeared on behalf of the Camden Association of Street Properties¹⁰². Mr Ewing looks in detail at the law behind planning decisions, with particular emphasis on that surrounding listed buildings and conservation areas.

Written Representations¹⁰³

Letters related to the application are contained in Document 3. Where appropriate it includes letters written before and during the inquiry.

229. I do not need to set out the cases expressed in the written representations as essentially these follow that of the council and rule 6 parties. In summary, there is massive local opposition to the proposal, with many letters and a petition.

230. Mr T Tugnut¹⁰⁴ submitted photographs taken on the day of the site visit with the 'blimp' in position. The height of the rope tethering it was agreed between the parties, although the securing position was a little to the east of the tower position. In addition, I would note that it was a windy day and the 'blimp' rarely flew vertically above its position, so its location would be to one side and vertical height not as measured. Therefore, it is my view that the photographs should be considered for general illustration only and not as a totally accurate representation of height or position.

Conditions and Obligations

The conditions agreed between the parties are contained in IQ30 and my recommended conditions are attached as annex A to this report. The signed planning obligation is at IQ40. This was replaced after the inquiry as a page had been omitted. My comments are in the conclusions.

¹⁰¹ Document IQ20

¹⁰² Original comments are in Red Folder 1 and closing submissions in Document IQ33

¹⁰³ Red Folders 1 and 2 and Blue folder

¹⁰⁴ Document IQ32

CONCLUSIONS

In this section the numbers in parentheses [n] refer to the preceding paragraphs.

231. I have covered the main considerations identified as well as a number of other matters raised by interested parties.

232. Main issues are:

1. Heritage Assets

- i. The effect on the significance, character and appearance of various nearby conservation areas, in particular Belsize Park, Fitzjohns and Netheral, Elsworthy, South Hampstead, Alexandra Road Estate and St John's Wood Conservation Areas.
- ii. The effect on the significance and special architectural and historic interest of heritage assets, including listed buildings. (There are a number of heritage assets/listed buildings, including the Swiss Cottage Library and the Hampstead Figure Sculpture. The Save Swiss Cottage Action Group will identify a further 37 listed buildings.)

2. The effect on the character and appearance of the surrounding area.

3. The effect on the amenity of the surrounding area, particularly in relation to daylight and sunlight on the Swiss Cottage open space and the effect on outlook of people using the space, including during construction and taking account of new walkways and routes.

4. The effect in relation to outlook and privacy on adjoining premises, including residents at Cresta House and users of the Central School for Speech and Drama.

233. There was some concern raised by interested parties about the town centre designation, [4] in particular the extension to include the appeal site, and whether there had been consultation. However, the statement of common ground makes it clear that the extension of the town centre to include the appeal site, library and leisure centre was part of the core strategy consultation changes to the proposals map.

Heritage Assets

234. Section 72 (1) of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 requires special attention to be paid to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character or appearance of a conservation area. There is no specific duty under the Act to consider the setting of conservation areas, but it is established practice that views into and out of a conservation area and any effect on character and/or appearance are relevant. There was also some confusion in the council's case relating to the assessment of harm in a conservation area. However, at the inquiry changes were made to confirm that the correct assessment is the effect on the character and/or appearance of the conservation area as a whole, which is well established case law. However, I acknowledge that this does not mean that any harm identified has to be over the whole area, and that harm in one part of a conservation area (or outside) could have an effect on the conservation area as a whole.

235. In addition, the Framework identifies conservation areas as designated heritage assets, where when considering the impact of proposed development on the significance of the asset, great weight should be given to the asset's conservation. It notes that significance can be harmed or lost through alteration or destruction of the heritage asset or development within its setting. It notes that proposals that preserve those elements of the setting that make a positive contribution to or better reveal the significance of the asset should be treated favourably. The effect of the proposal on the setting of the conservation area is relevant and there is no disagreement that the proposal would be in the setting of the assets identified.
236. No listed building is physically affected by the proposal, apart from the Hampstead Figure Sculpture. It would be necessary to remove the listed sculpture and reposition it after the works are complete. It has been relocated in the past from its original position nearer the library. Generally it is the setting of various listed buildings that needs to be considered. When considering applications that may affect a listed building or its setting, section 66 (1) of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 requires special regard to be paid to the desirability of preserving the building or its setting or any features of special architectural or historic interest which it possesses.
237. The council argues that their policies require development to protect and enhance heritage. Policy CS5 [13] does not require that, but for **consideration** to be given to protecting and enhancing the heritage environment. CS Policy CS14 [16] is a bit stronger, noting the council will ensure that Camden's places and buildings are attractive, safe and easy to use by, amongst other things, preserving and enhancing Camden's rich and diverse heritage assets and their settings. Text to the policy notes *'we have a responsibility to preserve, and **where possible**, enhance our heritage of important areas and buildings'*, which seems to indicate to me that the two components are not essential.' Reference is made to DP Policy DP25 [19] which also notes more strongly that the council *'will only permit development **within** a conservation area that preserves and enhances the character and appearance of the area'*. However, for development **outside** of the area it also notes that it *will not permit development outside of a conservation area that causes harm to the character and appearance of the conservation area'*. And for listed buildings it notes *'To preserve or enhance the borough's listed buildings the council will not permit development that it considers would cause harm to the setting of a listed building'. [my emphasis]*
238. My interpretation of these policies is that the aim is to seek development that both preserves and enhances heritage assets, but that development that preserves the assets or would not cause harm to them would also effectively satisfy the policy tests.
239. The Framework describes the setting of a heritage asset as the surroundings in which a heritage asset is experienced. Its extent is not fixed and may change as the asset and its surroundings evolve. Elements of a setting may make a positive or negative contribution to the significance of an asset, may affect the ability to appreciate that significance or may be neutral.
240. In enacting section 66(1), Parliament intended that the desirability of preserving the setting of listed buildings should not simply be given careful consideration by the decision-maker for the purpose of deciding whether there

would be some harm, but that it should be given 'considerable importance and weight' when the decision-maker carries out the balancing exercise. Even where 'less than substantial' harm is identified, Section 66(1) requires considerable importance and weight to be given to the desirability of preserving the setting of a listed building and for Section 72(1) the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character or appearance of a conservation area, when carrying out the balancing exercise.

241. The proposal was considered by Historic England and the Design Council, but it is suggested that the weight to this should be limited because the Design Council did not consider heritage matters, but left that to Historic England [211]. The committee report¹⁰⁵ notes the response of Historic England (English Heritage) indicating it considered the impact of the proposal on the historic environment is not so significant as to warrant English Heritage's involvement. English Heritage is therefore content for the council to determine the appeal. If Historic England had considered there was a notable unacceptable impact I would have expected them to have commented, but I also accept that just because it did not comment, does not mean that there is no harm to be identified; that was left to the council. The fact that the Design Council left the heritage assessment to Historic England does not undermine its support for the scheme.

Conservation Areas

242. There is no real dispute between the main parties or Rule 6 parties related to the character, appearance or significance of the conservation areas. All acknowledge the high quality and importance of these. There is also little dispute about what is within the setting/visible from the conservation area and that from parts of the conservation area there will be views of, in particular, the new tower.
243. In this respect, various views have been provided by the parties with montages of the building shown for comparison purposes. Those provided by the appellant were representative views agreed with the council and some further views provided in relation to arguments raised. Save Swiss Cottage Action Group has also provided its own evidence on views. A good place to see some of the evidence for the assessment of impact on views is CD1.4, CD1.5 and Document R11 Appendix 2. The main dispute is the impact that the development has on the significance/special interest and character and appearance of the surrounding heritage assets.
244. When considering the views illustrated, I have taken into consideration that these are representative views, and that, as seen at the site visit, there will be views of the proposed development from other parts of the conservation areas. There is a very comprehensive set of photographs illustrating many of the buildings in the various conservation areas at Document R11 appendix 4 parts 1, 2 and 3. I have taken into consideration views into, out of and within the conservation areas and effect on other heritage assets.

Belsize Conservation Area

245. This is a large conservation area and, while there is variation in the designs of the buildings in the different parts, the significance, architectural and historic

¹⁰⁵ Document CD1.37 paragraph 4.4

interest relates, to a greater part, to the overall residential character of the area, the layout of the streets, their verdant character, and the era of the housing expressed by their designs and relative small scale of the buildings. These provide a distinctive character and appearance [90, 203].

246. The setting of the conservation area is the surrounding urban areas, including the Swiss Cottage town centre (and appeal site), Swiss Cottage Open Space, the Fitzjohn's and Netherhall Conservation Area and the Chalcots Estate. Tall buildings, such as at the Chalcots Estate and the relatively large scale buildings in the town centre are all part of that setting. The urban setting of the conservation area is important as a general setting, but I find there is nothing specific in the setting that adds to the significance or architectural and historic interest of the conservation area.
247. Views in and out are important, but they are of the surrounding urban area that has changed considerably since this housing was constructed and conservation area designated. The fact that there is a change in the surrounding urban area does not in principle diminish the significance of the conservation area and continues to provide an urban setting for the conservation area. I do not consider that the appeal site itself makes any particular contribution to the significance of the Belsize Conservation Area. Currently the site is more open, but I do not consider that it being more open in itself adds to the significance of the conservation area.
248. There are views into and out of the conservation area to the surrounding urban area that will be affected by the proposal. Views 5, 24 and 26 are closest. View 5 from Crossfield Road¹⁰⁶ is along Adamson Road towards the appeal site. Currently there is a clear indication of the change in character at the end of the road, where the town centre is. Here there are buildings of a substantially different size and scale to those in the conservation area, including at the appeal site and across the road from the appeal site. These large scale existing buildings do not add to, or take away from, the significance of the conservation area, but indicate the position where the conservation area ends, helping define its limits.
249. The tower would become a prominent, modern feature in this view. However, because of its modern design and size it is clearly seen as part of the town centre beyond and in the conservation areas urban setting. The view clearly is changed, but character of the setting is not and nor is there an effect on significance of the heritage asset, in this part or as a whole. The character of the conservation area and buildings within it is also unchanged. So while the view would be changed, I consider the effect on the character and/or appearance would be neutral.
250. The view along Buckland Crescent¹⁰⁷ (view 24) is of a row of detached stucco villas with, in the distance, the large scale buildings of the town centre partly rising up behind the further away buildings. This is an attractive view, where the proposed tower would be visible behind the properties when walking along the street. While it would be a new feature in the view, it would be seen as a modern feature, not part of the conservation area, and seen in the distance. I do not consider that it would harm the views out, or within the conservation area and the impact on its significance would be neutral.

¹⁰⁶ Document CD1.4 view 5 page 14.

¹⁰⁷ Document CD1.4 page 71 view 24 and Document R11 Appendix 2 View 13

251. The view from Belsize Park (view 6) towards the junction of Buckland Avenue is an attractive view within the conservation area¹⁰⁸ and is referred to in the conservation area statement¹⁰⁹. This view is also shown in a painting. At present the view is an 'internal' view, with buildings from the setting outside the conservation area not intruding into the view. The building at the junction of the roads is attractive and forms a visual stop to the view at the junction. The tower of the proposed development would be prominent in this view and affect the character of the area as seen in this general location. However, the tower would be seen as being in the distance behind the house. While there would be some negative impact here, I do not consider that would have an effect on the conservation area when considered as a whole and I conclude that the effect would be neutral and the conservation area as a whole preserved. Nevertheless, there would be some harm, which in terms of the Framework would be 'less than substantial' and this should be carried through into the balance.
252. Save Swiss Cottage Action Group shows the new development from the front of 5 Adamson Road¹¹⁰ (appellant's view 26). This is close to the appeal site, being a little up from the Theatre and Royal Central School of Speech and Drama. This is close to the town centre and existing large scale modern buildings are part of the setting of the conservation area and part of the views in and out of it. In this location the tower would be very prominent, but would also be seen as part of the 'civic' complex of buildings around the Swiss Cottage Open Space, and particularly in this general location the theatre and Royal Central School of Speech and Drama.
253. I do not consider that it would cause harm to this part of the conservation area or affect the significance of the conservation area as a whole as there are already large modern buildings at this edge. This is a well designed building that enhances the town centre and would not be unacceptable in this position.
254. There are further away views from other parts of the conservation area, some illustrated at CD1.4 views 4, 6, 11, 21 and 25. Also see views 6 and 25 in Document R11 appendix 2.
255. As shown by view 11, this part of the conservation area is clearly seen as being at the edge of the conservation area, with modern development forming a distinct part of the setting. The buildings within the conservation area are seen with large buildings in the background, including the tower at the Chalcots Estate. While the new tower is seen in a different position, behind the houses on the opposite side of the street, because of its design and location it is clearly seen as not being part of the conservation area. The views of it would not affect the significance of the conservation area or its character and appearance.
256. Views 4 and 25 from Eton Avenue are from similar positions, with that in the middle of the road giving the clearest view of the appeal proposal¹¹¹. Again, the modern, large scale buildings can be seen in the distance, identifying the town centre and existing setting of the building. The tower would be prominent in the distance, but is clearly in the distance and seen as part of the town centre. I do

¹⁰⁸ Document CD1.4 page view 6 and View 12 in Document R11 Appendix 2

¹⁰⁹ Document G5 page 16 of the conservation area statement

¹¹⁰ Document R11 Appendix 2 Views 8/9, this is also the appellant's view 26 Document 1.4

¹¹¹ Document 1.4 View 4 page 11 and View 25 page 74 and Document R11 View 5

not consider the view of the tower affects the character or appearance of the conservation area or its significance. Similar comments relate to other views in the conservation area.

257. I have also taken into consideration other views, such as Views 9 and 23, where the building would be visible with the conservation area in sight, and views 31 to 34 of Save Swiss Cottage Action Group.
258. The towers in the Chalcots Estate were considered by the council and other parties to be a negative feature in the area and that these should not effectively form a precedent for further towers in the area. In my view, while prominent features, they are neutral, modern features forming part of the surrounding to the conservation area. I accept that these do not create a precedent for further development, but the towers clearly are an important part of the setting and cannot be ignored as there was no evidence to suggest they might be removed in the foreseeable future. It is therefore reasonable to consider them as part of the urban context of the conservation areas setting.
259. The council considered that the harm to the Belsize Conservation Area would, in terms of the Framework, be 'substantial harm'. To my mind, that clearly is not the case; the overall significance of the conservation area that derives from the buildings and their layout would be fully retained. The impact on views within the conservation area as a whole are limited, so even when considered individually or together any potential any harm would still be limited to 'less than substantial harm'.
260. In conclusion, taking account of all the views that would occur of the new development and the effect on other heritage assets, I consider that the impact on the conservation area as a whole would generally be neutral and the character and appearance would be preserved, but with some limited 'less than substantial' harm associated with the view from Belsize Park (View 6).

*Fitzjohn's and Netherhall Conservation Area*¹¹²

261. This is also a large conservation area and while there is some variation in the designs of the buildings in the different parts, the significance, architectural and historic interest relates, to a greater part, to the overall residential character of the area, the layout of the streets, their generally verdant character, and the era of the housing, expressed by their designs and relative small scale of the buildings. These provide a distinctive character and appearance.
262. The setting of the conservation area is the urban area surrounding it, including the Belsize Conservation Area and Swiss Cottage town centre. The appeal proposal would be visible from some parts of the conservation area and is therefore within its setting. However, I do not consider that any part of the setting of the conservation area is important to its significance, character or appearance, apart from being a 'surrounding' urban environment. This is important, as the conservation area is an enclave within the urban environment, with its own particular character and appearance. I therefore do not consider that the appeal site makes any contribution to the significance of the conservation

¹¹² Document G5 – conservation area statement Document 1.4 Views 7, 8, 9, 20 and 22 and Document R11 Appendix 2 Views 10, 11, 28 and 29

area apart from being part of the urban surroundings. The lack of seeing the appeal site currently from views is also not important in terms of the significance of the conservation area.

263. The appellant's view 9 and Save Swiss Cottage Action Group views 10 and 11 are in similar locations looking down College Crescent towards the appeal site. This position is clearly at the edge of the conservation area. The distant view of the Royal Central School of Speech and Drama is of a large scale, modern, relatively bulky building contrasting with the houses and character of the conservation area as a whole and the large blocks of flats on the left also provide a strong contrast between the setting of the conservation area and the area itself. This is also a position very close to the town centre, the character of which is very different from the conservation area itself.
264. The appeal building would be another distinctly modern building that would be prominent in views. However, it would be seen as part of the modern urban environment of the town centre, adjacent to the conservation area and not seen to be an intrusion into the conservation area and would not unacceptably affect the setting, its significance or its character and appearance either here or as a whole.
265. There are also views from further into the conservation area, with examples shown from Fitzjohn's Avenue, Daleham Gardens and Belsize Lane¹¹³. In the appellant's view 22 the town centre can be seen in the distance and the appeal building would be clearly seen as part of the town centre. While it would be visible as a new feature it would not impact on the significance, character or appearance of the conservation area. Lower down Daleham Gardens, as seen in Save Swiss Cottage Action Group views 29 and 34, the views without the new building are contained within the conservation area, so the introduction of the tower into these views would be a new feature, identifying the location of the town centre beyond. While it would change the view, the character and appearance of the conservation area would be unchanged and the fact that part of the wider setting of the town centre would now be seen would have little effect on the significance of the asset. I conclude taking into consideration all the views of the proposed building that would occur that the character and appearance and significance of the Fitzjohn's and Netherhall Conservation Area would be preserved.

Elsworthy Road Conservation Area, St John's Wood Conservation Areas and South Hampstead Conservation Area

266. These are large conservation areas and I have dealt with them together. While there is some variation in the designs of the buildings in the different parts, the significance, architectural and historic interest relates, to a greater part, to the overall residential character of these areas, the layout of the streets, their generally verdant character and the era of the housing, expressed by their designs and relative small scale of the buildings. These provide a distinctive character and appearance.
267. There is no direct connection of these conservation areas with the appeal site. The appeal site is simply an area of land within the surrounding area, which is

¹¹³ Document CD1.4 view 22, and R11 Appendix 2 views 29 and 34

currently not generally visible from these areas. The lack of visibility, in my view, does not add to the significance of the conservation areas. The contribution the surroundings make is providing an urban setting for the conservation areas which have a distinctly different and historically interesting character that contrasts with the town centre character and buildings.

268. These conservation areas are further away from the appeal building, with Elsworthy Road Conservation Area being closest.
269. Views of the proposal¹¹⁴ from these areas are provided by the appellant and Save Swiss Cottage Action Group. In the appellant's views 1 and 2 (same as views 3 and 4 of Save Swiss Cottage Action Group), the existing modern buildings near to the appeal site can clearly be seen, including a tall tower from the Chalcots Estate and the large, modern Visage building (seen particularly in the appellant's View 2). While the appeal building would be an additional modern building in this view, it would not change the town centre setting and would have little impact on appearance and no impact on the character and or significance of the conservation area.
270. There are illustrative views from the South Hampstead Conservation Area¹¹⁵. These are a reasonable distance from the appeal site and downhill from it. Appellant's view 19 is the closest. This is at the edge of the South Hampstead Conservation Area and there are a number of modern buildings close by, particularly in views towards the appeal site. The proposed tower would be visible above some of those modern buildings and would be seen to be a considerable distance from the conservation area. The character or appearance of the conservation area when considered in relation to views from here would be preserved and the significance of the conservation area unaffected.
271. View 10 of the appellant and views 2 and 23 of Save Swiss Cottage Action Group are from similar locations in Goldhurst Terrace. From Views 10 and 2 the town centre buildings are a feature on the horizon. A little around the corner in view 23 the views are more contained within the conservation area. From this location the new building would be an additional feature of the town centre visible within the views¹¹⁶. However, the new building would be at a considerable distance and clearly be seen as part of the distant town centre and the views of it would not affect the character and appearance of the conservation area or its significance, the new building being clearly not part of it, but of the distant urban setting.

Alexandra Road Conservation Area¹¹⁷

272. The Alexandra Road conservation area's special interest and significance also relates to the age and design of the dwellings within it and the layout. This is a dramatic and bold form of innovative modern development representative of its age. It is different from the other conservation areas in that the development is very 'modern' in its form and I consider it to be very compatible with the modern design approach used in the appeal proposal.

¹¹⁴ Document CD1.4 Views 1 and 2 and Document R11 Appendix 2 views 3 and 4

¹¹⁵ Document CD 1.4 views 10 and 19 and Document R11 Appendix 2 views 2, 23 and 38

¹¹⁶ Document IQ34 page 3

¹¹⁷ Document G5 for conservation area statement and CD 2.5 list description

273. The appeal building will be visible from some parts of the conservation area and listed building and is therefore within the setting of these assets. The character of the area generally is that of suburban London, with mainly residential development nearby, but with other urban centres, such as Swiss Cottage town centre at a distance. I do not consider that the design of the Alexandra Road properties has responded directly to the designs within the surrounding development, much of which would have been present when constructed, other than through restrictions of the land area itself and the proximity and alignment of the railway. There will have been some influence on the scale of the proposal with it responding to some extent to the height of the nearby buildings. The appeal site being at considerable distance has no direct influence on the significance of the conservation area.
274. I also do not consider that the lack of anything visible on the appeal site from these assets makes a specific contribution to the heritage assets, but can better be thought of as being a neutral factor.
275. I consider that the urban setting is in principle important to the conservation area and listed building, but the actual form of that setting has little impact on significance. The appeal site, being a considerable way from these assets does not have any direct impact or make any contribution to the significance of the asset, apart from forming the urban area around it. Specifically in respect of towers, the site is already seen in the context of towers [105] and the addition of a further tower [206], some distance away, would not affect the significance, character or appearance, or architectural and historic significance of these assets either in part or as a whole. The significance and special architectural and historic interest would be preserved.

Listed Buildings

*Swiss Cottage Library*¹¹⁸

276. The list description identifies that the library was built around 1963/4, designed by Sir Basil Spence, Bonnington and Collins with a reinforced concrete frame, clad in pre-cast black basalt concrete spandrel panels between projecting and finely-finished concrete fins with Portland stone aggregate set over a smooth centred basement and ground floor. The plan form is described as a cigar shape. The library was intended to be part of a designed complex but this was not completed because of local government reorganisation. The list description describes it as one of Spence's most accomplished civic buildings, and amongst the most ambitious architectural designs for a library.
277. I consider that the special interest and significance relates to the design and designer of the building, its materials and location. The design results in a very attractive civic building. The arrangement of fins on the upper elevations shield the windows from view when seen at an angle. This means that the windows that give some scale to the building cannot be seen in some views and it gives the impression of a large scale building and this is very apparent when looking along Avenue Road.

¹¹⁸ Document CD 2.2

278. The scale of the building is appropriate to the town centre location and is a robust modern piece of architecture appropriate to having large buildings around it. These currently include the civic centre, Visage Building and Regency Lodge opposite. The swimming pool/leisure centre is also a large building and this has been built very close to the library, and is acceptable because this is a civic and town centre area.
279. The proposed building would be the same distance away from the library as the existing building. The illustration in View 13¹¹⁹ shows the juxtaposition of the library with the new building. I consider that this demonstrates a very complementary relationship between the two buildings, particularly the horizontal emphasis of the library with the tall tower structure and appropriate spacing between. The panel and frame arrangement of the new building, while not copying the library, is reflective of it and would work well together. The fact that the low element of the proposal is taller than the old building and steps from front to back works well and is not out of scale with the library. It can be seen in the photograph that there is Regency Lodge, a large scale building, on the opposite side of the road. I consider the proposal would enhance the town centre setting and therefore also the significance of the listed building. The special architectural and historic interest would be enhanced.
280. The architect for the existing building at the appeal site explained the way the existing building was designed to step down towards the library. The stepping down is clearly visible in the design of the current building on the site and I consider that is a valid approach to the design of a building at the appeal site. However, because the existing building steps down towards the listed building, does not mean that other designs for the site should also step down, but the designs should be considered on their merits. So, while the proposed building does not step down in the same way, it also is a valid design solution and I consider that it works well with the listed building.

The Hampstead Figure Sculpture

281. This is grade II listed, with the list description noting it as a bronze reclining abstracted female figure on a plinth produced in 1964 by F E McWilliam. It is inscribed 'The Hampstead Figure, 1964' and signed. It was commissioned as part of the group of civic buildings for the borough of Hampstead by Sir Basil Spence, and forms a close and complimentary grouping. F E McWilliam (1909-92) was a noted and prolific British sculpture, whose public works have not survived well.
282. I consider that the special architectural and historic interest and significance of the figure sculpture relates to its form and example of the sculptor's work and that it is an attractive form in itself. This interest and significance is reinforced by the fact that the designer of the civic buildings arranged it to be complementary to the Swiss Cottage library. When the sculpture was first positioned it was closer to the library than currently as it has been repositioned in the past¹²⁰.
283. The sculpture would be directly affected by the proposal as it would need to be removed to allow construction work to proceed. It would also be directly affected by the changed setting, through repositioning.

¹¹⁹ Document CD1.4 page 40

¹²⁰ Document IQ20

284. In terms of the setting's contribution to significance this is clearly strong in terms of its relationship with the library and historic intention. However, currently the sculpture is very cut off from the library. This is not only because of the distance away, but a quantity of very prominent and utilitarian sports equipment¹²¹ has been placed between. In my view these spoil the relationship of the library and sculpture, so repositioning with careful thought is likely to substantially enhance the setting of the sculpture and its relationship with the library. In addition, in its current position the sculpture can only be seen on three sides. The height of the existing building to which the statue is adjacent neither adds to nor takes away from the significance of the sculpture.
285. As to the remainder of the setting in terms of the current building at the appeal site, Swiss Cottage Open Space and Avenue Road, these form a civic/town centre environment appropriate to the sculpture. The proposed building is within the setting of the sculpture and would form a backdrop to the sculpture. However, the current building also forms a strong backdrop, and when close to the sculpture the height of the building makes little impression. I do not consider the increased height of the proposed building would have any additional impact on the sculpture. The area of the open space itself would not be physically changed by the proposal.
286. The opportunity to reposition the sculpture to provide all around viewing would be a major benefit, as would re-establishing a more positive relationship with the library. Even if the sculpture is repositioned in the same location, the impact on its significance would be neutral. Overall I consider there is likely to be a significant enhancement to the setting of the statue and consequently the special architectural and historic interest of the listed building would be likely to be enhanced.

Regency Lodge

287. According to the list description, Regency Lodge consists of flats and a parade of shops with underground garaging built around 1937/8 by Robert Atkinson and A F B Anderson. It is built in brickwork with artificial stone bands and dressings on a steel frame with flat roofs and metal windows and is described as a modern style development. The setting is the surrounding urban area and includes the library, the appeal site building and other large scale buildings in the town centre. The list history sets its context as the inter-war transport developments and residential preferences for quality, stylish, flat accommodation close to the centre of the metropolis. I consider the urban setting is important to the flats in principle, but no particular form or development is an important aspect of the setting, contributing to significance.
288. The change of built form on the appeal site will maintain the urban setting in a manner appropriate to the town centre and complements the setting and therefore the significance of the listed building. While the proposal would be much taller than what is currently at the appeal site, Regency Lodge is a large building formed around a central courtyard and its scale and mass would not be dominated by the proposal, but they would balance well with each other. I conclude that the significance, special architectural and historic interest of the listed building would be preserved.

¹²¹ Document R11 appendix 5 photograph 27

Fire Station at Lancaster Grove and Eton Avenue

289. The grade II* fire station was built in 1912-15, by Charles Canning Windmill of the Fire Brigade Branch of the London County Council Architects Department. It is an impressive Arts and Crafts building with steep hipped and pitched roofs and intricate brick detailing. The fire station has other arts and crafts houses nearby and forms an attractive group in the conservation area.
290. The list description indicates that the architects brought an avant-garde approach to fire station design, which had evolved for new social housing to the Fire Brigade Division. While some stations were built to standardised plans, others were highly experimental, sensitive to local context, and designed to a bespoke plan, as was this one. It is distinctive architecture, with attention to detail and sensitivity to its setting. The station occupies a prominent site, on the apex of two roads lined with high-quality Edwardian houses and the sensitivity of the design to this context is marked. The generous plot size accommodates the fireman's flats in a separate two storey range and the view from the junction is strikingly picturesque.
291. I consider the significance and special architectural and historic interest relates to its history, past use, design and integration within the conservation area. It is difficult to see the appeal proposal from the listed building, but from the road outside the fire station it would be visible in the distance. I do not consider there is any direct relationship with the area around the appeal site or with the appeal site itself.
292. The appellant's view 4¹²² shows the view with the brick fire station to the right. While the proposed tower would be seen in the distance, it does not directly affect the listed building or impact on its significance. While it would change the distant view, the near setting of the other arts and crafts buildings remains unchanged. The general location is not isolated from the modern surroundings outside of the conservation area, with the towers at Chalcots Estate visible a little further down Eton Avenue, so further modern development in the surrounding area in the distance would not be unacceptable in terms of its setting. The impact on its significance would be neutral and the significance, special architectural and historic interest would be preserved.

Alexandra Road Estate and Primrose Hill Tunnels (Entrance)

293. This is grade II* listed and includes the Alexandra Road Estate, walls, ramps, steps, community centre and boiler house. This was built around 1968 by Neave Brown of the Camden Architects' Department. It is strikingly modern in its form, emphasised by the bold and imaginative use of shuttered reinforced concrete. There are three parallel blocks, with that nearest the railway forming an acoustic shield. The northern pair of blocks face the 'internal' Rowley Way and are organised with stepped elevations facing Rowley Way, with each level providing outdoor areas for everyone. I consider that the significance and special architectural and historic interest of these buildings relates to their striking modern design, use of materials and they are historically important in relation to architecture of that period.

¹²² Document CD1.4 page 11 View 4

294. Also nearby is the pair of railway portals at the western end of the Primrose Hill Tunnels, listed grade II and built in stock brick and stone with stone dressings. The tunnel was considered to be a triumph of engineering, being London's first railway tunnel. Their significance and special architectural and historic interest relates to their form and materials and they are historically important as the first railway tunnels in London.
295. The setting of these listed buildings is that of the surrounding urban environment and this has been described above in relation to the conservation area. There is nothing specific about the surroundings that adds to the significance or special architectural and historic interest of these buildings. While the proposal is technically within the setting of these listed buildings and could be seen in the context of them, the appeal site makes no particular contribution to their significance. In my view, while the new building would be seen in the context of the listed buildings, the view of it would be at a considerable distance and would be seen as a modern part of the surrounding urban environment. It would not cause any material impact on the setting or affect the significance or special architectural and historic interest of the listed buildings.

Other listed buildings.

296. The council has not identified other listed building settings as being affected by the proposal. Other parties have identified some other listed buildings in the surrounding area, including many in the conservation areas. The evidence submitted does not form any direct/designed link between them and the appeal site in terms of their setting that makes a contribution to their significance. The harm identified is the relationship of those buildings with the appeal site, particularly where they can be seen in the context of the new building and its tower.
297. The next nearest listed houses are in Eton Avenue. The list description of 73 includes the front boundary wall and piers. It is a detached house built around 1890 by Harry Measures. It is in red brick with tile-hung and relief plasterwork and tile gabled roofs with tall brick chimney stacks and dormers. The next house is 69 Eton Avenue, was also built around 1890 by Fredrick Waller for the painter the Hon John Collier. It is constructed with red brick and terracotta dressings and slated hipped roofs and has a studio. The special architectural and historic interest and significance of these relates to their age, architects and, for 69, the past owner. The setting of the conservation area is important to the significance of these listed buildings as for others in the street. However, I see no direct link between the appeal site and the setting of the listed buildings or their significance.
298. I acknowledge that there will be some views of the listed buildings, where the appeal building would also be seen. However, the setting of these buildings not only includes the surrounding conservation area, but also the town beyond. While the setting is changed it remains an urban environment and with the proposed building at a considerable distance the setting and significance of the listed buildings would be preserved.
299. The Church of St Peter's is grade II listed and constructed about 1858-9 by W Mumford with tower and chancel by JP St Aubyn. It is built using Kentish ragstone, squared rubble with fine stone dressing with a tiled roof. It has angled buttresses, pointed belfry openings, clock faces and a crenellated parapet and

tracery windows with at the east and west windows stained glass by O'Connor. It was restored 1927.

300. I consider that its special architectural and historic interest and significance relate to the design of the church, its materials and its relationship with the surrounding conservation area and its people.
301. The setting of the church is principally the surrounding conservation area, but the appeal site is within its setting as the proposed tower would be visible from near to the church¹²³ as are other buildings outside of the conservation area. The conservation area setting adds to the significance of the parish church and it will be the location for a significant part of its congregation. The appeal site and surrounding town have a neutral impact in relation to the appeal site. The fact that the new tower would become visible in the distance from the church would not affect its significance or special architectural and historic interest. The tower would be seen as a distant feature of the urban landscape surrounding the conservation area. The significance, special architectural and historic interest would be preserved.
302. There are also listed buildings at 40 College Crescent (also identified as the nurses' home), the Palmer Memorial Drinking Fountain in College Crescent and South Hampstead High School in Maresfield Gardens. All listed grade II. The special architectural and historic interest of No 40 relates to the building's design and materials. It was constructed about 1880 and is an asymmetrical building in Queen Anne style in red brick with terra cotta detailing. The house was built for S Palmer of Huntley and Palmer biscuits of Reading, in a style that was popular in Reading at the time. Palmer's family presented the Palmer Memorial drinking fountain in his memory in 1904. The special architectural and historic interest of this relates to its design and materials and historical links with No 40 and the Palmer family.
303. While the fountain and 40 College Crescent are related there is no direct link between these listed buildings and the surrounding setting other than the setting providing an urban environment, so the setting makes little contribution to the special architectural and historic interest or significance of the listed buildings. The tower in particular would be visible from the streets with the listed building in view. However, the view would still be of the town centre where other modern and large buildings are located. The introduction of the appeal proposal would not have any impact on the special architectural and historic interest or significance of these listed buildings.

Local Lists¹²⁴

Swiss Cottage Open Space

304. This is described as a very innovative example of contemporary park design, with Gustafson Porter's water feature providing play opportunities and a visual drama with 7 streams of arching water and a performance space when dry. There is sculptured landscaping around, creating seating in a natural amphitheatre, which is extremely well used and appreciated by the community and unites the

¹²³ Document R11 appendix 2 page 33

¹²⁴ Document CD 5.4

surrounding area, which is mixed in character and appearance. The setting is the surrounding buildings that include the large scale Visage building, Leisure Centre, Library, Theatre and existing building at the appeal site. This is not a 'parkland' setting, but a small park next to a town centre with large scale civic buildings. I do not consider that the size of the buildings is a particular factor in the setting or significance of the park and the fact that the design of the proposal would be changed in relation to what is currently on site, particularly that there is a much taller building proposed would not alter the civic/town centre character of the setting, so the significance of the asset would not be harmed by the proposed change.

Hampstead Theatre

305. This is the first free-standing theatre in London for over 25 years designed by Architects Bennett Associates and it won an RIBA Award in 2003. It was designed for contemporary plays. The auditorium is a dramatic tilting zinc drum accessed across bridges over a void. The glazed foyer provides views of the park and makes a significant contribution to the setting of both the market and the park as well as the cultural life of the area.

Swiss Cottage Leisure Centre

306. This is described as a metal and glass leisure centre dating to 2006 by Architect Sir Terry Farrell. It is light and spacious, with views of the open space from almost every part of the centre. The glazed north face brings the activity of the building into the park. To the south, the colourful illuminated climbing wall offers "a striking night display" to Adelaide Road with dramatic glass atrium on the western face and upper-level links to library. It has a similar roof line to the listed Basil Spence library and is a complementary design, creating a distinctive landmark.

Royal Central School of Speech and Drama

307. This is described as a late 19th century stucco fronted building by Roland Plumbe. It was originally Eton Avenue Hall, which was reconstructed 1888 for the Hampstead Conservatoire of Music and School of Art, and converted to the Embassy Theatre in 1928. It became the Central School in 1956. Its façade of vertical windows set in brickwork gives a residential scale and character, linking it to the Victorian terraces to the east. This is reinforced by stone facing at ground floor level reflecting the usual stuccoed ground storey. The simplicity of the extension avoids conflict with the stucco fronted theatre or the adjacent houses. The school has produced many distinguished alumni and staff including Laurence Olivier, Vanessa Redgrave, Judi Dench, Harold Pinter and Cameron Mackintosh. There is no other single faculty worldwide that offers such a diverse range of specialist masters programmes in theatre and performance practices.
308. With all three buildings located around the Swiss Cottage Open Space, the setting is the open space itself and the other buildings, which include those in the Belsize Conservation Area and the civic buildings and town centre. In my view, the town centre is an important aspect because of the civic function of the buildings and to my mind there is an expectation of town centre type and scale buildings. I therefore consider that it is the character of the town centre that is particularly important in terms of the contribution the setting makes to the significance of these buildings and I consider that this character would not be

altered by the change proposed. There would be a neutral impact on the setting and significance of these buildings.

309. Another building identified as being important by local people is the Swiss Cottage Inn¹²⁵. This is directly across Avenue Road from the appeal site and close to the appeal proposal. It has a distinct character of its own and it is identified as providing the name for the area and is important in that respect. It is also an important community building. The context of this building is the town centre with many existing large buildings nearby. The proposed development would not alter the town centre context of the inn, but reinforce it and provide additional activity in the vicinity of the building providing a focus for the area. I consider if anything the town centre setting of the inn would be improved with the new development through improved pavement frontage and increased activity/vitality on the ground floor of the development.
310. I conclude that the proposal generally accords with the aims and objectives CS Policies CS5 & CS14, DP Policy DP25 and LP Policy 7.8. However, there is some harm in terms of CS Policies CS5, CS14 and DP25 related to the impact on the two views identified above to be carried through into the planning balance.

Character and Appearance

311. The existing building at the appeal site is not well thought of by the appellant or council officers, but interested parties consider it to be well designed, particularly in terms of its bulk and scale adjacent to the Swiss Cottage Open Space and the way that it steps down towards the listed library. I consider it to be an attractively designed building and generally well thought out in relation to its surroundings, including the listed library. However, I do acknowledge that the ground floor poorly relates to the surrounding area, with a lack of interaction with the streets or Swiss Cottage Open Space. The provision of active frontages around the buildings would considerably improve the urban environment. However, the question here is not how the existing building relates to its surroundings, but how the proposed building would relate.
312. In this respect many of the witnesses have compared the existing building with the proposed building and significant change in size. There is no doubt that there would be a considerable change in the size of the buildings, which will have a greater presence. The extent of the change for the area is not the main consideration, but whether what is proposed would be acceptable in the context of its surroundings.
313. The council at the inquiry was suggesting that the design principles were formed after the scheme had formed. From my own experience, while you may start with a brief, the design will always evolve as issues emerge through the expert studies undertaken and consultations. I therefore consider that the process would be that explained by the appellant's architect, and if it had not evolved and responded to emerging evidence and consultation, there would be something wrong. That does not make the design principles 'artificial', but an explanation of what emerged from the design process.

¹²⁵ Document R11 appendix 5 page 39 shows views of this.

314. Concern has also been raised about the impact of the development as seen from Primrose Hill, from which it would be seen in distant views¹²⁶. The park is a good distance from the appeal site and there are already views of other tall buildings from the park. The addition of this building would not have any direct impact on the setting, amenity value or significance of the park at Primrose Hill.
315. The building can best be appreciated in the illustrations in Document CD1.5 and the Finchley Road area can be seen in Documents R11 photos 60 onwards, with the context analysis in Document CD1.6. Assessment of the impact on the character and appearance of the area necessarily includes that on nearby heritage assets and they have been considered above.
316. The principle of development for residential and commercial uses is appropriate, the site being in the town centre and not far from many other residential developments. In terms of the scale of the building there are a number of tall buildings near to the site, including the Cresta House opposite, and the Visage Building next to the Leisure Centre. One of the Chalcots Estate towers is nearby and is of 24 storeys¹²⁷. The Camden's Site Allocations Local Development Document identifies the site as being appropriate for the type of development proposed [41]. It noted the potential for taller buildings, although there is no particular height indicated. However, while I accept that adjacent to the site there are no buildings that are nearly as high as the tower, and buildings such as the library, theatre and leisure centre have a more horizontal emphasis, the illustrations provided show that the tall tower is complementary to the nearby buildings.
317. There are objections to the elevations of the building and plan form. It is suggested that these have not been articulated enough and the plan form has remained the same for the height of the tower, leading to a 'boring' shape, which is not considered to result in a slender form. The materials are also not liked and surprise is expressed that materials are matters for conditions.
318. The appellant describes how the design has been carefully considered [62-77]. While I acknowledge the consistent plan form of the tower through its height, the elevations have been carefully articulated through different manipulation of the framework, materials and arrangement of the panels between the frames. The result is an attractively designed building that responds to its context. The top of the tower would be articulated by opening the upper storey frames and providing glazing. The tower through its height would, on two elevations, be divided into thirds with different elevation treatment at the sides. So even if the tower were not to be considered to be slender, which tends to be relative and subjective, the design provides a distinct, elegant, vertical emphasis. The other two elevations are also split, with a glazed central section with the two sides being principally identified by slim panels and glazing. The lower building has been similarly carefully considered and articulated.
319. The proposal has suggested materials and colours which would provide an attractive building. However, I accept that there should be an opportunity for materials to be considered prior to construction, which is appropriate to be

¹²⁶ Document IQ7 and R11 appendix 2 photograph 26

¹²⁷ Documents CD1.6 pages 16 and 17 show context in terms of tall buildings

controlled through condition and in my experience occurs on the majority of planning applications.

320. I consider that the proposed building meets the criteria of the Camden Site Allocations Policy. It is a well designed, attractive building that sits well within its town centre context and is supported by the Design Council and the GLA. The proposal would accord with CS Policies CS3, CS5, CS7 & CS15, DP Policies DP24 & DP31 and LP Policies 2.15, 3.3, 3.4, 3.5, 3.6, 3.7, 3.8, 3.9, 3.10, 4.7, 4.8 and 7.7.

Sunlight and Daylight

321. There is no dispute that the impact of the development on shadowing of the open space is relevant [50] and included in the BRE guidance. The BRE guidance indicates that the sunlit nature of a site can be enhanced by various techniques including placing low rise, low density housing to the south with taller, higher density buildings to the north, which has occurred here with the taller element. While there was some question about whether the guide was intended to consider the quality of the use of open space, the guide makes it clear that it gives advice on site layout planning to achieve good sunlight and daylight both within buildings and in the open spaces between them [50].
322. However, I accept that the BRE is only guidance and that while the detailed assessment carried out by the appellant identifies the impact of the proposal on the open space, it is also necessary to consider the impact on the way that the particular open space is used. The appellant also accepts that this is the case, as a previous scheme that also complied with the BRE guidance was redesigned to allow for the comments relating to shadows by the Design Council. However, as noted by the BRE guidance, it must be borne in mind that nearly all structures will create areas of new shadow, and some degree of transient overshadowing of a space is to be expected [54].
323. The diagrams show that the proposed development will result in increased shading of the open space, generally causing the various areas to be in shade for about 60 - 90 minutes or so earlier than would be the case without the development. The shading from the building of the open space would generally occur from about 13:00 in March, 14:00 in August and about 16:00 in June.
324. However, the council has undertaken a survey of the area, identifying use of the Swiss Cottage Open Space. The space was found to be well used, including the playground and water feature and this is with the current building empty. It was noted that that the playground and games area use did not appear to be weather dependent [126]. In clement weather the open space was found to be used for recreational purposes, with generally greater use at the weekends. The general impression is that the shadow areas when present are little used.
325. My two site visits were on a cloudy day and on a day with mainly sunshine in the morning. On the shady day, at around 17:00 the site was seen to be well used with people sitting on the benches by the theatre and around the park area. The lack of sunshine did not appear to inhibit use of the space, although it might well have had greater use had there been sun and there is a difference between the shade produced by clouds and that of a nearby building. On the sunny day the park was again seen to be well used, with most people in the sunny areas,

- but still reasonable numbers sitting in shaded areas. The fact that there is shade does not prevent use of the open space.
326. It is suggested that the Swiss Cottage Open Space is used more in the afternoon. There is no detailed survey evidence for that, but I expect that is likely to be the case with people perhaps passing through from school and work and lingering on the way. However, the evidence does not indicate that the space could not be used if, on the sunny days, the sunny parts were shaded earlier in the day. Evidence from interested parties also indicates substantial use of the park year round.
327. I do not consider that there are particular uses of the park that are highly sensitive to shading. The only area where I would consider sun to be more suited to the use is the water feature in the centre of the park, which was well used by children. However, I also noted the use did continue even in shade and it seems probable that it is to some extent dependent on ambient temperature. The use of this area may be affected to some extent by the new building, but as noted above the impact is mainly for about 60-90 minutes a day. In my opinion, the additional shading will not have an unacceptable impact on the amenity provided by the park and generally would comply with the guidance provided by the BRE.
328. The building will also cause shading of the pedestrianised end of Eton Avenue, where markets are held. This is a naturally shady area, because of the large avenue of trees, particularly in the summer. However, I appreciate that the usual dappled shade provided by trees is different from, and more pleasant, than that produced by a building, but the market use is not a use that relies on sunshine. The stalls themselves provide canopies to shield the users from rain and sunshine. As an example, the shading in August can be seen in Document A1 appendices drawings 99 to 105. While I acknowledge that sunshine can enhance any use, the additional length of shading, while having an impact for 2/3 hours of the day, would, overall not unacceptably impact on the amenity of the space and would accord with guidance in the BRE Site Layout Planning for Daylight and Sunlight Guide 2011. I do not consider that the markets would be unacceptably affected and their amenity, social and economic value would remain.
329. While some concerns are raised by interested parties in relation to the study undertaken, I consider that it has been very comprehensive and considers the site and particularly the Swiss Cottage Open Space in great detail. The report has been considered by other experts¹²⁸. Cresta House Residents' Association identify the lack of mention of Cresta House in the report [181]. However, I acknowledge that it was included, as can be seen in the report, and there was simply an error in labelling that part of the building being considered as being Cresta House. Clearly, particularly through the winter months there could be some more distant shading from the tower than shown on the diagrams, beyond the Swiss Cottage Open Space and surrounding the appeal site are many other buildings that themselves would cause shading with low angle sun. In my view the study undertaken provides sufficient information for a robust assessment to be made.
330. The report clearly considers the impact of the development on the surrounding residences and concludes any impact would be acceptable [59]. While it is acknowledged that some of the flats at Cresta House do not have balconies and

¹²⁸ Documents CD1.42 and CD1.43

that the rooms are longer than identified, I am satisfied that the impact on these flats in terms of daylight and sunlight would be minimal and accept and that it would accord with BRE recommendations. The distance across the roads from these flats to the development is substantial and the residences would not be affected by the lower block because of its height, and the tall element is relatively slender and would not have an unacceptable impact on much of the sky component providing daylight to these residences.

331. The question was also raised as to whether the level of the Swiss Cottage Open Space had been accounted for [215], but the appellant indicates that the software used for the assessment is a standard form used in the industry and does account for levels [53]. It is also argued that the BRE guidance has been used flexibly and not in a way that an expert would do. However, the introduction to the BRE guidance indicates, amongst other things, that the guide is intended for building designers and their clients, consultants and planning officials. The advice given is not mandatory and the guide should not be seen as an instrument of planning policy; its aim is to help rather than constrain designers. Although it gives numerical guidelines, these should be interpreted flexibly since natural lighting is only one of many factors in site layout.
332. It is also argued that trees should be included in the assessment. However, the BRE leaves that as a judgment for the assessor¹²⁹. It seems to me that had trees, even evergreens, been included these would have indicated a greater extent of shading of the existing areas, and the further impact from the proposed building would not have been so great. Either way I consider the assessment is a reasonable interpretation of the BRE guidance. The Design Council considered the impact on sunlight /daylight in considerable detail and concluded, following changes after its initial comments that it was acceptable.

Other Amenity Issues

Swiss Cottage Open Space

333. Save Swiss Cottage provide a good photographic description of the use of the park and market area¹³⁰. It is a popular and well used area, with children particularly liking the large water feature¹³¹. The proposed development does not encroach on the park, but is separated from it by the main north/south path. I have considered the effect of daylight and sunlight above. The use of the park would not be physically impeded by the completed proposed development. I consider that the significance of this relates to its design, layout, surroundings and extensive use.
334. The proposal would considerably increase the extent of overlooking of the park from residential properties. However, the park is not a private space, with many residential windows directly overlooking it from the rear of the Winchester Road properties¹³² and existing office in the building at the appeal site. There would be no expectation by users of privacy while using the park, so I do not consider that

¹²⁹ Document CD1.57 page 19 paragraph 3.3.9 also see closings – Appellant IQ38 page 44 and Council IQ37 page 16 paragraph 83 onwards

¹³⁰ Document R11 appendix 5

¹³¹ Document R11 appendix 5 photo 18

¹³² Document R11 appendix 5 photograph 18

the additional overlooking would have any significant impact on the use of the space or harm its amenity for users.

335. The significant increase in residential use at the appeal site would result in greater use of the Swiss Cottage Open Space by the residents [196], but it is a large space, very capable of increased use, and I consider that this would be an enhancement in terms of increased vitality of the area.
336. The proposal would provide ground floor uses that would be accessed from the path adjacent to the park. Uses such as cafés and restaurants would, to my mind, be a positive benefit to the open space increasing the vitality of the area and improving the junction between the park and existing building, which is not well connected at the moment. The neighbours to the Swiss Cottage Open Space particularly along Winchester Road, are concerned that people exiting the proposed A3 uses at night would cause noise and disturbance in the area as they leave, spoiling the tranquillity of the Swiss Cottage Open Space and causing excessive noise and disturbance to the occupiers of the houses backing on to the park as they sleep, including the occupiers in Mora Burnett House.
337. However, some also note that there are other restaurant type uses in Winchester Road, but that these are well managed and do not cause difficulties. The restaurant uses that face the Swiss Cottage Open Space are a considerable distance from the rear of the properties on Winchester Road. The opening times would be regulated by condition, with the opening times proposed being the usual required in the area. These include a requirement to vacate any outside spaces by 22:00 hrs. While it cannot be said that there would never be a noise / disturbance incidents, there is no reason to expect that these new premises would be likely prone to problems and could be equally well managed. Any problems that did arise can be dealt with by appropriate means. Given the distance from the properties and control of opening hours, I do not consider that there would be likely to be unacceptable noise and disturbance generated by the properties.
338. The buildings at the appeal site would be taller and the tower would have a significantly greater presence. However, when considering a 360 degree view from the park the tower would be a small element in the outlook of the park and I do not consider that it would cause unacceptable harm to the outlook of users of the park.
339. Overall, while the appearance of the setting would change, the civic/town centre character would not. I do not consider that there would be an unacceptable impact on the Swiss Cottage Open Space.
340. Mr Grimm, an interested party, is concerned about the impact of the development as experienced from the swimming pool. In terms of privacy, there are viewing positions around the pool, including from the café area adjacent, so users of the pool are not expecting this to be a private space. In any case, the proposed development would be a considerable distance away, such that any views from its windows would not cause harm to the amenity of those using the pool. In addition, because of the distance away, the building would not have an overbearing impact on pool users. There are also already windows in a similar position close to the pool in the existing building.

341. I have also considered the various residential properties around the proposed development, including Cresta House, Winchester and Eton Avenue properties and residences above the leisure centre. While the proposed building would be clearly visible from these properties, in each case the tower would be a considerable distance away and its height and bulk would not cause an unacceptable impact on the outlook from these premises. Similarly because of the considerable distance between the proposed buildings and any existing buildings, there would be no unacceptable impacts in terms of overlooking or loss of privacy for neighbouring occupiers. There could be some overlooking of the space outside of the Central School for Speech and Drama, but this space is open to public view already, including from the existing building at the appeal site and there would be no further significant impact from the proposal that would cause unacceptable harm.
342. The proposal would accord with CS Policy CS5, DP Policy DP26 and LP Policy 7.7.

Other Matters

Air Quality

343. Evidence is submitted by Katharine Bligh located in the appendices at Document IQ28 (red folder). Some readings of pollution monitoring are provided and shown in the appendices to IQ28. The appellant has provided reports at CD1.13 and CD1.14.
344. The appellant's report indicates that transport related emissions are one of the main sources of air pollution and the principle pollutants relevant to the assessment are considered to be NO₂ and PM₁₀ particulates and the spread of survey results indicates that is the case here, with much higher readings near to the main road. The interested party also provides details of PM_{2.5} particulates. Local authorities are required by law to review and assess air quality for pollutants specified in the Government National Air Quality Strategy. If quality objectives are likely to be exceeded, then a detailed assessment is required and where this is an on-going situation the authority must declare an Air Quality Management Area. The whole of Camden is an Air Quality Management Area for nitrogen dioxide, including the appeal site. It is not designated in relation to particulates. The interested parties note that there are no safe limits, but only objective targets.
345. I accept that in relation to particulates, interested party evidence indicates that the recommended air quality objective levels are exceeded at times, but the estimated annual average pollutant concentrations at the development site, apart from nitrogen dioxide, are below the air quality objective. Clearly there needs to be action to reduce the pollution levels in the whole of Camden, as indicated by the Air Quality Management Area.
346. However, London needs more housing and that is likely to bring more associated pollution. The councillor indicated at the inquiry that the housing would be better located in northern towns, but that is not a realistic prospect, at least in the short term. The main source of pollution is generated by traffic, so the impact in relation to this proposal would, in terms of traffic generation, be reduced to minimum levels. It would be a car free development and is located in a town centre close to transport links.

347. The combined heat and power plant will result in some emissions that could increase particulates in the air and could affect some of the nearer residents of the development. This has been considered in the report and mitigation measures are proposed to resolve this matter, so that emissions are acceptable.
348. There will be a risk of increased pollution during construction. This has been taken into consideration in terms of conditions and the obligation, requiring a construction management plan for air quality and carbon reduction. There is a risk of increased pollution from the Combined Heat and Power plant, particularly nitrogen dioxide, and controls of the extent of the output are also proposed.
349. The high levels of pollution generated by the existing traffic could be an issue at low level to residents within the tower. However, sealed units with mechanical ventilation are proposed at the lower levels. In terms of the Swiss Cottage Open Space, this is generally well protected from the main road by buildings and that would generally continue to be the case, with an even taller building between it and the road. The proposal, with the appropriate mitigation, particularly during construction, should not add significantly to pollution within the park. There would be the new opening provided between the two new buildings where pollution from the road could migrate across. However, readings at the other end of the building show that there is considerable drop off of readings further away from the road. The gap is at the top corner of the park and I do not foresee this as being a significant issue.
350. The overall conclusion of the report on this issue is that, with the recommended mitigation measures in place, air quality is not considered to be a significant consideration for the proposed development.

Wind Environment

351. It is acknowledged that there would be some increase in wind speeds, but this is to be expected when a tall building is constructed [108]. The question is whether there would be an unacceptable impact. The proposals have been fully wind tested and assessed in line with the best standards for the industry, including use of the Lawson Criteria to assess suitability for the intended use of surrounding spaces. It is the expert's opinion that the wind conditions seen in the assessment are not particularly severe or unusual in London.
352. Receptor 2 is on the edge of the market area, but receptors 44 and 45 towards the centre of Eton Avenue would, to my mind, be more representative of where the market area is mainly located, although some market stalls are located towards receptor 2¹³³. The location of receptor 1 was for the tube entrance, where higher winds can be tolerated and receptor 2 was on the pedestrian thoroughfare. There is no specific criterion for market stalls; the experts have taken standing/entrance use as the target as it is appropriate for this type of activity year around¹³⁴. This, to my mind, is a reasonable approach and there would be acceptable conditions for the market use. In addition, in the summer months it is expected that the trees when in leaf would provide some additional protection.

¹³³ Document R11 appendix 5 photographs 29 and 34 shows a stall in relation to the existing building

¹³⁴ Document IQ31

353. Looking at the report, receptor 1 is near the tube entrance. Receptor 2 is located on the pedestrian route adjacent to the façade. The wind speed in this location is satisfactory for a thoroughfare use being used for access to the building and to the tube station.
354. The report indicates that receptor 7, which is the windiest location, is identified as being on a route used infrequently by pedestrians. This is not correct at the moment. The path is a main thoroughfare north/south and south/north through the park. However, it is likely the extent of use would change with the development, with at least some diversion of current users to the new route between buildings to get to Avenue Road and the tube station. However, I accept that the route by the theatre would continue to be an important pedestrian route.
355. The potential impact was identified in the report and mitigation measures are proposed that would ensure the wind environment is acceptable. Condition 14¹³⁵ has been included to ensure that suitable measures are incorporated within the design to mitigate potential adverse wind environments arising from the development. In relation to receptor 7, specific proposals are put forward in the report. Taking into consideration the use of this area as a main walking route and the times of year and the high winds are expected, I consider that this matter can be satisfactorily resolved.
356. There is also some likelihood of high winds in the new route at receptor 12, with occasional winds of Beaufort force 6. This is not expected to cause a nuisance on a thoroughfare such as this and would not be a harmful impact. The study has also considered the Swiss Cottage Open Space for any impact on the amenity of users. This remains suitable for sitting during the summer and suitable for its amenity use.
357. Overall, I conclude that a thorough study of the wind environment has been made and that, with suitable mitigation methods no harm to the users of the area would be caused. The proposal would accord with CS Policies CS5 & CS15, DP Policies 26 and DP31 and LP Policies 5.1 and 5.2

Safety

358. Concern is expressed over the safety of users of the Swiss Cottage Open Space, particularly the formation of a new access route into the area between the new buildings. This would lead directly out of the park to the main road. The provision of another access into the Swiss Cottage Open Space does potentially provide an additional safety risk. However, the Swiss Cottage Open Space already has many entrances, two from Eton Avenue, one from Winchester Road, one from Adelaide Road and one from The Avenue, between the library and existing building. The current access to the Avenue is large and directly towards the park area¹³⁶. The new route would be at the top end of the park and not so directly related to it. In addition, there are internal hedges/boundaries that provide some internal enclosure with the park. The park is currently not an enclosed space where parents could simply leave children to play; children would need to be supervised and I do not consider, given the current situation and

¹³⁵ Document IQ30

¹³⁶ Document R11 appendix 5 photograph 27

arrangement that the new entrance to the Avenue would result in any significant impact on the safety of users.

359. The presence of a gas reduction valve adjacent to the appeal site is identified by Mr Reed [200]. While this is reasonably close to the building, I do not consider that this is a safety issue. It is located in a pedestrian area, adjacent to the existing offices and near to the Royal Central School of Speech and Drama.

Road Access

360. The site is in a town centre location directly adjacent to Swiss Cottage underground station and on good bus routes. It is at the top of the PTAL rating (6b) and very sustainable in these terms and an ideal location for a car free development as proposed. There would be very little opportunity for occupiers to keep cars in the area. The only parking at basement level is for persons with disabilities. The Section 106 undertaking removes the ability of occupiers to apply for resident parking spaces in the area. However, I accept that there will still be service traffic attending the site.
361. The existing building, while not as large as the proposal, is a big office building with some restaurants and is serviced from Eton Avenue. Servicing and access to the existing basement, which is to continue in the new proposal, is via the basement ramp that passes beneath the theatre. This is expected to continue, but the head room is limited meaning that servicing using this would be restricted to Transit type vans. Access can be achieved without interfering with the existing pedestrian infrastructure or tree line adjacent to the site on Eton Avenue at the rear of the proposed building.
362. It would be necessary to control the times of delivery very strictly to avoid clashes with the market trading that takes place in Eton Avenue, but that is a matter that can be controlled. Mr Reed notes that moving bollards were tried previously but were found not to work and were removed. While I accept that was the case, there is no reason why with good management access to the property cannot be controlled. A taxi drop-off point is proposed in Avenue Road, but Transport for London cannot confirm that this would be acceptable until their plans for the gyratory have been formed and I consider that little weight can be attached to this at the moment.
363. There would be increased use of the underground station adjacent, but it is estimated that if all the additional trips were to and from the south and they were grouped together into one 15 minute segment in the morning, it would add just 12 additional trips on each train during each peak hour, which is a minimal increase. An interim travel plan is provided¹³⁷ and would be the subject of the planning obligation¹³⁸ and obligations relating to provision of a service and construction management plans are included. The impact of the development would not be substantial and certainly not severe as indicated by the Framework [109].
364. Mr Reed questions whether the occupants of the units would walk or cycle, particularly as there is a Red Route adjacent. I believe the suggestion is that

¹³⁷ Document CD 1.12 appendix F

¹³⁸ Document IQ40 page 27/28 – construction, service and travel management plans

occupants of expensive flats would not wish to. There is no reason why these occupants should not walk and cycle; after all, the Prime Minister and London Mayor cycle and there is no reason why others should not. In addition, many of the units will be affordable housing and those occupiers may also wish to walk and cycle. The proposal would accord with CS Policies CS5 & CS15, DP Policy 26 and LP Policy 3.6.

Trees

365. Save Swiss Cottage Action Group identify that it is indicated that tree 10 is removed. This is located towards the end of Eton Avenue near its junction with Avenue Road and near to the Royal Central School of Speech and Drama. I accept that this is what is noted in the report. However, there is no need for this tree to be removed and it would appear that instead of noting trees 9 and 11 for removal it was mistakenly noted as trees 9-11. In any case, I agree that this is an attractive tree and not appropriate for removal and this is a matter that can be controlled through the conditions proposed to be attached. The council's tree officer does not object, subject to appropriate conditions being in place¹³⁹.
366. Mr Harverson noted that his tree grading was based on an interpretation of the British Standard it had been confirmed to him by the institution was not an approved method. He also confirmed that he did not suggest that planning permission should be refused on the basis of his points and that there would be likely to be technical solutions to issues concerning the weight of construction traffic crossing the root protection zones of retained trees. Mr Tabor also confirmed that if all his points were taken up he was not inviting dismissal of the appeal.
367. I accept that there will be considerable additional traffic along Eton Avenue, including in the pedestrian part of the area. However, this was originally a road now pedestrianised and there are very large articulated lorries visiting the theatre. While there is clearly a risk, particularly to the mature trees in Eton Avenue and those near the appeal proposal on Avenue Road, these can be protected and conditions are proposed to ensure that this is the case.
368. I also accept that it was originally proposed that the trees near to the southern end of the new buildings would be retained. The proposal is that these should now be removed and replaced at the end of the construction. While these are attractive trees, they are not large and so well established that their removal and replacement would cause significant harm, but I accept that the tree removal proposed would cause some harm to amenity, which is to be carried forward into the planning balance.

Community Facility

369. The developer has set aside space to allow a community facility to be located in the building and that mixed use would be part of the planning permission. The current intention is that the Winchester Project should be relocated from its current building in Winchester Road. Details of the project can be found at IQ 16, particularly the key benefits are identified in appendix 4. The current building is on many floors and has had to be fitted into the old building. I am satisfied that

¹³⁹ Document IQ31 proposed conditions 19 and 20

there would be substantial benefits in providing space for this use in a modern building, which can be arranged to suit the needs of the project and is closely related to the civic centre and library.

370. At the inquiry interested parties were concerned that clauses appeared to allow reversion of the use of the space to housing, if it was not taken up for community facility within a certain time frame. This, they suggested could be manipulated, perhaps through pricing. However, the clause does not allow automatic reversion to housing, but just allows the developer to apply for planning permission for a change of use back to residential use. Clearly if the Winchester Project, or some other community use, indicated to the council in the course of that planning application that it wanted to take up the space, then that would be a major consideration for the planning authority and would be likely to affect the outcome of the planning application. The developer also indicated at the inquiry that discussions with the Winchester Project were at an advanced stage and that the intention was for it to use the space. Overall, I consider that the allocation of the community space, whether taken up by the Winchester Project or others, is a significant benefit to go into the planning balance.

5 year Housing Supply

371. There was some comment about the 5 year housing supply position by the appellant [138], particularly related to the inclusion of housing for students, as this was said to distort the availability of 'general' housing. The council has dealt with it in terms of defining the 5 year supply figure in accordance with government guidance, but even if the non-conventional housing contribution was at 25% and no local authority-owned sites were developed, the council would still have an up-to-date 5 year supply. I conclude that the council does have an up to date 5 year housing supply for the purposes of considering policies in the Framework.
372. In these circumstances the second part of paragraph 49 would not come into play, but it is still necessary that housing applications should be considered in the context of the presumption in favour of sustainable development. I consider that great weight should be attached to the housing provision proposed.
373. There was considerable concern raised by interested parties about the number of affordable houses proposed. The appellant has undertaken a viability appraisal¹⁴⁰ that demonstrates what is proposed is reasonable and this has been accepted by the authority. In addition, as a check, the 106 agreement requires that the viability of providing affordable housing is re-assessed at the end of the project and if it is found that there should have been more affordable housing a mechanism is set out for adjustment by a deferred payment. I consider that this viability study and method of ensuring that adequate affordable housing is provided is reasonable and necessary and related to the proposal.

Environmental Impact Assessment

374. Objectors consider that the Environmental Impact Assessment screening should have identified the need for an Environmental Statement¹⁴¹. However, a

¹⁴⁰ Document CD1.31 Viability report

¹⁴¹ Document IQ34 page 7

screening assessment was made and this demonstrated that an Environmental Statement was not required for the proposal. Some of the main concerns referred to were in relation to amenity and heritage assets. Having considered these matters in great detail in the course of this inquiry, I conclude that the scoping was reasonable and that there was nothing to indicate that an Environmental Statement should have been prepared. In forming my recommendation on this appeal, I have taken into consideration the extensive environmental information submitted and evidence from consultation bodies and other organisations.

Planning Obligation and Conditions

375. The Agreement is made between the London Borough of Camden and Essential Living (Swiss Cottage) Ltd and others with an interest in the land.
376. I consider that the requirements for affordable housing and other associated controlling clauses are reasonable, necessary and related to the development and when viability is taken into consideration as set out above, I consider that it accords with the aims and objectives of policy. The viability study indicates that the extent of supply is reasonable, but I consider that it is reasonable that should the project viability be improved during construction that the affordable housing situation should be reviewed.
377. The streets around the appeal site are currently heavily used for parking cars and it would not be acceptable to increase the load with cars from the new development. It is therefore necessary to prevent residents from parking in the streets, which will require the undertaking for residents not to be able to apply for resident parking permits (unless the applicant is chronically sick or disabled). It is necessary, fair and reasonably related to the development.
378. The residents of the proposal will make considerable use of the surrounding public realm and the proposal will have an impact on its surroundings, so it is reasonable and necessary that contributions should be made to improving the public realm nearby, including providing appropriate landscaping. In addition, it is reasonable that the proposal should 'contribute' additional space to the open space and to allow for its future maintenance. These contributions are necessary, fair and reasonably related to the development.
379. This is a tight site, with busy roads adjacent, an active park, civic buildings and residential properties nearby. It is therefore essential that the construction at the site is actively managed and that subsequent traffic movements are also actively managed. Therefore, the Construction Management Plan, Service Management Plan and the Travel Plan are necessary, fair and reasonably related to the development. It is also reasonable that the project should provide units suitable for wheelchair users and this is a benefit to be carried into the planning balance.
380. A key factor in sustainable development is the public benefits provided by a development. In this case I attach weight to the public benefits provided by local procurement/local employment, Energy Efficiency, Community Facility and potential New Station Access. I consider these are necessary, fair and reasonably related to the development.

381. With a large development it is necessary to actively manage waste disposal and recycling which is generated by the development and control of this is necessary, fair and reasonably related to the development.
382. The only clause in the obligation that I have some issue with is that relating to the project architect. The council is concerned that if another architect is brought into the project to take over from the design architect the quality of the scheme and design intentions could be harmfully affected. I understand the concern of the council and accept that a 'new designer' might not fully appreciate the concept. However, to bind the developer to one architect does not seem reasonable or acceptable, particularly if there were some 'falling out' between them. The general form of the design is set by the application drawings, which conditions require to be followed. The council would, through the conditions, have an opportunity to refuse/approve the details submitted and if the building is not in accordance with the drawings/conditions, can take appropriate action. Overall, I do not consider that this clause is compliant with the CIL Regulations as it is not necessary or fair.
383. I conclude overall, apart from as identified above, that the section 106 requirements are necessary to make the development acceptable in planning terms, directly related to the development, and fairly and reasonably related, in scale and kind, to the development.

Conditions

384. The conditions agreed between the council and appellant are set out in Annex A together with the reasons for them, which I agree with.

Planning Balance

385. When considering applications that may affect a listed building or its setting, section 66 (1) of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 requires special regard to be paid to the desirability of preserving the building or its setting or any features of special architectural or historic interest which it possesses. Section 72 (1) of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 requires special attention to be paid to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character or appearance of a conservation area.
386. The Framework notes that when considering the impact of a proposed development on the significance of a designated heritage asset, great weight should be given to the asset's conservation. The Framework describes the setting of a heritage asset as the surroundings in which it is experienced. Its extent is not fixed and may change as the asset and its surroundings evolve. Elements of a setting may make a positive or negative contribution to the significance of an asset, may affect the ability to appreciate that significance or may be neutral.
387. In enacting section 66(1), Parliament intended that the desirability of preserving the setting of listed buildings should not simply be given careful consideration by the decision-maker for the purpose of deciding whether there would be some harm, but that it should be given 'considerable importance and weight' when the decision-maker carries out the balancing exercise. Even where 'less than substantial' harm is identified, Section 66(1) requires considerable importance and weight to be given to the desirability of preserving the setting of

a listed building when carrying out the balancing exercise. The same applies to conservation areas.

388. In giving considerable importance and weight to the heritage assets, I find, taking the effects individually and cumulatively, that the special architectural and historic interest of these would be preserved and any effect on significance would be neutral. In relation to the Hampstead figure sculpture I consider that there is significant potential for the setting of this to be enhanced and the effect on the library is likely to be more positive than neutral.
389. However, I also found that in relation to conservation areas there would be some harm to appearance through views of the proposal and this should be added into the planning balance.
390. Overall there is considerable social benefit in the provision of the proposed housing and affordable housing, and by the provision of space for community use. The potential for the underground station to be improved would also be a significant benefit. There would also be an enhancement to the frontages of the buildings at ground level compared with the existing arrangement that could improve the vitality of the area.
391. I accept that it is an attractive design and will fit in with the area, but to my mind this must be an expectation of new development and therefore adds minimal weight to the planning balance.
392. I have found that there would be some impact on trees, although much of that would be in the short term of the development, but that weighs against the development. While every effort is made in terms of conditions and obligations to mitigate the impact of the construction of the development, there will inevitably be some disruption because of vehicle movements, and some small local increase in particulate production and this also weighs against the development. However, that is tempered by the fact that more housing is needed and development will need to occur somewhere.
393. While I have found that the heritage assets would not be harmed, there will be an impact on views from around the area which many people have indicated that they would find intrusive. There is also considerable local opposition to the proposal¹⁴², particularly in relation to the impact on the Swiss Cottage Open Space, so I consider that some weight against the proposal should be put into the planning balance for that harm. In respect of the Swiss Cottage Open Space, there will be some loss of sunlight, small changes to the microclimate and additional building surrounding it and again, while I have not found that unacceptable, but the increase in shading is a harm that needs to be weighed against the proposal.
394. In terms of the impact on views identified and if the Secretary of State disagrees with me in relation to the interpretation of policies in relation to the need for development to not only preserve, but also to enhance assets, I would conclude that the public benefits of the development far outweighs the harm.

¹⁴² Document IQ36 page 2 – Over 1,000 with some on behalf of groups of residents

395. Overall, I conclude that the social, economic and environmental benefits of the proposal make it sustainable development in terms of the Framework and that the substantial benefits considerably outweigh the harm that has been identified.

Recommendation

396. I recommend that the appeal be allowed for the demolition of the existing building and redevelopment with a 24 storey building and a part 7 part 5 storey building comprising a total of 184 residential units (class C3) and up to 1,041sqm of flexible retail/financial or professional or café/restaurant floorspace (classes A1/A2/A3) inclusive of part sui generis floorspace or potential new London Underground station access fronting Avenue Road and up to 1,350sqm for community use (Class D1) with associated works including enlargement of the existing basement level to contain disabled car parking spaces and cycle parking, landscaping and access improvements, within the terms of the application, Ref 2014/1617/P, dated 28 February 2014, subject to the conditions set out in Annex A, which I recommend be imposed and which I consider are necessary to achieve a satisfactory standard of development and supported by the planning obligations.

Graham Dudley

Inspector

APPEARANCES

FOR THE APPELLANT:

Mr R Warren QC	Instructed by Brecher, 64 North Row, London W1K 7DA
He called	
Mr Craig Casci MA(Hons)	Director GRID Architects
Dip Arch Grad Cons Dip (AA) RIBA	
Ian Absolon BSc MRICS	Director GVA Schatunowski Brooks
Peter Stewart MA (Cantab) Dip Arch RIBA	Peter Stewart Consultancy
Roger Mascall	Turley Heritage
BSc(Hons) Dip Bld Cons (RICS) IHBC MRTPI	
Michael Lowndes	Planning Director at Turley
BA(Hons) DipTP MSc Dip Cons (AA) MRTPI	

FOR THE LOCAL PLANNING AUTHORITY:

Mr N Cameron QC	Instructed by W Bartlett, Planning Solicitor, London Borough of Camden
He called	
Catherine Bond	Principal Planner (Conservation and Design), London Borough of Camden
BA(Hons) BArch(Hons) MTP Grad Dip Cons AA IHBC	
Phillip Hughes BA(Hons) MRTPI Dip Man MCMI	Principal, PHD Chartered Town Planners

FOR RULE 6 PARTIES

Ms K Olley	Of Counsel
She called	
Mr Tabor	
Julia Court	
Elaine Chambers	
Peter Rich Architect	
James Weeks	
Edie Raff	

FOR SAVE SWISS COTTAGE ACTION GROUP

Mr Tarpey	
He called	
Dr P Smith Architect	
Mr B Harverson	

Mr Reed

Mr Reed

INTERESTED PARTIES:

Cllr R Freeman
Cllr C Leyland
Cllr J Bucknell
Katharine Bligh
Madelaine Slade
Mr G Turner
Ms Carro
Mr Bagherzade
Mr Balint Kurti
Mr Barrie Tankel
Mr P Symonds
Mr Alan Spence
Mr Grimm
Mr T Ewing

Camden Association of Street Properties

DOCUMENTS

General and Application Documents

Document	G1	Appeal File
	G2	Blue folder of letters sent in by interested parties related to the application
	G3	Blue folder of letters sent in by interested parties related to the application
	G4	Black folder of letters sent in by interested parties related to the appeal
	G5	Black folder with relevant conservation area documents
	G6	Planning Statement
	G7	Sustainability Statement
	G8	Statement of Community Involvement
	G9	Transport Assessment
	G10	Townscape and Visual Impact Assessment
	G11	Heritage Statement
	G12	Energy Statement
	G13	Archaeological and Desk-based Assessment
	G14	Drainage Strategy
	G15	Stage 1 and 2 Arboricultural Report
	G16	Structural Design interface with London Underground
	G17	Flood Risk and Drainage Assessment
	G18	Pedestrian and Terrace Level Wind Microclimate Assessment
	G19	Preliminary Construction Information
	G20	Basement Impact Assessment
	G21	Air Quality Assessment
	G22	Noise and Vibration Assessment
	G23	Justification for the Loss of Office Space

- G24 BRE Sunlight and Overshadowing Report
- G25 Phase 1 Environmental Report
- G26 A Blimp over London from J Sachs

Appellant's Documents

- | | | |
|----------|-----|--|
| Document | A1 | Proof of Evidence of Mr Absolon |
| | A2 | Appendices 1 – 5 to Mr Absolon's Proof |
| | A3 | Summary proof of Evidence of Mr Lowndes |
| | A4 | Proof of Evidence and Appendices 1 - 4 of Mr Lowndes |
| | A5 | Summary Proof of Evidence of Mr Mascall |
| | A6 | Proof of Evidence of Mr Mascall |
| | A7 | Summary Proof of Evidence of Mr Stewart |
| | A8 | Proof of Evidence of Mr Stewart |
| | A9 | Proof of Evidence of Mr Casci |
| | A10 | Appendix 1 to Mr Casci's Proof |

Council's Documents

- | | | |
|----------|----|---|
| Document | C1 | Proof of Evidence of Ms Bond |
| | C2 | Proof of Evidence of Mr Hughes |
| | C3 | Appendices 1 – 14 to the Proof of Evidence of Mr Hughes |
| | C4 | Rebuttal proof of Ms Bond |
| | C5 | Rebuttal proof of Mr Hughes |

Rule 6 Documents

- | | | |
|-----|-----|---|
| Doc | | <i>Mr Reed</i> |
| | R1 | Proof of Evidence of Mr Reed |
| | R2 | Appendices to the Proof of Evidence of Mr Reed |
| | | <i>Belsize Residents Association</i> |
| | R3 | Proof of Evidence of Mr Tabor |
| | R4 | Proof of Evidence of Julia Court |
| | R5 | Summary Proof of Elaine Chambers |
| | R6 | Proof of Evidence of Elaine Chambers |
| | R7 | Proof of Evidence of Peter Rich |
| | R8 | Summary Proof of Evidence of James Weeks |
| | R9 | Proof of Evidence of James Weeks |
| | | <i>Save Swiss Cottage Action Group</i> |
| | R10 | Proof of Evidence of Dr Peter Smith |
| | R11 | Appendices 1 – 9 to the Proof of Evidence of Dr Smith |
| | | <i>Eton Avenue Housing Association</i> |
| | R12 | Proof of evidence of J Sachs |
| | | <i>Cresta House Residents' Association</i> |
| | R13 | Proof of evidence of E Raff |

Core Documents

Doc	CD1.0	Application Covering Letter
	CD1.1	Application form
	CD1.2	Site location plan
	CD1.3	Application Plans
	CD1.4	Visualisations Booklet by GRID
	CD1.5	CGI's Booklet by Grid
	CD1.6	Design and Access Statement
	CD1.7	Planning Statement
	CD1.8	Townscape and Visual Impact Assessment
	CD1.9	Heritage Statement
	CD1.10	Daylight and Sunlight Report
	CD1.11	Microclimate Assessment
	CD1.12	Transport Assessment
	CD1.13	Air Quality Assessment February 2014
	CD1.14	Air Quality Assessment August 2014
	CD1.15	Noise and Vibration Assessment
	CD1.16	Energy Strategy
	CD1.17	Sustainability Statement
	CD1.18	Statement of Community Involvement
	CD1.19	Preliminary Construction Information
	CD1.20	Construction Management Plan
	CD1.21	Avenue Road Air Quality Assessment
	CD1.22	Stage 1 and 2 Arboricultural Report
	CD1.23	Archaeological Desk-based Assessment
	CD1.24	Basement Impact Assessment
	CD1.25	Flood Risk Assessment
	CD1.26	Drainage Strategy
	CD1.27	Draft Delivery and Service Plan (Additional Submission)
	CD1.28	Demise Interface Report
	CD1.29	Phase 1 Environmental Report
	CD1.30	Justification for Loss of Office Use Report
	CD1.31	BPS Redacted Report on viability
	CD1.32	Response to Philip Davies Statement of Objections
	CD1.33	Peter Stewart Detailed Response to Philip Davies Objection
	CD1.34	Philip Davies Objection on behalf of Resident Groups
	CD1.35	Decision Notice
	CD1.36	Development Control Committee Minutes Sep 2014
	CD1.37	Officers' Committee Report
	CD1.38	Supplementary Agenda 11 Sep 2014 Development Control Cttee
	CD1.39	GLA Per Application Response
	CD1.40	GLA Stage 1 Report
	CD1.41	GLA Stage 2 Report
	CD1.42	Hoare Lee Daylight Review
	CD1.43	Hoare Lee Shadow Paths
	CD1.44	GVA Rebuttal to Hoare Lee Assessment
	CD1.45	Design Council Formal Response to Application May 2014
	CD1.46	Design Council Overshadowing Workshop Response Dec 2013
	CD1.47	Design Council Pre-Application 2 Response Nov 2013
	CD1.48	Design Council Pre-Application Response Aug 2013

-
- CD1.49 Draft S106 Agreement Aug 2014
 - CD1.50 Urban Design Compendium
 - CD1.51 Historic Environment Good Practice Advice in Planning Note 3 The Setting of Heritage Assets – Historic England 2015
 - CD1.52 Understanding Place-Conservation Area Designation, Appraisal and Management – English Heritage 2011
 - CD1.53 Principles of Selection for Listing Buildings – DCMS 2010
 - CD1.54 Culture and Entertainment Designation Listing and Selection Guide – English Heritage 2011
 - CD1.55 Commemorative Structures Designation Listing Selection Guide – English Heritage 2011
 - CD1.56 Domestic 4 Modern House and Housing Designation Listing Selection Guide – English Heritage 2011
 - CD1.57 BRE Site Layout Planning for Daylight and Sunlight Guide 2011
 - CD1.58 Camden Core Strategy Proposed Submission Proposals Map Changes 2009
 - CD1.59 Camden Housing Strategy 2011-2016
 - CD1.60 Camden Annual Monitoring Bulletin 2013/14
 - CD1.61 London Office Policy Review 2012
 - CD1.62 London SHMA 2013
 - CD1.63 London SHLAA 2013
 - CD1.64 Camden Employment Land Review 2008
 - CD1.65 Camden Annual Monitoring Report 2013/14
 - CD1.66 Statement of Common Ground
 - CD1.67 Tall Buildings Guidance
 - CD1.68 Laying the Foundations: A Housing Strategy for England

 - CD2.0 Map showing Location of the Site and Conservation Areas
 - CD2.1 Map showing Location of the Site and Listed Buildings
 - CD2.2 List Description for Grade II Listed Swiss Cottage Library
 - CD2.3 List Description for Grade II Listed adjacent Statue
 - CD2.4 List Description for Grade II Listed St John's Lodge
 - CD2.5 List Description for Grade II* Alexandra Road Estate
 - CD2.6 Conservation Area Statement for Belsize Conservation Area
 - CD2.7 Conservation Area Statement for Fitzjohn's/Netherhall Conservation Area
 - CD2.8 Conservation Area Statement for Alexandra Road Estate Conservation Area
 - CD2.9 Conservation Area Appraisal and Management Strategy for St John's Wood Conservation Area
 - CD2.10 Conservation Area Appraisal and Management Strategy for Elsworthy Conservation Area
 - CD2.11 Conservation Area Appraisal and Management Strategy for South Hampstead Conservation Area

 - CD3.0 National Planning Policy Framework

CD4.0	The London Plan 2011
CD4.1	The Mayor of London Housing SPG 2011
CD4.2	The Mayor of London Town Centres SPG 2014
CD4.3	The Mayor of London Housing Strategy 2014
CD4.4	The Mayor of London Interim Housing SPG 2015
CD4.5	Camden Core Strategy 2010
CD4.6	Camden Development Plan Policies 2010
CD4.7	Camden Site Allocations Local Development Documents 2013
CD4.8	Camden Planning Guidance 8 Planning Obligations 2015
CD5.0	Draft Camden Local Plan 2015
CD5.1	Historic England – Managing Significance in Decision Taking in the Historic Environment
CD5.2	Historic England Conservation Principles, Policies and Guidance
CD5.3	English Heritage Seeing the History in the View
CD5.4	Camden’s Local List
CD5.5	Camden Planning Guidance - Amenity

Documents handed in to Inquiry

Document	IQ1	Notification documents
	IQ2	Council’s Appearances
	IQ3	Appellant’s opening statement
	IQ4	Council’s opening statement
	IQ5	Evidence from Alan Spence
	IQ6	Evidence of B Tankel
	IQ7	Evidence of Cllr J Bucknell
	IQ8	Plan submitted by Save Swiss Cottage showing properties opposite
	IQ9	Cutting from local paper (Ham and High) dated July 2 2015
	IQ10	Correspondence related to having a blimp at site visit
	IQ11	Objection to scheme from Mr Steadman
	IQ12	Objection to scheme from K Fernald
	IQ13	Objection to scheme from J Sheridan
	IQ14	Letter from Z Goldsmith MP
	IQ15	Email with photograph from J Sachs
	IQ16	Evidence from P Perkins – Winchester Project
	IQ17	Objection from M Caro
	IQ18	Background information A Spence
	IQ19	Emails relating to flying of blimp at site visit
	IQ20	Photograph of library with sculpture in original position and view from swimming pool
	IQ21	Extract of Planning Practice Guidance
	IQ22	Camden’s Local List
	IQ23	Note relating to appendix one of Dr Smith’s proof
	IQ24	Tree plans enlarged by Save Swiss Cottage Action Group
	IQ25	Press article relating to scrapping of a previous proposal for 16 storey building at the appeal site
	IQ26	Housing provision statistics

IQ27	Information provided for the site visit
IQ28	Evidence of K Bligh
IQ29	Additional evidence from Janine Sachs
IQ30	Draft Addendum to Statement of Common Ground
IQ31	Response by RWDI relating to additional evidence from J Sachs
IQ32	Photograph of blimps from various locations – T Tugnutt DipArch RIBA
IQ33	Closing on behalf of Camden Association of Street Properties
IQ34	Closing statement/submissions of Save Swiss Cottage Action Group
IQ35	Closing statement of David Reed
IQ36	Closing submissions of Belsize Residents' Association
IQ37	Closing submissions of the London Borough of Camden
IQ38	Essential Living (Swiss Cottage) Ltd closing submissions
IQ39	Report of S106 Agreement
IQ40	Signed 106 Agreement
IQ41	Plan submitted by Save Swiss Cottage showing heritage assets

PLANS

Plan	Application Drawings
------	----------------------

1	Location Plan
2	PL 099 P3
3	PL 100 P2
4	PL 101 P1
5	PL 102 P1
6	PL 105 P3
7	PL 106 P1
8	PL 107 P2
9	PL 108 P1
10	PL 113 P1
11	PL 119 P1
12	PL 121 P1
13	PL 123 P1
14	PL 124 P1
15	PL 161 P1
16	PL 162 P1
17	PL 163 P1
18	PL 164 P1
19	PL 170 P1
20	PL 171 P1
21	PL 172 P1
22	PL 173 P1
23	PL 200 P1
24	PL 201 P2
25	PL 202 P1
26	PL 203 P1
27	PL 204 P1
28	PL 205 P1
29	PL 206 P1
30	PL 207 P1

31 PL 210 P1
32 PL 211 P1
33 PL 401 P1
34 PL 402 P1
35 PL 403 P1
36 PL 404 P1
37 PL 405 P1
38 PL 406 P1
39 LL443 100 001 P1
40 LL443 100 002 P2
41 LL443 100 003 P1
42 LL443 100 004 P1
43 LL443 100 005 P2
44 LL443 100 006 P1
45 LL443 100 007 P1
46 LL443 100 100
47 LL443 100 101

Annex A – List of Proposed Conditions

1. The works hereby permitted shall be begun not later than the end of three years from the date of this consent.
2. The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the approved plans listed below.

PL_099 P3, PL_100 P2, PL_101 P1, PL_102 P1, PL_105 P3, PL_106 P1, PL_107 P2, PL_108 P1, PL_113 P2, PL_119 P1, PL_121 P1, PL_123 P1, PL_124 P1, PL_161 P1, PL_162 P1, PL_163 P1, PL_164 P1, PL_170 P1, PL_171 P1, PL_172 P1, PL_173 P1, PL_200 P1, PL_201 P2, PL_202 P1, PL_203 P1, PL_204 P1, PL_205 P1, PL_206 P1, PL_207 P1, PL_210 P1, PL_211 P1, PL_401 P1, PL_402 P1, PL_403 P1, PL_404 P1, PL_405 Pt, PL_406 P1, LL443-100-001 P1, LL443-100-002 P2, LL443-100-003 P1, LL443-100-001 P1, LL443-100-004 P1, LL443-100-005 P2, LL443-100-006 P1, LL443-100-007 P1, LL443-100-100, LL443-200-101.

Reason: For the avoidance of doubt and in the interest of proper planning.

3. No part of the development hereby permitted shall be occupied until the following have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority
 - 1) full details of hard and soft landscaping and means of enclosure of all un-built, open areas [such details/shall include details of any proposed earthworks including grading, mounding and other changes in ground levels as well as the delivery of a feature of public art.]
 - 2) a scheme for replacement trees, including details of tree pit locations, viability and a planting programme.
 - 3) a planting programme and landscape aftercare plan.

The development shall be undertaken in accordance with the approved details including the planting program.

Reason: To ensure that the development achieves a high quality of landscaping which contributes to the visual amenity and character of the area, in accordance with the requirements of policies CS14, CS15 of the London Borough of Camden Local Development Framework Core Strategy and policy DP24 of the London Borough of Camden Local Development Framework Development Policies.

4. Development works (other than demolition) shall not take place until plans showing the levels at the interface of the relevant phase of development with the boundary of the property and the public highway have been submitted to and approved in writing by the council. Thereafter the development shall be carried out in accordance with the details approved.

Reason: To ensure that the scheme promotes the use of sustainable transport means in accordance with policy CS11 of the London Borough of Camden Local Development Framework Core Strategy.

5. No plant or machinery shall be installed on the external parts of the building other than in the areas indicated as plant areas on the plans hereby approved.

Reason: To ensure that the appearance of any external plant is compatible with the appearance of the building and the area and to ensure that residential amenities are protected, in accordance with the requirements of policies CS5 and CS14 of the London Borough of Camden Local Development Framework Core Strategy and policies. DP24, DP25 and DP28 of the London Borough of Camden Local Development Framework Development Policies.

6. Prior to the installation of any mechanical plant, an acoustic report demonstrating how any mechanical plant to be installed will accord with the noise and vibration standards as set out in the Local Development Framework and Camden Planning Guidance shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The report shall include such manufacturer's specifications and details of noise and vibration mitigation measures as necessary. The plant shall not be operated other than in complete accordance with such measures approved.

Reason: To safeguard the amenities of the adjoining premises and the area generally in accordance with the requirements of policy CS5 of the London Borough of Camden Local Development Framework Core Strategy and policies DP26 and DP28 of the London Borough of Camden Local Development Framework Development Policies.

7. At 1 metre outside the windows of any neighbouring habitable room the level of noise from all plant and machinery shall be at all times at least 5 decibels below the existing background noise levels, expressed in dB(A) at such locations. Where the noise from the plant and machinery is tonal in character the differences in these levels shall be at least 10 dB(A).

Reason: To safeguard the amenities of the adjoining premises and the area generally in accordance with the requirements of policy CS5 of the London Borough of Camden Local Development Framework Core Strategy and policies DP26 and DP28 of the London Borough of Camden Local Development Framework Development Policies.

8. No more than 1100sqm gross external area of floorspace shall be provided within use classes A1-A3.

Reason: To ensure that the future occupation of the premises does not undermine the vitality and viability of the Finchley Road/Swiss Cottage Town Centre, in accordance with policy CS7 of the London Borough of Camden Local Development Framework Core Strategy and policy DP10 and DP12 of the London Borough of Camden Local Development Framework Development Policies.

9. Before any ducting and ventilation is installed associated with the proposed Class A uses details of extract ventilating systems shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. Such details to include routing of ducts and discharge points and associated acoustic isolation and sound and vibration attenuation measures and an Acoustic Impact report prepared by a suitably qualified and experienced acoustic engineer which sets out how the equipment would meet the council's published noise and vibration standards.
10. The acoustic isolation shall thereafter be maintained in effective order. In the event of no satisfactory ventilation being provided, no primary cooking shall take place on the premises.

Reason: To safeguard the amenities of the adjoining premises and the area generally in accordance with the requirements of policies CS5 and CS7 of the

London Borough of Camden Local Development Framework Core Strategy and policies DP12 and DP26 of the London Borough of Camden Local Development Framework Development Policies.

11. Any Class A use hereby permitted shall not be carried out outside the following times:
08:00hrs to 23:00hrs Sunday to Thursday and Bank Holidays and 08:00hrs to 00:00hrs on Friday and Saturday.
12. Outdoor seating areas associated with the Class A uses shall be cleared of customers between 22:00 and 08:00 hours, 7 days a week.
Reason: To safeguard the residential amenities of the adjoining premises and the area generally in accordance with the requirements of policies CS5 and CS7 of the London Borough of Camden Local Development Framework Core Strategy and policy DP26 and DP12 of the London Borough of Camden Local Development Framework Development Policies.
13. The shop front windows to the retail and food drink units shall be used for display purposes and the window glass must not be painted or obscured.

Reason: To safeguard the appearance of the premises and the character of the immediate area and to prevent the introduction of dead frontages within the development in accordance with the requirements of policy CS14 of the London Borough of Camden Local Development Framework Core Strategy and policies DP24 and DP25 of the London Borough of Camden Local Development Framework Development Policies.
14. Development shall not commence below ground level until a scheme for the following has been submitted to and approved in writing by the council:
 1. an intrusive land contamination survey and the written results. Laboratory results must be provided as numeric values in a formatted electronic spread sheet.
 2. a remediation scheme, if necessary, shall be agreed in writing with the Local Planning Authority.

The scheme as approved shall be implemented before any part of the development hereby permitted is occupied.

Reason: To protect future occupiers of the development from the possible presence of ground contamination arising in connection with the previous industrial/storage use of the site in accordance with policy CS5 of the London Borough of Camden Local Development Framework Core Strategy and policy DP26 of the London Borough of Camden Local Development Framework Development Policies.

15. Development works (other than Demolition) shall not take place until details of the following micro climate mitigation measures have been submitted to and approved in writing by the council.
 - the raising of the proposed balustrade on the west-facing penthouse to 1.8m in height and mitigation in the area of the eastern site boundary adjacent to the Hampstead Theatre

Development shall not be carried out other than in accordance with the approved measures.

Reason: To ensure that suitable measures are incorporated within the design to mitigate potential adverse wind environments arising from the development and to safeguard the amenities of the area generally in accordance with the requirements of policy CS5 of the London Borough of Camden Local Development Framework Core Strategy and policy DP26 of the London Borough of Camden Local Development Framework Development Policies.

16. Prior to the occupation of the first residential unit three of the proposed basement car parking spaces shall include access to an electrical charging point.

Reason: In the interests of sustainable transport in accordance with policy CS11 of the London Borough of Camden Local Development Framework Core Strategy and policy DP16 of the London Borough of Camden Local Development Framework Development Policies

17. (i) Works below ground level shall not start until detailed design and construction method statements for all of the ground floor structures, foundations and basements and for any structures below ground level, including piling (temporary and permanent) have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. These shall:
- Accommodate the proposed location of the HS2 structures and tunnels.
 - Accommodate ground movement and associated effects arising from the construction thereof, and;
 - Mitigate the effects of noise and vibration arising from the operation of the HS2 railway within the tunnels, ventilation shaft and associated below and above ground structures.

(ii) The design and construction method statements to be submitted under part (i) shall include arrangements to secure that, during any period when concurrent construction is taking place of both the development hereby permitted and of the HS2 structures and tunnels in or adjacent to the site of that development, the construction of the HS2 structures and tunnels is not impeded. The development shall be carried out in all respects in accordance with the approved design and method statement and all structures and works comprised within the development hereby permitted which are required by the approved design statements in order to procure the matters mentioned in part (i) shall be completed, in their entirety, before any part of the building(s) hereby permitted is/are occupied.

(iii) No works below ground level comprised within the development hereby permitted shall be carried out at any time when a tunnel boring machine used for the purposes of boring tunnels for the HS2 Ltd railway is within 100 metres of the land on which the development hereby permitted is situated.

Reason: To manage the structural impact of the development upon the HS2 proposals, in accordance with policies CS5 and CS14 of the London Borough of Camden Local Development Framework Core Strategy and policies DP24, DP26 and DP27 of the London Borough of Camden Local Development Framework Development Policies.

18. Development works (other than demolition) shall not take place until details of the following have been submitted to, and approved in writing by, the Local Planning Authority:

- a) Facing materials of all buildings
- b) Details including typical sections at 1:10 of external windows and door frames.
- c) Details including materials typical of balconies and roof terraces.

The relevant part of the works shall not be carried out otherwise than in accordance with the details approved.

Reason: To safeguard the appearance of the site and the character of the immediate area in accordance with the requirements of Policy CS14 of the London Borough of Camden Local Development Framework Core Strategy and policy DP24 and DP25 of the London Borough of Camden Local Development Framework Development Policies.

19. Prior to first occupation details of the following shall be submitted to, and approved in writing by, the Local Planning Authority:

- Shopfronts; including sections, elevations and materials

The relevant part of the works shall not be carried out otherwise than in accordance with the details thus approved.

Reason: To safeguard the appearance of the site and the character of the immediate area in accordance with the requirements of policy CS14 of the London Borough of Camden Local Development Framework Core Strategy and policy DP24 and DP25 of the London Borough of Camden Local Development Framework Development Policies.

20. Replacement trees that do not survive for five years after they are planted shall be replaced within the first available planting season.

Reason: To ensure that the development achieves a high quality of landscaping which contributes to the visual amenity and character of the area, in accordance with the requirements of policies CS14, CS15 of the London Borough of Camden Local Development Framework Core Strategy and policy DP24 of the London Borough of Camden Local Development Framework Development Policies.

21. Before any development commences details demonstrating how trees to be retained shall be protected during demolition and construction work shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the council. Such details shall be implemented as approved before any development commences and retained during the demolition and construction works, unless otherwise agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The approved works shall follow guidelines and standards set out in BS5837:2012 "Trees in Relation to Construction". All trees on the site, or parts of trees growing from adjoining sites, unless shown on the permitted drawings as being removed, shall be retained and protected from damage in accordance with the approved protection details.

Reason: To ensure that the development will not have an adverse effect on existing trees and in order to maintain the character and amenity of the area in accordance with the requirements of policy CS15 of the London Borough of Camden Local Development Framework Core Strategy.

22. None of the residential units shall be occupied until details of external lighting have been submitted to and approved by the Local Planning Authority. The external lighting details shall be implemented and retained in accordance with the approved details before any residential unit is occupied.

Reason: In the interests of amenity and security in accordance with policies CS17 and CPG1 (Design).

23. Before the occupation of any part of the development full details of cycle parking shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority and thereafter provided in accordance with the approved details. The approved cycle parking facilities shall be permanently retained thereafter.

Reason: To ensure the development provides adequate cycle parking facilities in accordance with the requirements of policy CS11 of the London Borough of Camden Local Development Framework Core Strategy and policy DP17 of the London Borough of Camden Local Development Framework Development Policies.

24. Before any works or construction commences details of at least two real time particulate air quality monitors shall be submitted to and agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority. Such details shall include the location, number and specification of the monitors, including evidence of the fact that they have been installed in line with guidance outlined in the GLA's Control of Dust and Emissions during Construction and Demolition Supplementary Planning Guidance. The monitors shall be installed 1 month prior to the development taking place and must be retained and maintained on site for the duration of the development in accordance with the details thus approved. Real time data from the monitors should be available online, and council officers provided access to this data. In addition, quarterly reports should be sent to the Air Quality officer for the duration of the works. These should detail any exceedences of the trigger action level (which is 250 ug/m³), and the action that was taken to remedy this.

Reason: To safeguard the amenities of the adjoining premises and the area generally in accordance with the requirements of policies CS5 and CS7 of the London Borough of Camden Local Development Framework Core Strategy and policies DP12, DP26 and DP28 of the London Borough of Camden Local Development Framework Development Policies.

25. Before any plant is installed details of the proposed CHP (combined heat and power) engine and any required mitigation measures to demonstrate that the Mayor's 'Band B' NO_x emissions standards will be adhered to must be submitted to the Local Authority and approved in writing. The measures shall be installed in accordance with the approved details.
26. Prior to occupation, details (installation contracts, photographs) of the approved CHP engine and required mitigation measures to demonstrate that the Mayor's 'Band B' NO_x emissions standards will be adhered to must be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. Thereafter, these measures shall be retained in accordance with the approved details.

Reason: To safeguard the amenities of the adjoining premises and the area generally in accordance with the requirements of policies CS5 and CS7 of the London Borough of Camden Local Development Framework Core Strategy and policies DP12, DP26 and DP28 of the London Borough of Camden Local Development Framework Development Policies.

27. Before any development commences details of proposed u-values and the approach to thermal bridging shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details.

Reason: To ensure a sustainable and resource efficient development in accordance with the requirements of policies CS13 and CS16 of the London Borough of Camden Local Development Framework Core Strategy and policies DP22, DP23 and DP32 of the London Borough of Camden Local Development Framework Development Policies

28. The development shall achieve 60% BREEAM score for the retail (A Class), retail/LUL and community floorspace within the buildings.

Reason: To ensure a sustainable and resource efficient development in accordance with the requirements of policies CS13 and CS16 of the London Borough of Camden Local Development Framework Core Strategy and policies DP22, DP23 and DP32 of the London Borough of Camden Local Development Framework Development Policies.

29. Before first occupation details of the brown roof in the area indicated on the approved roof plan of the tower element shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. No part of the buildings shall be occupied until the approved details have been implemented and these works shall be permanently retained and maintained thereafter.

Reason: In order to ensure the development undertakes reasonable measures to take account of biodiversity and the water environment in accordance with policies CS13, CS15 and CS16 of the London Borough of Camden Local Development Framework Core Strategy and policies DP22, DP23 and DP32 of the London Borough of Camden Local Development Framework Development Policies.

30. Before the first residential unit is occupied details of mechanical ventilation shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the council. Prior to occupation of any residential unit the mechanical ventilation shall be installed and be in full working in the residential units, as the approved details. All such measures shall thereafter be retained and maintained.

Reason: To safeguard the amenities of the premises and the area generally in accordance with the requirements of policies CS5 and CS7 of the London Borough of Camden Local Development Framework Core Strategy and policies DP26, DP28 and DP12 of the London Borough of Camden Local Development Framework Development Policies.

31. Before development commences detailed design and assessment reports and outline method statements (in consultation with London Underground) for all of the foundations, basement and ground floor structures, or for any other structures below ground level, including piling (temporary and permanent), shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning authority, such reports shall:
- provide details on all structures over and adjacent to LU assets
 - accommodate the location of the existing London Underground structures and tunnels
 - accommodate ground movement arising from the construction thereof
 - mitigate the effects of noise and vibration arising from the adjoining operations within the structures and tunnels and mitigate against any EMC (Electromagnetic Compatibility) issues arising from the construction of the new plant.

The development shall thereafter be carried out in all respects in accordance with the approved design and assessment report, method statements and subject to an agreed monitoring strategy, and all structures and works comprised within the development which are required by the approved

design statements in order to procure the matters mentioned in paragraphs of this condition shall be completed, in their entirety, before any part of the building hereby permitted is occupied.

Reason: To ensure that the development does not impact on existing London Underground transport infrastructure, in accordance with London Plan 2011 Table 6.1 and 'Land for Industry and Transport' Supplementary Planning Guidance 2012.

32. The proposed Class A uses will operate within use classes A1, A2, and A3 only.

Reason: To ensure that the future occupation of the building does not adversely affect the adjoining premises/immediate area by reason of noise and disturbance in accordance with policy CS5 of the London Borough of Camden Local Development Framework Core Strategy and policies DP26 and DP28 of the London Borough of Camden Local Development Framework Development Policies and to protect the viability of Swiss Cottage Town Centre in accordance with policies CS7, DP12 and Camden Planning Guidance No.5.

33. Before any residential unit is occupied a scheme to demonstrate that each dwelling hereby approved achieves a maximum internal water use of 105 litres/person/day, allowing 5 litres/person/day for external water use, shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The development shall be constructed in accordance with the approved scheme and retained thereafter.

Reason: To ensure the development contributes to minimising the need for further water infrastructure in an area of water stress in accordance with policies CS13 (Tackling climate change through promoting higher environmental standards), DP22 (Promoting sustainable design and construction) and DP23 (Water).



RIGHT TO CHALLENGE THE DECISION IN THE HIGH COURT

These notes are provided for guidance only and apply only to challenges under the legislation specified. If you require further advice on making any High Court challenge, or making an application for Judicial Review, you should consult a solicitor or other advisor or contact the Crown Office at the Royal Courts of Justice, Queens Bench Division, Strand, London, WC2 2LL (0207 947 6000).

The attached decision is final unless it is successfully challenged in the Courts. The Secretary of State cannot amend or interpret the decision. It may be redetermined by the Secretary of State only if the decision is quashed by the Courts. However, if it is redetermined, it does not necessarily follow that the original decision will be reversed.

SECTION 1: PLANNING APPEALS AND CALLED-IN PLANNING APPLICATIONS

The decision may be challenged by making an application for permission to the High Court under section 288 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (the TCP Act). This new requirement for permission to bring a challenge applies to decisions made on or after 26 October 2015.

Challenges under Section 288 of the TCP Act

With the permission of the High Court under section 288 of the TCP Act, decisions on called-in applications under section 77 of the TCP Act (planning), appeals under section 78 (planning) may be challenged. Any person aggrieved by the decision may question the validity of the decision on the grounds that it is not within the powers of the Act or that any of the relevant requirements have not been complied with in relation to the decision. An application for leave under this section must be made within six weeks from the date of the decision.

SECTION 2: ENFORCEMENT APPEALS

Challenges under Section 289 of the TCP Act

Decisions on recovered enforcement appeals under all grounds can be challenged under section 289 of the TCP Act. To challenge the enforcement decision, permission must first be obtained from the Court. If the Court does not consider that there is an arguable case, it may refuse permission. Application for leave to make a challenge must be received by the Administrative Court within 28 days of the decision, unless the Court extends this period.

SECTION 3: AWARDS OF COSTS

A challenge to the decision on an application for an award of costs which is connected with a decision under section 77 or 78 of the TCP Act can be made under section 288 of the TCP Act if permission of the High Court is granted.

SECTION 4: INSPECTION OF DOCUMENTS

Where an inquiry or hearing has been held any person who is entitled to be notified of the decision has a statutory right to view the documents, photographs and plans listed in the appendix to the Inspector's report of the inquiry or hearing within 6 weeks of the date of the decision. If you are such a person and you wish to view the documents you should get in touch with the office at the address from which the decision was issued, as shown on the letterhead on the decision letter, quoting the reference number and stating the day and time you wish to visit. At least 3 days notice should be given, if possible.